

Summary of Submissions by Chapter/Topic

Now including reference to Further Submissions

This document has been updated to include late further submission accepted as per **Minute 3** and minor corrections

Contents

General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan	Pg.1
Mapping	Pg.47
How the Plan Works	Pg.244
Interpretation - Definitions	Pg.245
Tangata Whenua	Pg.312
National Direction Instruments	Pg.316
Strategic Direction	Pg.549
Energy Infrastructure and Transport	Pg.589
Energy, Infrastructure and Transport - Three Waters	Pg.550
Energy, Infrastructure and Transport - Infrastructure	Pg.580
Energy, Infrastructure and Transport - Renewable Energy Generation	Pg.743
Energy, Infrastructure and Transport - Transport	Pg.771
Hazards and Risks - Contaminated Land	Pg.806
Hazards and Risks - Hazardous Substances	Pg.807
Hazards and Risks - Natural Hazards	Pg.810
Historical and Cultural Values - Historic Heritage	Pg.851
Historical and Cultural Values - Notable Trees	Pg.903
Historical and Cultural Values - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Pg.908
Historical and Cultural Values - Viewshafts	Pg.935
Natural Environment Values - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Pg.937
Natural Environment Values - Natural Character	Pg.993
Natural Environment Values - Natural Features and Landscapes	Pg.1000
Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity - Public Access	Pg.1028
Subdivision	Pg.1030
General District-wide Matters	Pg.1094
General District-wide Matters - Coastal Environment	Pg.1095
General District-wide Matters - Earthworks	Pg.1179
General District-wide Matters - Light	Pg.1213
General District-wide Matters - Noise	Pg.1221
General District-wide Matters - Signs	Pg.1281
General District-wide Matters - Temporary Activities	Pg.1329
General District-wide Matters - Wind	Pg.1336
General Point on Part 3	Pg.1338
Residential - General Points	Pg.1339
Residential - Medium Density Residential Zone	Pg.1355
Residential - High Density Residential Zone	Pg.1568
Residential - Large Lot Residential Zone	Pg.1668
Rural Zone	Pg.1679
Commercial and Mixed use - General Points	Pg.1701
Commercial and Mixed use - Neighbourhood Centre Zone	Pg.1709
Commercial and Mixed use - Local Centre Zone	Pg.1744
Commercial and Mixed use - Commercial Zone	Pg.1793
Commercial and Mixed use - Mixed Use Zone	Pg.1802
Commercial and Mixed use - Metropolitan Centre Zone	Pg.1830
Commercial and Mixed use - City Centre Zone	Pg.1880
General Industrial Zone	Pg.2015
Open Space and Recreation Zone	Pg.2024
Open Space and Recreation - Natural Open Space Zone	Pg.2026

Open Space and Recreation - Open Space Zone	Pg.2040
Open Space and Recreation - Sport and Active Recreation Zone	Pg.2049
Special Purpose Zone - General Points	Pg.2052
Special Purpose Zone - Airport Zone	Pg.2055
Special Purpose Zone - Corrections Zone	Pg.2089
Special Purpose Zone - Future Urban Zone	Pg.2091
Special Purpose Zone - Hospital Zone	Pg.2092
Special Purpose Zone - Port Zone	Pg.2100
Special Purpose Zone - Quarry Zone	Pg.2111
Special Purpose Zone - Stadium Zone	Pg.2114
Special Purpose Zone - Tertiary Education Zone	Pg.2115
Special Purpose Zone - Waterfront Zone	Pg.2123
Special Purpose Zone - Wellington Town Belt Zone	Pg.2149
Development Areas - General Points	Pg.2153
Development Areas - Kilbirnie Bus Barns	Pg.2154
Development Areas - Lincolnshire Farm	Pg.2155
Development Areas - Upper Stebbings and Glenside West	Pg.2163
Designations	Pg.2179
Appendices	Pg.2186
Design Guide	Pg.2204
Schedules	Pg.2273
General Points – Other	Pg.2357

General Points on Whole PDP

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Peter Kelly	16.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Councillors have a democratic mandate to balance the interests of WCC residents against the important natural environment values represented by significant natural areas (SNAs). The Proposed Rules are essentially the Officer Draft Rules, but with the SNA designation removed from all residential zoned land. Requests that if SNAs are returned to residentially zoned land, the provisions in the draft District Plan are reinstated and fine-tuned.	If the Proposed District Plan is amended to allow Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land: Seeks that the proposed District Plan gives effect to paragraph 6 of the amendment in the name of Councillors Jenny Condie and Rebecca Matthews.
Lizzie Waugh	30.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports higher density housing in Newtown.	Retain as notified.
Brendon White	36.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the changes in the PDP that allow more intensification for the reasons of - housing affordability - climate change - productive land use	Retain intensification provisions as notified.
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Restrictive district plan requirements can adversely affect the ability of aerial operators to undertake and respond (particularly to biosecurity and biosecurity threats.	Seeks that the use of airstrips and helicopter landing areas for agricultural aviation activities on an intermittent basis are adequately provided for in the Proposed District Plan.
Paul Burnaby	44.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Council should provide heritage incentives to encourage the appropriate recognition and protection of places of historic heritage value. The following are examples to indicate the types of incentives, and is certainly not meant to be exhaustive, as there are many incentives that may be open to Council: (a) Enabling Transferrable Development Rights (TDRs) for owners of historic heritage places (b) Providing a 'fast-track' process for proposed development where a Conservation Plan has been prepared and provided for a historic heritage place, and where the Conservation Plan has been used to guide the proposed development.	Seeks that Council provide heritage incentives to encourage the appropriate recognition and protection of places of historic heritage value.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that growth estimates are a key component to a successful plan. It is unclear what the final impact of Covid and the new working landscape will have on the city.	Seeks that the Council split the 30 year District Plan into three 10 year stages to allow for reviewed and updated population growth estimates every 10 years.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that critical mass is required to preserve character and that WCC officers' recommended character precincts in Mt Victoria, guided by the Boffa Miskell Report, were reduced significantly with reasons for this decision not clear.	Seeks clarification as to why the character areas were reduced in size.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that a number of empty office buildings will be suitable for converting to residential and that this could be attractive to students among others.	Seeks that the Council split the 30 year District Plan into three 10 year stages to allow for reviewed and updated population growth estimates every 10 years.
Grant Birkinshaw	52.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Considers that the District Plan Review is overly complex, and becomes less a document for the public use, and more one requiring professional (and expensive) advice to use. The District Plan Review is a discouragement of public participation in what should be a democratic instrument. The evolution of District Plans has deteriorated to this extent and requires a fresh approach.	Opposes the District Plan Review in its entirety.
Grant Birkinshaw	52.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the District Plan review, as notified, should be reassessed to become a more user friendly public document.	Seeks that the District Plan Review process be reassessed to become a more user friendly public document.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Acknowledges the differentiation between historic heritage and character precincts, even though there is some overlap with some character precincts also being identified as heritage areas, or containing heritage buildings.	Not specified.
Aro Valley Community Council	87.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	The Aro Valley Community Council does not believe that the PDP understands or adequately responds to a number of important considerations (sunlight, aging infrastructure, character homes, wellbeing for community members particularly marginalised peoples). Considers HRZ zoning is inappropriate and some sites should retain character protection provided by the ODP. Considers that while intensification is important, it should not be at the expense of fundamentals such as biodiversity, sunlight and human scale.	Seeks site specific changes to zoning.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Aro Valley Community Council	87.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that sunlight is scarce in Aro Valley and further losses of this will be unacceptable. Sunlight is a key component of health and wellbeing and it the Council's responsibility to protect and promote community wellbeing.	Seeks site specific changes to zoning.
Aro Valley Community Council	87.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that any increase in population density must be accompanied by, and increase, sunny and accessible open space.	Not specified.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the term 'cannot be achieved' implies the standard must be complied with unless it is impossible to do so and should be changed to 'is not achieved' throughout the entirety of the Proposed District Plan. Amending the language to 'is not achieved' reflects language used in district plans elsewhere in the country and provides greater consenting flexibility for when permitted activity standards are not met.	Seeks that all instances of 'cannot be achieved' in the Proposed District Plan are changed to 'is not achieved'.
Oliver Sangster	112.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports general thrust of the plan to increase density in neighbourhood areas	Retain growth approach of intensification.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports all moves towards higher density housing. Significant housing supply increases are necessary and effective in improving housing affordability. Higher density housing is more sustainable, affordable, and resource-efficient approach, and promotes connectivity within the city.	Seeks that all moves towards higher density housing are supported. [Inferred decision requested].
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the PDP is not ambitious enough with regard to sustainability, resilience, and climate change and does not adequately recognise that we are in a climate emergency.	Seeks that the proposed District Plan should refer to the 2022 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers report, and plan and revise the District Plan, as a living document, with the specific warnings for these time frames in mind – particularly focusing on preparing for long-term consequences.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that the IPCC <i>Summary for Policymakers</i> explains that in terms of adaptation and preparation for climate change, lower income population groups will suffer most from adaptation gaps. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]. Considers that WCC should take full heed of the IPCC warning and plans now in order to protect the most vulnerable communities in the future. Increasing climate resilience in Pōneke Wellington looks like addressing poverty. The needs of the private sector are often over-represented in city planning and development plans, however to improve climate resilience and social justice, vulnerable communities need to be at the front and centre of plans and city design.	Seeks that the District Plan should support the creation and maintenance of affordable, warm, dry and safe housing, infrastructure and spaces that support community-building and inclusion, improving shelter conditions, and more.
Airbnb	126.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the permitted status for visitor accommodation in all zones.	Retain provisions providing for visitor accommodation as an Permitted Activity in the PDP as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
Airbnb	126.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that home sharers must also be good neighbours and take the issues of managing wrongdoers seriously. This is why we are eager to work with governments and communities on policies that address amenity concerns and have supported frameworks to resolve issues. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that a standardised approach is utilised to assess impacts on amenity values from visitor accommodation activities.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Generally supports the aims of the PDP. In particular Precinct Properties supports the following features and objectives of the plan: (a) the creation of well-functioning urban environments (consistent with the direction set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS@UD)); (b) the provision of sufficient development capacity to meet long term demands for housing and business land; (c) the provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification; and (d) the hierarchy of centres, and the recognition of the City Centre as the primary centre serving the wider Wellington region.	Not specified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that it is not appropriate that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications. Rather than being formally incorporated into the District Plan, the design guides should be reference documents that sit outside the District Plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance.	Seeks that all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed District Plan provisions are deleted and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.
John Tiley	142.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the following wording ('Protects the natural ridge top around the Upper Stebbings Valley to provide a natural backdrop to Upper Stebbings and Tawa valleys and a connected reserves network') is typical of dealing with all ridgelines.
Andy Foster	FS86.24	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.1].	Allow
Andy Foster	FS86.30	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.10].	Allow
Grant Buchan	143.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the Spatial Plan was agreed through a robust process and it is inappropriate to re-litigate character protections/height limits.	Seeks that where character protections or height limits have been imposed over the Spatial Plan recommendations, these are removed.
Grant Buchan	143.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that where restrictions in the Spatial Plan are inconsistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS they should be removed, even if these were present in the Spatial Plan.	Seeks that height limits inconsistent with the NPS-UD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development) are removed.
Matthew Gibbons	148.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers there should be increased densification throughout Wellington, including in Character Precincts.	Supports the Proposed District Plan provisions that enable intensification.
Amos Mann	172.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that easier consenting and incentives for accessible and eco-friendly developments are provided for.
Amos Mann	172.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the District Plan prioritises emissions reduction, better quality of life, and community cohesion and resilience.
Amos Mann	172.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Supports integrating circular economy principles into the District Plan.	Seeks that waste is minimised and designed out of construction projects, and that resource recovery infrastructure is put in place to manage any remaining waste.
Amos Mann	172.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that green space should be recreational, food producing, and support biodiversity. Community gardens and green stormwater infrastructure should maximise their value across all these outcomes.	Seeks that the District Plan supports the creation of a sustainable and resilient local food and biodiversity network system.
Amos Mann	172.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Tangata Whenua and Te Tiriti are placed at the core of planning.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington	182.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports provisions of the PDP aimed at planning for a capital city that is compact, resilient, energetic, prosperous, inclusive, connected, green, and partnered with mana whenua.	Not specified.
Churton Park Community Association	189.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the following wording ('Protects the natural ridge top around the Upper Stebbings Valley to provide a natural backdrop to Upper Stebbings and Tawa valleys and a connected reserves network') is typical of dealing with all ridgelines.
Andy Foster	FS86.35	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 189.1].	Allow
Chris Howard	192.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Opposes the Proposed District Plan for the following reasons: - Considers that it ignores that there are numerous streets in greater Wellington that contain well maintained, character, semi-heritage buildings that are predominantly single storey. -considers that the plan does not enable residential intensification that is carefully tailored to avoid destroying the widespread special character that exists across many of the city's well-established suburbs. - considers the plan risks being highly damaging to local character and the city's unique beauty and liveability. - considers the plan risks unnecessarily fragmenting neighbourhood cohesion, due to development fairness inequity - one size fits all approach to intensification across Wellington in not appropriate across our varied property sections and suburbs. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council urgently undertake an updated section-by-section, and street-by-street review of all areas in their draft spatial plan to determine what level of intensification is contextually appropriate for a given section or area.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.11	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that upzoning heights on swathes of housing is very 'destructive'. Considers high rise sites need to be carefully and individually selected according to topology with pockets of intensity if sites allow.	Allow
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose in part	Opposes the parts of the PDP where the northern suburbs of Crofton Downs, Ngaio and Khandallah are sacrificed for densification.	Not specified.
Angus Hodgson	200.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports provision of more housing through increased height limits across more of Wellington City.	Not specified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that Council actively seek and actively listen to voices of mana whenua.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers the importance of Councils partnership with mana whenua throughout the decision making process. Considers that Iwi resources are often stretched by demands of crown authorities. Considers the importance of tools such as apū/Iwi Resource Management Plans	Not specified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that Council use its resources in partnership with local iwi to provide for papakāinga housing, marae, and Māori customary and commercial activities to support the social, cultural, and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua across Te Whanganui-a-Tara.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.16	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	The submitter seeks that Council use its resources in partnership with local iwi to provide for papakāinga housing, marae, and Māori customary and commercial activities to support the social, cultural, and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua across Te Whanganui-a-Tara. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because Wellington City Council should partner with tangata whenua across Te Whanganui a Tara to support tino rangatiratanga.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Youth Council	201.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that barriers to tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga over their ancestral lands are removed.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.17	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	The submitter seeks that barriers to tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga over their ancestral lands are removed. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because removing barriers for tangata whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga will support tino rangatiratanga.	Allow
Wellington City Youth Council	201.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the plan is implemented alongside mana whenua to protect sites of spiritual and cultural significance from the impacts of climate change and pollution.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.18	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	The submitter seeks that the plan is implemented alongside mana whenua to protect sites of spiritual and cultural significance from the impacts of climate change and pollution. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because implementing the plan alongside mana whenua is key to partnership and also will ensure that sites of significance are protected.	Allow
Wellington City Youth Council	201.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the consenting process is improved to support in-fill developments overcome logistical and delay challenges.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.13	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that mixed use residential and commercial areas along public transport lines is encouraged to facilitate shorter trips for climate and wellbeing and better accessibility.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.14	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Supports increase of density in existing urban areas.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.15	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that PDP should employ environmentally friendly urban planning techniques. This including - but not limited to - Creating neighbourhoods that are more walkable, less car-centric, and have direct access to public transport lines, in addition to recreational community spaces with green amenities.	Seeks that PDP promotes environmentally friendly urban planning techniques such as creating neighbourhoods that are more walkable, less car-centric, and have direct access to public transport lines, in addition to recreational community spaces with green amenities.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.16	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that increasing housing supply, climate resilience and designing a city that meets the needs of its people, in partnership with mana whenua, is paramount.	Not specified.
Avryl Bramley	202.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	<p>Considers that the PDP's assumption of 50,000 - 80,000 population increase by 2050 is incorrect and is more likely to be 28,000.</p> <p>A number of issues are raised regarding whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this figure been subjected to, or does the possibility exist of, bias, manipulation, control or corruption by parties who stand to benefit from the extreme intensification whilst possibly bearing few of the costs. - extreme intensification, particularly in multi story residential, would result in sale to non residents and an increase in "nobody home" buildings as seen overseas. - the figure would enable a large part of the dwellings in the city to fall under the control of the "corporate landlord" with the downstream negative effects of monopoly rents or use as de-facto hotels like Berlin. - independent arms length increases were not used as per Statistics NZ, - how this proposed level of population increase can be seen as filling any green objectives whatsoever. - how this serves and embraces TOW principles and needs, - how democratic is it for one set of Councillors in a single 3 year term to set such a high track for a horizon of 30 years and 10 future councils. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks the removal of all elements of the PDP that are relying on the assumption of 50,000 - 80,000 population growth by 2050.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Avryl Bramley	202.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP's assumption of 50,000 - 80,000 population increase by 2050 is incorrect and is more likely to be 28,000.</p> <p>A number of issues are raised regarding whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this figure been subjected to, or does the possibility exist of, bias, manipulation, control or corruption by parties who stand to benefit from the extreme intensification whilst possibly bearing few of the costs. - extreme intensification, particularly in multi story residential, would result in sale to non residents and an increase in "nobody home " buildings as seen overseas. - the figure would enable a large part of the dwellings in the city to fall under the control of the "corporate landlord" with the downstream negative effects of monopoly rents or use as de-facto hotels like Berlin. - independent arms length increases were not used as per Statistics NZ, - how this proposed level of population increase can be seen as filling any green objectives whatsoever. - how this serves and embraces TOW principles and needs, - how democratic is it for one set of Councillors in a single 3 year term to set such a high track for a horizon of 30 years and 10 future councils. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to all elements of the PDP reliant on population growth figures to base the growth on an assumption of 28,000 by 2050.
Avryl Bramley	202.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP's assumption of 50,000 - 80,000 population increase by 2050 is incorrect and is more likely to be 28,000.</p> <p>A number of issues are raised regarding whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this figure been subjected to, or does the possibility exist of, bias, manipulation, control or corruption by parties who stand to benefit from the extreme intensification whilst possibly bearing few of the costs. - extreme intensification, particularly in multi story residential, would result in sale to non residents and an increase in "nobody home " buildings as seen overseas. - the figure would enable a large part of the dwellings in the city to fall under the control of the "corporate landlord" with the downstream negative effects of monopoly rents or use as de-facto hotels like Berlin. - independent arms length increases were not used as per Statistics NZ, - how this proposed level of population increase can be seen as filling any green objectives whatsoever. - how this serves and embraces TOW principles and needs, - how democratic is it for one set of Councillors in a single 3 year term to set such a high track for a horizon of 30 years and 10 future councils. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that any intensification through the district plan only accounts for population increase over the lifespan of the PDP (10 - 15 years).
Richard Murcott	FS71.1	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	<p>The District Plan is has a ~10yr planning horizon. It needs to focus on anticipated needs for this period and some 'strategic' guesswork (for infrastructure investment). Currently, the PDP appears to be overreaching regarding residential 'intensification'. Recent data from StatsNZ and other authoritative sources suggest that some planning assumptions may be seriously flawed. To the extent that some of the potential sacrifices proposed this decade are avoidable. Plus, the PDP is biased toward a laissez-faire, permissive planning approach; allowing intensification at nearly any cost (or profit), rather than a firm focus on community desires for cohesive, liveable environments, achieved by a rigorous and reliable (no surprises) planning approach, underpinned by a vision for a liveable city by design, rather than by luck.</p>	Allow
Avryl Bramley	202.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington has many natural hazards and that intensification beyond 1 - 2 stories is a bad idea because of this.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks the removal of any clauses or zoning that increase intensification beyond 1-2 low rise stories.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Avryl Bramley	202.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers the current national legislation banning sales of residential standalone dwellings. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of provisions banning the sale of any multi level dwelling or residence to non residents owners.
Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the application of a recession plane standard to sites adjoining scheduled heritage will to some extent avoid the adverse effects of visual dominance which can arise when new buildings are out of scale with the existing environment [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that all sites adjoining a scheduled historic heritage item or scheduled historic heritage site/building or Historic Reserve should be subject to the Height In Relation To Boundaries (HIRB) variation of 3 metres and 45 degrees.
Graham Spargo	211.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Councillors face exposure to liability under section 43 (1) (a) of the Local Government Act due to decisions made on housing density. Considers that the evaluation process for the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 was poor and that Councillors have a responsibility to consider that. Considers that Councillors owe a duty of care to be fully informed as to foreseeable consequences of implementing '3 stories, 50% coverage' provisions in the PDP. This will lead to property market decline, and therefore exposure to liability under section 43 (1) (a). [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks the removal of "3 storey, 50% site coverage everywhere" provisions in the PDP.
Graham Spargo	211.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks the addition of good planning practice assessments based on infrastructure availability, built form character and heritage, and walkability and other established 'good practice' ways of determining appropriate locations for intensification.
Glen Scanlon	212.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports solutions to create more affordable housing. Considers the continued, sustainable, growth of our city is vitally important to the well-being of residents.	Not specified.
Glen Scanlon	212.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that retaining sunlight hour provisions from the operative district plan design guide will help ensure dry homes and a reasonable healthy quality of life for all. Sunlight is important to mental health Auckland's design rules also support maintaining and creating living environments where sunlight is maximised [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the proposed district plan retains the provisions for sunlight hours from the operative district plan design guides.
Glen Scanlon	212.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that construction of large buildings would require purchasing many properties in the area with major earthworks to provide suitable platforms. The costs will be high, infrastructure will be under pressure and it's a high wind zone - the PDP does not account for these. As a result, properties will be expensive and will result in renters moving out. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the plan focuses building more where building platforms are larger, flatter, have access to more parking, public services, and infrastructure such as Kent and Cambridge Terraces, Hania St and Adelaide Rd.
Robert Murray	213.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Opposes the entire PDP and its principles. Considers that it's too long, over-complicated, and unintelligible. It leaves decisions upon unelected officials and the technology used is for experts which still gets it wrong. [Refer to original submission for further reason]	Seeks that the entire PDP is rewritten so that it's clear and intelligible to the average person.
Robert Murray	213.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the PDP provides rules rather than guidelines that comply with and support Councils principles.
Robert Murray	213.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that Council should provide services to the public first and put customer/user first.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Robert Murray	213.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers there is no housing shortage, it is a shortage of affordable housing. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Eva Brodie	217.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that placement of even one tall building in this neighbourhood would degrade surrounding homes. A non-compliant development has become compliant under the PDP which will severely impact sunlight on the submitters home, which is counterintuitive given New Zealand's push for healthier homes. It does not make sense that a single dwelling can be allowed to have such a devastating impact on surrounding homes. Developments built to the edge of zones in the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Lower Kelburn will mean losses of privacy, sun, views, and access.	Seeks that the plan is amended to put more emphasis on protecting neighbours sun access.
Tyers Stream Group	221.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that public access can lead to greater cognisance and care of areas by the public, and in the case of Tyers Stream Reserve result in greater restoration of natural biodiversity and reduction of damaging events, in line with the Reserve's SNA status.	Seeks that the plan provide for public access to and within areas for which WCC has jurisdiction.
Anna Jackson	222.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Supports any provision that will help support actions to minimise the damage caused by climate change and help reduce emissions that are causing climate change.
Anna Jackson	222.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Supports more intense housing development that is linked to public transport and close to facilities such as schools, libraries and shops, to reduce reliance of private cars.	Not specified.
Anna Jackson	222.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a 30-40% permeability standard for all sites.
Anna Jackson	222.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a requirement for shared mini-parks and other forms of green spaces.
Anna Jackson	222.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a requirement for consideration of waste management to be factored into planning.
Anna Jackson	222.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a requirement for consideration of disability access to be factored into planning.
Anna Jackson	222.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that parking and road congestion as best managed by the provision of reliable and frequent public transport, preferably free but certainly subsidised and as cheap as possible.	Seeks that mini-buses are added to serve a greater number of routes more frequently.
Nick Humphries	223.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers the approach taken by Auckland City Council to provide more qualifying matters to provide greater protection of heritage/character/townscape and amenity values. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of more qualifying matters regarding heritage/character/townscape and amenity values.
RR Ventures (2018) Ltd	227.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the population in Northern suburbs is increasing consistently and has been earmarked for medium-density housing, we would like to understand Council's plans for further development of Glanmire Road. We are keen to work with the Council to understand the options that present an approach/ solution that is mutually beneficial for the development of this section.	Clarify intent of future development in Glanmire Road.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	The heritage and culture of the urban landscape contributes to everyone's overall wellbeing and quality of life	Add a new objective as follows: <u>Reflect the essential contributions made by heritage, character and quality design, giving us the ability to remember our heritage and to visually enjoy unique urban landscapes which provide character and a sense of belonging to our unique city.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Add a new objective as follows: <u>Recognise the essential value of local residents' participation in planning decisions as central to our communities' wellbeing.</u>
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the detailed provisions of the PDP should be evaluated against the newly suggested objectives to ensure that the Council's chosen methods are the best options to deliver the objectives of the plan and respect the wishes of the people of Wellington..	Seeks that the PDP is evaluated against the newly suggested objectives.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that many sites that sit idle or under utilised business facilities. Development in these spaces will address much of future housing demand and avoid adverse effects on quality, amenity and character. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the sequence of intensification in the Proposed District Plan focus first on major areas of under utilised land and smaller groups of under utilised sites close to public transport.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that homes should be a warm, dry places of stability, where sunlight providing natural light and mood enhancing benefits are recognized as essential to human wellbeing.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan recognise the critical importance of sunlight to the wellbeing of residents.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan ensure that current well-functioning established homes, neighbourhoods, old trees and plantings are not demolished.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the aim of the council to provide for a greater density of population in Central Wellington.	Not specified.
Richard W Keller	232.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems and so forth that actively support the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.
Richard W Keller	232.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that people shouldn't need to drive to stations and use Park n Rides.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan prioritises active and sustainable travel.
Richard W Keller	232.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan prioritises universal accessibility.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the PDP needs to enable mixed use in more areas so that people can access more services by walking. Considers that the Vogeltown, Morningson, Kingston and Brooklyn suburbs lack suitable shops, supermarkets and restaurants.	Seeks that more mixed-use development is enabled in Vogeltown, Morningson, Kingston and Brooklyn
Go Media Ltd	236.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the PDP is amended to give effect to any other elements of the submission that were not directly captured under their submission points.
Regan Dooley	239.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports greater density city-wide generally.	Not specified.
Regan Dooley	239.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the PDP has too many protections for heritage and character generally.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to reduce character protection to enable more intensification. [Inferred decision requested]
Regan Dooley	239.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the PDP has too many protections for heritage and character generally.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to reduce heritage protection to enable more intensification. [Inferred decision requested]
Alan Fairless	242.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan include an objective recognising the positive value of participation in decisions on an ongoing basis, and acknowledge that this is central to communities being able to meet their needs on an ongoing basis.
Alan Fairless	242.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan include an objective reflecting the positive contributions heritage, character and quality design, and the ability to read stories in the urban landscape, make to overall wellbeing.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Alan Fairless	242.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the detailed provisions of the District Plan be more rigorously tested against the objectives to ensure that chosen methods are the best options to deliver on the objectives of the Plan.
Alan Fairless	242.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the District Plan sets out a clear sequence for intensification that aligns with the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan.
Alan Fairless	242.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that given the opportunity, Wellingtonians will relish the challenge of working together which can create a sense of community, enhance democracy and deliver change in ways that build on community strengths. Imposing arbitrary change when better options exist simply fosters local resentment. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the District Plan identify communities to participate in community-based planning.
Alan Fairless	242.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the District Plan increase the extent of new green space.
Peter Charlesworth	248.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Generally supports the PDP, including the rezoning from Rural Area to Large Lot Residential Zone at 11B Wilmshurst Place, Tawa.	Retain Proposed District Plan notified with amendments.
Generation Zero Inc	254.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that housing is not adequate if it does not respect and take into account the expression of cultural identity. Considers that the Proposed District Plan needs to support the development of papakāinga and culturally adequate housing for Māori. Considers that under Local Governments obligations to Te Tiriti and delivering the right to a decent home, Councils must provide effective regulation to stop private enterprises from developing Māori land without free, prior and informed consent of mana whenua. [see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan supports the development of papakāinga and culturally adequate housing for Māori. [Inferred decision requested]
Generation Zero Inc	254.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the Proposed District Plan needs to support the development of adequate housing through densification and supporting infrastructure for the wellbeing of everyone in the Wellington City Council area and to deliver the right to a decent home. [see original submission]	Seeks that the plan support the development of adequate housing through densification and supporting infrastructure.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.66	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
Pauletta Wilson	257.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports more housing in Mount Cook but wants to see it done without loss of character and diversity.	Not specified.
Jim & Christine Seymour	262.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Supports more affordable and dense housing in central city areas but not at the risk of losing established character areas.	Not specified.
Jim & Christine Seymour	262.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that mistakes have been made regarding design of buildings in the past - for example the Copthorne Hotel and Bay Plaza. Considers a design control process could prevent badly designed buildings from being built and to ensure a sustainable and enjoyable place to live.	Seeks the addition of an effective design control process for the district plan implementation.
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that when Salisbury Garden Court was listed as a heritage area, at the initiative of owners and residents, the key heritage feature sought to be protected was historic connectedness. The heritage controls imposed are, in practice, too heavy and go well beyond what is sought to be protected. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Item 24 (Salisbury Garden Court) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas is exempt from any other controls arising from Heritage Area status.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers there are numbering errors and minor spelling errors that need to be resolved. This includes consistent use of numbering throughout plan i.e. matters of discretion use: a, b, c or i, ii, iii (as per the National Planning Standards).	Seeks that consequential amendments are made to resolve numbering and minor spelling errors.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.84	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Submission point 266.1 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers consequential numbering changes need to be made for all inserted or deleted provisions.	Seeks that consequential renumbering changes are made for all inserted or deleted provisions.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.85	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Submission point 266.2 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that references to Mākara throughout the PDP are missing the macron above the 'a'.	Seeks to amend all references of 'Makara' to 'Mākara'.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.86	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Submission point 266.3 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that references to 'dwelling' throughout the PDP should be changed to 'residential unit' as residential unit is defined, whereas dwelling is not.	Seeks to amend all references of 'dwelling' to 'residential unit'.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.87	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Submission point 266.4 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers there are several words that are underline (i.e. have definitions) in the PDP but the link does not work (i.e. the definition pop-up does not appear).	Amend the definition links so that the definition pop-up appears when the word is clicked for the following definitions throughout the ePlan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures - Customer Connection - Cut Height - Demolition - LAF(Max) - National Grid - National Grid Yard - Natural Hazard Mitigation Works - Trenching
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.88	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Submission point 266.5 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers there are several definitions where the words in the PDP do not have a link (i.e. are not underlined) to click to see the definition pop-up.	Amend PDP by adding a definition link for the following words throughout the ePlan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Architectural Feature - Design Speed - Environment - K Value - LA90 - Marina Facilities - R Value - Radiocommunication - Reclamation - Temporary Sign - Wetland

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that quarrying activities (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone) have a challenging role in the PDP. Despite their resource dependence and functional constraints, that they are essential to enabling the growth the city and enabling the construction of key infrastructure (such as providing material for cycleways and road, fill material for the repair and maintenance of three waters infrastructure), and they provide essential construction material for new dwellings, they are not recognised as 'Infrastructure' within the PDP. Concerns as to the lack of recognition (in particular policy recognition) of quarry activities within the PDP outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone.	Not specified.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.36	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Considers that Horokiwi are arguing that they are providing an essential service to the city, over a number of parts of the PDP. WCCERG agree that some materials will be necessary for new infrastructure in the city that is required in order to (as rapidly as possible) achieve a steady state circular economy where a climate-safe emphasis requires reductionism/ degrowth and using existing materials where possible.	Not specified
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that there is currently no plan wide recognition of the need and benefits of quarrying activities. While the General Rural zone provides one specific policy (GRUZ-P6), it relates to effects as opposed to the benefits of quarry activities and therefore is limited in its scope. While the Special Purpose Quarry Zone has a policy (and rule) framework it relates to existing quarry sites within the Special Purpose Quarry Zone only and does not have plan wide application, including for any expansion of existing quarries outside the Quarry Zone. Horokiwi suggests that the most logical place for some form of plan wide recognition of quarrying activities would be within the Infrastructure Chapter. However, it is recognised the quarries are not infrastructure as defined in the PDP. As such, as an alternative Horokiwi would support the policy recognition in other parts of the PDP (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone). Two policies are suggested. One relating to benefits and the other to functional constraints noting quarries are ultimately resource dependent and therefore their potential location is constrained.	Add a new policy within the PDP (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone) as follows: <u>The benefits of quarrying activities to the city and region are recognised and provided for.</u>
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that there is currently no plan wide recognition of the need and benefits of quarrying activities. While the General Rural zone provides one specific policy (GRUZ-P6), it relates to effects as opposed to the benefits of quarry activities and therefore is limited in its scope. While the Special Purpose Quarry Zone has a policy (and rule) framework it relates to existing quarry sites within the Special Purpose Quarry Zone only and does not have plan wide application, including for any expansion of existing quarries outside the Quarry Zone. Horokiwi suggests that the most logical place for some form of plan wide recognition of quarrying activities would be within the Infrastructure Chapter. However, it is recognised the quarries are not infrastructure as defined in the PDP. As such, as an alternative Horokiwi would support the policy recognition in other parts of the PDP (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone). Two policies are suggested. One relating to benefits and the other to functional constraints noting quarries are ultimately resource dependent and therefore their potential location is constrained.	Add new policy within the PDP (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone) as follows: <u>When assessing quarrying activities, provide for their functional needs and operational needs, and have regard to their functional constraints.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that the PDP needs to adequately give appropriate consideration to fire safety and operational firefighting requirements, particularly in relation to housing development and fire station development, including: - adequate access and water supply for new developments and subdivisions to ensure the submitter can efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies; and - the ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies; and - the ability to undertake training for firefighters within the region.	Not specified.
McDonald's	274.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Remove all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed District Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the level of high density development in Newtown is inappropriate because of the constraint around the Three Waters.</p> <p>Considers that the upgrading of Wellingtons Three Water infrastructure has not kept up with demand and levels of service have reduced.</p> <p>Newtown in particular has high need for network upgrades and investment into Three Waters.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the level of high density development of Newtown be reduced.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports overall strategy and intention of PDP to intensify development within the City.	Not specified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Supports (in general) the Proposed District Plan as it provides for an appropriate residential and open space outcome for the land owned by the submitter - being 16 Patna Street, 109A Awarua Street and 76 Silverstream Road, Ngaio.	Not specified.
Grant Henderson	FS55.1	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	<p>Provide housing and open space is needed.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 290.1]</p>	Not specified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the proposed natural environment values will place restrictions on the future use and development of the residential land within the Kilmarston block which will result in restrictive (potentially uncertain) development potential of the land for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of the whole application site as being within a Special Amenity Landscapes (SCHED11) (SAL); and 2. Identification of the balance land as being within the Natural Open Space Zone without agreement being reached with the Submitter on the appropriate tenure of the land; 3. Failure to provide for infrastructure within the Natural Open Space Zone (i.e. Original reservoir that was included as part of the original zoning). 	Not specified.
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.1	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jo McKenzie	FS64.1	General / Whole PDP /Whole PDP / Whole PD	Oppose	<p>Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.</p> <p>Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous landuse consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.12	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	<p>The site at 76 Silverstream Road is within the designation of Huntleigh Park & surrounds Significant Natural Area (WC060) and zoned as a Special Amenity Landscape as noted in the submission. Huntleigh Park contains a remnant of the original forest of Te Whanganui a Tara and as such is a valuable seed source. The vegetation of Huntleigh Park and its surrounds has been reduced in size by earlier developments and its biodiversity is now in danger of becoming reduced simply by the limitation of its physical size. Any more development and vegetation clearance will place the remaining forest at greater risk of natural decline. Wellington is losing its seed source through inappropriate developments of these remnant areas and the Council has made the important decision to protect this area by recognising it as part of an Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape.</p> <p>Considers that biodiversity protection and landscape overlays are appropriate for the properties in question.</p>	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.42	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.2]</p>	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.52	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Support	<p>Considers that it is reasonable to uplift the Special Amenity Landscape over the residential part of the land. However Andy Foster suggests that the hearings panel find a way of ensuring that development is sympathetic to the landform and to the ecological values on the lower part of the land.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.20]</p>	Allow
Tawa Community Board	294.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports initiatives in the plan to benefit urban intensification, both in the CBD and in Tawa.	Not specified.
Tawa Community Board	294.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the PDP's requirements for hydraulic neutrality.	Retain all provisions relating to Hydraulic Neutrality as notified.
Johanna Carter	296.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	<p>Considers that the PDP generally aligns with the proposed RPS direction, despite being notified before this.</p> <p>[Refer to submission for commentary relating to the RPS]</p>	Not specified.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Supports the objective of the PDP to provide greater density, but not at the expense of quality control.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that cycling facilities are provided and enabled in a way that improves safety and accessibility.	Retain the PDP, subject to amendments that ensure cycling facilities are provided and enabled in a way that improves safety and accessibility.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.	Retain the PDP, subject to amendments that ensure the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that aggregate is essential for the construction sector, for housing and transport infrastructure and for climate change adaptation.	Not specified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identifies where rock for aggregate is located and protects those areas from other development and alternative land uses.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.31	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	A number of submission points made by the Aggregate & Quarry Association (please see multiple points in their submission relating to the same theme) argue that "it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction." Elsewhere, they also say: "... the District Plan must not unreasonably curtail expansion of existing quarries and establishment of new quarries..." WCCERG disagree, on the basis of primary and secondary greenhouse gas emissions from quarrying, which are no longer tenable; and the opportunity to re-use existing materials (instead of sending them to landfill, as is currently the case).	Disallow / Seeks that instead of allowing new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use, WCC requires no expansion of any kind of mining or quarrying activities, and a second policy stating that these activities be phased out by (for example), 2030.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Considers that while the provisions in the Special Purpose Quarry Zone are appropriate as they are enabling of quarry activities, there are some potential conflicts with other parts of the PDP.	Seeks a statement that where conflicts between the Special Purpose Quarry Zone provisions and other Proposed District Plan provisions occur, the Special Purpose Quarry Zone provisions prevail.
Firstgas Limited	304.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	The PDP needs to give effect to the RPS- Wellington Region, in particular Objective 10 and policies 7, 8 and 39.	Clarify that the Proposed District Plan gives effect to Objective 10 and policies 7, 8 and 10 of the Regional Policy Statement.
Firstgas Limited	304.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers the Proposed District Plan should: - Recognise and provide for the Gas Transmission Network to be safely, effectively and efficiently operated, maintained, replaced, upgraded, removed and developed through more enabling activity statuses where effects are acceptable; - Recognise the Gas Transmission Network as having functional and operational requirements and constraints, including in respect of its location; - Recognise that on some occasions works involving the Gas Transmission Network will have adverse effects; - Ensure that adverse effects of third-party development or activities in close proximity to the Gas Transmission Network are managed to the extent that adverse effects on the network are avoided or appropriately mitigated.	Not specified.
Firstgas Limited	304.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers the Proposed District Plan should identify First Gas an affected party in the event that resource consent is required in respect of potential effects on assets owned and operated by First Gas, especially land use changes and subdivision.	Not specified.
Roland Sapsford	305.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the District Plan should focus its action on climate change by applying targeted and focal intensification to create local nodes or "urban villages" rather than broad brush intensification or intensification focussed in already dense areas. Considers that Emission reduction through intensification occurs largely through changes in the ways and distances people travel. Intensifying already dense areas has little effect on emissions. Rather it is modest changes in focal density in lower density areas that has the most impact.	Seeks that the District Plan be amended to focus on reducing existing emissions through focal intensification and the creation of nodes or "urban villages" in areas of relatively low density, rather than simply a broad brush approach to intensification.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	305.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that light is fundamental to wellbeing and the ability of people and communities to provide for their needs, and has concerns about reduction in sunlight.</p> <p>Is concerned that removing the ability to address sun and shading issues on a site-specific basis will pose a risk to existing housing stock, as new houses positioned to maximise solar access will shade established houses.</p> <p>Notes that reduction in sunlight can affect heating and lighting costs and mental wellbeing</p> <p>Considers that houses built 100years ago rely on sunlight access to keep them in good condition.</p> <p>Considers that a resource consent is a necessary means of assessing sunlight access in Aro Valley.</p> <p>Considers that only one six storey building in an inappropriate location in Aro valley could result in widespread shading effects]</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for details]</p>	Seeks that the plan is amended to address sunlight and shading with particular reference to Aro Valley.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.27	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
Roland Sapsford	305.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the PDP be amended to recognise that character is in part derived from heritage (as set out in the Operative Plan) in pre-1930s character areas (as defined in the Operative Plan), and use a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter under the National Policy Statement-Urban Development.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the importance of camping should be explicitly recognised in the PDP, in line with Section 5 of the Resource Management Act 1991. In particular, camping enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being.</p> <p>Refer to original submission for full reasons.</p>	Seeks that camping be recognised in the Proposed District Plan as an important activity.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP should explicitly exempt freedom camping in all zones to ensure that this is not inadvertently caught by 'catch-all rules', for example NOSZ-R11.</p> <p>Considers freedom camping should instead be managed through the Council's bylaw.</p>	Seeks an exemption for freedom camping in the Proposed District Plan on the basis that this is dealt with through the Council bylaw(s).
Bruce Crothers	319.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Supports G99 to G102 (external bike storage) and considers that these should be carried into the PDP rules, policies and objectives.	Seeks that the content of G99 to G102 (external bike storage) is carried into the rules, policies and objectives.
Bruce Crothers	319.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Supports walking for transport via tracks through green spaces via tracks through green spaces and interconnection to form a network	Not specified.
Hilary Watson	321.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports increasing housing and housing density as long as they are situated in places that are suitable and aligned with the Strategic Direction of the PDP.	Not specified.
Hilary Watson	321.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports well-designed multi-unit developments as long as they are situated in places that are suitable and aligned with the Strategic Direction of the PDP.	Not specified.
Richard Murcott	322.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that Council should recognise the value of the inner city suburbs which has been achieved through the two decades of Operative District Plan, rather than jeopardising the gains in these relatively small enclaves of the city.	Not specified.
Joan Fitzgerald	323.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that G99-102 (External bike storage) of the Residential Design Guide be referenced in the specific rules, policies and objectives.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan leaves much of the city's environment vulnerable to demolition with no guarantee of quality and /or affordable development in its place.	Not specified.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.38	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials. Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that investing in the infrastructure and open space improvements are great ideas. We'd like to see this activity extended to all suburbs, and not limited to Mt Cook and Newtown only.	Seeks more infrastructure and open space improvements in all suburbs.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that rules and guidance to ensure density is done well must be embedded into the District Plan before removal of the pre-1930s rule. The status quo around design rules is not working well, with too much discretion allowed. Council officers need unambiguous design rules to guide them around Density Done Well, but currently suffer from the lack of them – there is enormous community interest in being part of the development of design rules that will guide building in our city.	Seeks more rules on design density.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that community involvement is essential to bring about quality development that supports people to live well and thrive.	Seeks that the community be engaged in any and all co-design activities.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.46	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that active street frontages should be part of the district plan. Active frontages area a better use of ground floors and street front boundaries, as they allow for small business on the street to provide opportunities for community connection.	Supports active frontages in the district plan.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that the viewshaft from Matairangi Mt Victoria over the city towards Te Ahumairangi, Brooklyn and Mt Albert will be greatly diminished if the building heights are realised at the levels imagined in the proposed District Plan. There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.	Not specified.
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the approach of the MVRA submission, which seeks to protect and enhance the townscape of Mount Victoria. While MVRA particularly stresses the importance of protecting the much admired townscape of suburban housing on the lower to mid slopes of the hill, the submitter also agrees with the MVRA submission's reference to 'soft fringes' against the Town Belt, the importance of green and open spaces, and the iconic values of the wider views of Mount Victoria. The submitter particularly supports the reference to special protection being needed for 'Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt' and 'There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi - Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.' Supporting MVRA's reference to special protection for Mount Victoria bus and lookout – Town Belt' and avoiding further intrusions into what is read visually as Town Belt and the critical Mount Victoria Ridgeline, the submitter requests that protection for Mount Victoria Lookout is achieved by number 22 Alexandra Road retaining the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan. [Inferred reference to submission point 342.12]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	<p>Supports the approach of the MVRA submission, which seeks to protect and enhance the townscape of Mount Victoria. While MVRA particularly stresses the importance of protecting the much admired townscape of suburban housing on the lower to mid slopes of the hill, we also agree with their submission's reference to 'soft fringes' against the Town Belt, the importance of green and open spaces, and the iconic values of the wider views of Mount Victoria. The submitter particularly supports the reference to special protection being needed for 'Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt' and 'There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi - Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.'</p> <p>Supporting MVRA's reference to special protection for Mount Victoria bush and lookout – Town Belt' and avoiding further intrusions into what is read visually as Town Belt and the critical Mount Victoria Ridgeline, the submitter requests that protection for Mount Victoria Lookout is achieved by number 22 Alexandra Road retaining the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 342.12]</p>	Allow
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.13	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified.	Considers that the PDP should lay out a path to affordability of housing. Land values in Mt Victoria are too inflated for private developers to provide affordable and/or social housing. Commitment to partnerships from the government and Council needs to be in place before any change can happen.	Seeks that the District Plan lay out a path to affordable housing.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.14	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified.	Considers that the PDP encourages gentrification and the imminent moving on of more vulnerable residents from Mt Victoria. Removal of the pre-1930s rule will only speed that up, as more land under older rental properties is made available for development.	Not specified.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.15	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should account for the impacts of population growth in schools, hospitals and hospices. It likely many schools are overcrowded, such as Clyde Quay School.	Seeks that the impacts of population growth on schools, hospitals and hospices be taken into account.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.16	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should account for the impacts of development surrounding schools, hospitals and hospices on access to sunlight and warmth.	Seeks that access to sunlight and warmth in schools, hospitals and hospice be protected from neighbouring tall developments.
Carolyn Stephens	344.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify communities which will be involved in community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the plan identify communities to participate in community-based planning.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.51	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	<p>Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area.</p> <p>Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.</p>	Allow
Carolyn Stephens	344.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that limited notification should be prioritised in provisions (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that limited notification provisions be prioritised over non-notification, especially in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.25	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
Carolyn Stephens	344.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify key potential actors and development partnerships as a method for achieving an increased rate of development on land that is underutilised. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that key potential actors and partnerships to develop underutilised land more efficiently be identified.
Carolyn Stephens	344.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.	Seeks that areas suitable for intensification be identified and that development masterplans be devised.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Carolyn Stephens	344.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the assessment of housing capacity in Wellington needs to be based on a target of realising at least 50% of the development capacity (as measured under the Operative Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the Plan. The Plan needs to include methods to achieve this. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that methods be included to better assess housing and development capacity on underutilised land.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.67	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Considers that the Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs)	Opposes the Residential Design Guide and seeks amendment to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Residential Design Guide.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.68	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs)	Opposes the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and seeks amendment to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Inconsistent and incorrect reference to the regional plan.	Seeks to ensure consistent reference to the regional plan throughout. By the time decisions are made on the Proposed District Plan (PDP), the regional plan will be operative so should be referred to as the 'Natural Resources Plan'.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Inconsistent and incorrect reference to the Regional Policy Statement.	Seeks to ensure consistent reference to, "the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region".
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that references to the effects management hierarchy in matters of discretion should also extend to the consideration of biodiversity compensation.	Seeks that where the effects management hierarchy is mentioned in matters of discretion, amend to include, "...and where relevant the ability to offset or compensate biodiversity impacts".
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the reference to the Subdivision Design Guide is currently only in two places in the Subdivision chapter. The wording 'The matters in the Subdivision Design Guide,' does not require evaluation for consistency with the design guide and could be strengthened. Greater Wellington acknowledges that the design guides use a rating system of importance for different guidelines, but do not Consider that the current wording is strong enough.	Seeks to strengthen reference to Subdivision Design Guide to require consistency with, or appropriate consideration of, its guidelines.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the Residential Design Guide is not referenced in any rules for the High Density Residential Zone and greenfield development areas.	Seeks to ensure that the design guides are included in all necessary rules across chapters.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.52	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.52	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the reference to the Residential Design Guide throughout residential and commercial zone matters of discretion could be strengthened. The wording used in policies, 'Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide...', should be reflected in matters of discretion. The Residential Design Guide provides direction on carbon reduction, urban design, stormwater, ecology, water conservation and freshwater ecosystem health, which are all contribute to achieving the PDP's strategic objectives. The Design Guide's weight as a matter of discretion should therefore reflect this. We acknowledge that the design guides use a rating system of importance for different guidelines, but do not Consider that the current wording is strong enough	Seeks to strengthen reference to Residential Design Guide to require consistency with, or appropriate consideration of, its guidelines.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.53	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.53	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide throughout zones does not require evaluation for consistency with the design guide and could be strengthened. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide provides direction on carbon reduction, urban design, stormwater, ecology, water conservation and freshwater ecosystem health, which all contribute to achieving the PDP's strategic objectives. The Design Guide's weight as a matter of discretion should therefore reflect this. We acknowledge that the design guides use a rating system of importance for different guidelines, but do not Consider that the current wording is strong enough.	Seeks to strengthen reference to Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide to require consistency with, or appropriate consideration of, its guidelines.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.54	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow / Disallow the submission point to the extent that it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.54	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow / Disallow the submission point to the extent that it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.13	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers the reference to the Rural Design Guide could be strengthened in matters of discretion. We acknowledge that the design guides use a rating system of importance for different guidelines, but do not Consider that the current wording is strong enough.	Seeks to strengthen reference to Rural Design Guide to require consistency with, or appropriate consideration of, its guidelines.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.14	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that throughout the plan ECO-P2 is incorrectly referred to, where reference should be made instead to ECO-P1.	Seeks to amend incorrect ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) cross-references to ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas).
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.15	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers the earthworks, historic heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapters should recognise the potential for accidental discovery of archaeological sites and wahi tapu and require appropriate consents to include an accidental discovery protocol. This would give effect to Policy 22 of the RPS.	Seeks to amend the PDP to manage the accidental discovery of archaeological sites and wahi tapu to protect historic and cultural values.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.16	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that section 3.5 of the NPS-FM 2020 requires every territorial authority to include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems and receiving environments. Further, local authorities that share jurisdiction over a catchment must co-operate in the integrated management of the effects of land use and development on freshwater. There is mention of achieving Te Mana o Te Wai in the Three Waters chapter, which we support. However, Te Mana o Te Wai is missing from other chapters, with no linkage established to other chapters an activity could have direct effects on water e.g. Infrastructure, Earthworks and Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity. Throughout the plan further provisions are necessary to support the achievement of Te Mana o Te Wai and manage potential effects of activities on water bodies. Policy FW.3 in Proposed RPS Change 1 provides some further direction for district plans that should be considered in drafting the appropriate provisions. This includes methods to manage effects on rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs and riparian margins, including any relevant water quality attribute targets in a regional plan, ecosystem values and drinking water sources. In addition, further consideration of the adequacy of erosion and sediment control policies for the management of sediment-laden water from sites to water bodies; rivers, estuaries and harbours, particularly Te Awarua o Porirua is required.	Seeks to amend the district plan to give effect to Section 3.5 of the NPS-FM, specifically to provide further direction on how activities are to be managed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.17	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Policy CC.8 in Proposed RPS Change 1 seeks for activities regulated by the District Plan that relates to greenhouse gas emissions, to prioritise achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions over offsetting emissions.	Seeks to identify the type and scale of activities within the PDP to which Policy CC.8 of Proposed RPS Change 1 applies.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.18	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Policy CC.8 in Proposed RPS Change 1 seeks for activities regulated by the District Plan that relates to greenhouse gas emissions, to prioritise achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions over offsetting emissions.	Seeks to include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods to prioritise reducing greenhouse gas emissions for the identified activities rather than applying emissions offsetting.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.4	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Agree this proposed District Plan needs to give effect to PC1 of the RPS, to prioritise achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions over offsetting emissions	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.19	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that proposed RPS Change 1 seeks that District Plans provide for these solutions to be part of infrastructure and development planning and design in order to manage issues such as water quality and natural hazard protection and increase resilience against climate change. A number of actions are set out in Policy CC.14 as measures that should be considered and provided for.	Seeks to amend the PDP to more broadly address nature-based solutions and their use not only to manage natural hazard risk but as part of the response to climate change and the effects of climate change. Policy direction and rules should set out a clear preference for implementing nature-based solutions in all infrastructure planning and land use development.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.5	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.20	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks that the PDP should include provisions for recognising the functions of the ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to climate change and avoid adverse effects on functions, including before they are mapped.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.6	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.21	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks that policies should also direct the protection of areas that already perform a function as a nature-based solution, including the many wider benefits these can have.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.7	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.22	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that policy CC.4 and CC.14 of Proposed RPS Change 1 seek for actions and initiatives that contribute to climate resilient urban areas to be provided for, with a preference for the use of nature-based solutions. To have regard to these policies, the PDP should contain provisions which seek to improve the climate resilience of urban areas as part of the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments.	Seeks the PDP should include provisions which seek to improve the climate resilience of urban areas through measures identified in Policy CC.14.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.8	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.23	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that policy CC.4 and CC.14 of Proposed RPS Change 1 seek for actions and initiatives that contribute to climate resilient urban areas to be provided for, with a preference for the use of nature-based solutions. To have regard to these policies, the PDP should contain provisions which seek to improve the climate resilience of urban areas as part of the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments.	Seeks that new development areas should be required to include actions and initiatives that contribute to the broader climate resilience of the urban area through policies and rules, and the extent to which they do this should be a matter of discretion.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.9	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.24	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that both brownfield and greenfield development enabled by the PDP should ensure adequate space for public transport on roads. This includes requiring verandahs and other street frontage structures to be set back from the kerb to allow for sufficient bus accessibility	Seeks to amend transport, subdivision, zone and development area standards and rules as necessary to ensure new brownfield and greenfield development enabled by the PDP provides for sufficient bus accessibility.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.25	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	The submitter notes that there is no papakāinga chapter, nor are papakāinga activities specifically provided for in the zone chapters. The PDP does not provide for papakāinga on Māori owned land or ancestral land.	Seeks to include a Papakāinga chapter and provide for papakāinga on Māori owned land or ancestral land throughout the zone chapters.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.24	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	The submitter seeks the inclusion of a papakāinga chapter in the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this part of the submission because we also seek the inclusion of a papakāinga chapter in the plan, as it will provide pathways for tangata whenua to build housing and gain tino rangatiratanga in regard to housing.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Inner City Wellington	352.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Notes that the Proposed District Plan offers improvements in clarity and consistency over the Operative District Plan.	Not specified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	<p>Considers that the comprehensive District Plan review is very important for network utility operators as land use, housing intensification and subdivision development activities proposed throughout Wellington City, as well as the Governments decarbonisation initiatives, will often instigate customer driven network utility upgrading and development.</p> <p>Notes that the provision of electricity infrastructure is a Part 2 matter as the provision of secure and efficient electricity is fundamental to enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing.</p> <p>Notes that the overall content of the PDP Infrastructure provisions are well considered, robust and reflect the appropriate context for the safe and secure supply of the District's electricity distribution network.</p>	Seeks some further refinement to the Proposed District Plan to ensure that the document is able to be effectively implemented and understood, as well as to enhance particular provisions in order to provide for the importance of electricity infrastructure.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the definitions of 'Additional Infrastructure' and 'Development Infrastructure' should be given the same level of priority. For instance, Council's 'Development Infrastructure' is routinely dependant on 'Additional Infrastructure' so a balanced level of recognition and provision in the PDP is required.	Seeks that the term 'Additional Infrastructure' is appropriately applied with the same level of priority, purpose and intent as 'Development Infrastructure' throughout the PDP.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	It is requested that appropriate, alternative, amendments be made to the provisions to give effect to the concerns raised, in the event requested amendments are denied.	Seeks that alternative amendments be made to provisions to give effect to the concerns raised in the Wellington Electricity Lines Limited submission. [Refer to submission 355]
Woolworths New Zealand	359.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the plan should provide a "centre plus" approach by adopting a more flexible planning regime, rather than the current PDP's direct and control model of setting commercial and land supply use. To support this "centres plus" approach, the activity status of supermarkets (essential services and catalysts for well-functioning urban environments) would be more appropriate as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Permitted in all Centre zones, - Restricted Discretionary in the Mixed-Use Zone, for larger-scale supermarkets; - Discretionary in the General Industrial Zone and General Residential Zone. <p>Currently, the PDP does not enable supermarkets in any zone without resource consent (be it for the activity itself or for the building which would be required to accommodate a supermarket in terms of GFA). This is at odds with both the higher order enabling framework set out in the PDP and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 ("NPSUD").</p> <p>It is considered that a restricted discretionary activity consent process is sufficient to undertake the assessment required to address the effects of infringements in respect of built form and site layout, without needing a broader fully discretionary approach. This again supports a more efficient consenting process to focus assessment where needed without detracting from an enabling planning framework for appropriate activities in appropriate locations. This approach is elaborated upon in additional submission points.</p> <p>The "centres plus" approach recognises the primacy of centres but also that business activity ought to be enabled in other zones, where appropriate. In particular, this approach recognises that functional need and catchment drivers may dictate the location of supermarket operations, on the fringe, or in some cases, outside of identified centres.</p>	Seeks that a "centres plus" approach is adopted in the Proposed District Plan, so as to provide more flexibility in the planning of supermarkets in Centre Zones, Mixed-Use Zones, General Industrial Zones and General Residential Zones.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.2	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	FSNI support supermarkets being permitted activities in Centre Zones. Submission point 359.1 supports submission points 476.92, 476.94, 476.100.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	The PDP is generally supported, subject to changes which will ensure that the PDP is consistent with the stated objectives at regional and national level. The general approach of the PDP is supported, in that it seeks to agglomerate small-scale retail and commercial activities within the various commercial and mixed-use zones – being the Metropolitan Centre zone, the Local Centre zone and the Neighbourhood Centre zone. The Commercial zone and the Mixed-Use zone are intended to complement the hierarchy of centres and provide for activities that are incompatible with other centres-based activities. This is reflected in Objectives CEKP-O2 and CEKP-O3, which are also generally supported.	Supports the Proposed District Plan, subject to amendments.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose in part	Parts of the plan are not supported, as they: - lack sufficient evidential justification, particularly in respect of the PDP preceding completion of any Business Land Assessment in respect of demand, supply and forecast growth; - go beyond the stated intent of the PDP in respect of its Strategic Direction and as analysed and supported in the Council's section 32 reports. Rather than resolving a resource management issue for the District in terms of enabling activities in the right locations, the approach taken in the PDP is a direct and control model of setting commercial land supply; - Do not give effect to the NPS-UD, which seeks well-functioning urban environments (Objective 1) through enabling urban environments to develop and change in a responsive manner (Objective 4), and requires provisions that have particular regard to providing choice (Policy 1); - Are inappropriate parts in terms of Sections 32, 74 and 75 of the RMA; - Do not achieve Part 2 of the RMA.	Opposes parts of the Proposed District Plan on the grounds that they are inadequate, over-reach stated intent, do not give effect to the NPS-UD or do not appropriately respect the Resource Management Act 1991. [Refer to original submission]
Woolworths New Zealand	359.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Considers that where activities infringe identified standards, a restricted discretionary activity status remains appropriate, rather than defaulting to a more onerous discretionary activity status, where discretion is unfettered in assessment. Restricted discretionary activity status can be accompanied by suitably limited criteria that still ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities are anticipated, such assessments will be rational and streamlined. It is noted that the PDP has generally taken this approach when it comes to standard infringements with the exception of infringing MCZ-R15, NCZ-R13, and LCZ-R13 whereby discretionary activity consent is required if the provision of visible carparks along an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage is proposed. Woolworths considers a restricted discretionary activity status is more appropriate, and specifically with consideration given to operational and functional needs of larger commercial activities like supermarkets. Supermarkets often require car parking to be visible, both from commercial viability perspective but also given the requirements to separate loading and servicing activities from public interfaces. This site layout requires that loading is located to the rear of a store, with the building in front and the entrance accessible and legible from the car park and street frontage. Car parking to the rear removes the ability to keep loading and servicing separate from public areas and leads to safety and CPTED issues after hours. These are examples of operational and functional requirements for supermarkets that are overlooked by application of blanket urban design ideals in these standards.	Seeks that restricted discretionary activity status are retained when activities infringe identified status. [Inferred decision requested]
Elizabeth Nagel	368.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the PDP should have an objective recognising the positive value of participation in decisions on an ongoing basis, and acknowledge that this is central to communities being able to meet their needs on an ongoing basis.	Seeks that an objective be added regarding the positive value of community participation in decisions.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.49	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elizabeth Nagel	368.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the PDP should have an objective reflecting the positive contributions heritage, character and quality design, and the ability to read stories in the urban landscape, make to overall wellbeing.	Seeks that an objective be added to recognise the positive contributions of heritage, character and quality design to overall wellbeing.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the detailed provisions of the District Plan be more rigorously tested against the objectives to ensure that chosen methods are the best options to deliver on the objectives of the Plan.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the PDP should set out a clear sequence for intensification, as set out by the Spatial Plan. Zoning should be used appropriately to achieve this, rather than upzoning broad areas of land. The sequence should focus first on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport. The submitter considers this is because there are many sites throughout the city which sit idle or underutilised and can be utilised for development.	Seeks that a clear sequence for intensification be devised to focus intensification on underutilised land and sites close to public transport.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.7	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Elizabeth Nagel	368.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify communities which will be involved in community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the plan identify communities to participate in community-based planning.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.8	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Elizabeth Nagel	368.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that limited notification should be prioritised in provisions (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks greater provision for limited notification provisions over non-notification, especially in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.26	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify key potential actors and development partnerships as a method for achieving an increased rate of development on land that is underutilised. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that key potential actors and partnerships to develop underutilised land more efficiently be identified.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.	Seeks that areas suitable for intensification be identified and that development masterplans be devised.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the assessment of housing capacity in Wellington needs to be based on a target of realising at least 50% of the development capacity (as measured under the Operative Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the Plan. The Plan needs to include methods to achieve this. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that methods be included to better assess housing and development capacity on underutilised land.
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the sequencing of development is aligned with increased and improved infrastructure development.	Seeks that development be provided in a sequenced manner.
Waka Kotahi	370.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that adding a note to zones which provide for noise sensitive activities to draw applicants' attention to the reverse sensitivity provisions would be beneficial for aiding public interpretation on the planning provisions that apply. [Applicant was 'neutral' on the provisions].	Add a note in all Zone chapters that provide for noise sensitive activities: <u>Note: As well as provisions in the zone new buildings or alterations to existing buildings for noise sensitive activities are required to comply with the provisions in the NOISE chapter, which include sound insulation as a requirement in certain areas or limiting the establishment of noise sensitive activities in some cases.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Overall position is very supportive of the PDP and the progress towards a more liveable and sustainable City.	Not specified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified as a rapid transit service. As a permanent transit route capable of large capacity carriage of people, the Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified as a rapid transit service. GWRC's Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 recognises the route as a rapid transit route. The line also fits the definition of a rapid transit route in the NPS-UD definitions for the purpose of giving effect to Policy 3(c). With the suburbs along this line well served by commercial and community facilities, and with land available that could accommodate denser development, it makes no sense for this route not to be classified in this way, and provision made for higher density development. We are facing a climate crisis and a housing crisis: this area must shoulder some of the change necessary to reduce Wellingtonian's carbon footprint, and increase housing availability and affordability along transport routes well served by community facilities, which this is.	Amend the Plan to add to the definitions, schedules, policies, maps, and rules provisions to designate the Johnsonville Rail Line a rapid transit route, and all stops along it, as rapid transit stops. Revise the status of the suburbs it serves, and their zones accordingly, to match the land use density expected of land along such a route, e.g. enabling higher buildings within the walkable catchment.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.15	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.41	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	<p>Considers that hospitals, like residential areas, must intensify and expand; and that the NPS-UD recognises this.</p> <p>Southern Cross supports the PDP in part, but seeks amendments to:</p> <p>(a) provide for well-functioning urban environments, which give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD);</p> <p>(b) recognise the role of public and private hospitals as additional infrastructure;</p> <p>(c) enable efficient operation and expansion of hospital activities in the Special Purpose Hospital zone;</p> <p>(d) identify and impose appropriate controls on natural hazard risks; and</p> <p>(e) clarify the application of the sites and areas of significance to Māori provisions.</p> <p>[Refer to cover letter to submission for further details]</p>	Not specified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that hospitals, like residential areas, must intensify and expand; and that the NPS-UD recognises this.</p> <p>Southern Cross opposes the PDP in part, but seeks amendments to:</p> <p>(a) provide for well-functioning urban environments, which give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD);</p> <p>(b) recognise the role of public and private hospitals as additional infrastructure;</p> <p>(c) enable efficient operation and expansion of hospital activities in the Special Purpose Hospital zone;</p> <p>(d) identify and impose appropriate controls on natural hazard risks; and</p> <p>(e) clarify the application of the sites and areas of significance to Māori provisions.</p> <p>[Refer to cover letter to submission for further details]</p>	Not specified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that of 'Health care facility' and 'Healthcare facility' should be used consistently within the Proposed District Plan	Seeks that either HEALTH CARE FACILITY or HEALTHCARE FACILITY is used consistently in the Proposed District Plan.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Seeks for the names of other zones to be stated in full. It is unclear which zone 'HRZ' refers to.	Seeks that names of zones within the Proposed District Plan be represented by their full names, rather than acronyms.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	<p>Opposes this policy which requires some developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions in accordance with the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. This is because:</p> <p>- This provision elevates what is normally a design guide into a rule. A design guide should be separate to a plan. The Design Guide should be an external document to the District Plan and be referenced as a guide only.</p> <p>- Further, this provision, provides a mechanism for the Council to require these aspects as part of a development. This is inappropriate. A development should be assessed on its merits.</p>	Delete all references to City Outcomes Contributions in the Proposed Plan.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.29	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Submission point 383.1 supports FSNI submission point 476.1.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS-FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that “wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction”.</p> <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment² (MfE) specifies that “territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments”.</p>	Opposes in part to the Proposed District Plan in its current form and seeks amendment.
Director-General of Conservation	385.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS-FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that “wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction”.</p> <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment² (MfE) specifies that “territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments”.</p> <p>It is noted that MfE requires the Council to notify changes to regional policy statements, regional plans, and district plans to give effect to the new NPS-FM 2020 by 31 December 2024. To avoid an additional plan change, it would be prudent for the Council to incorporate this national direction into the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Seeks that there are additional objectives, policies, and methods to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments (including wetlands).
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.11	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PD	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support requests to amend the Proposed District Plan to promote positive effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on freshwater and welcome working with WCC to give effect to the NPSFM.	Allow
Director-General of Conservation	385.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS-FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that “wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction”.</p> <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment² (MfE) specifies that “territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments”.</p> <p>It is noted that MfE requires the Council to notify changes to regional policy statements, regional plans, and district plans to give effect to the new NPS-FM 2020 by 31 December 2024. To avoid an additional plan change, it would be prudent for the Council to incorporate this national direction into the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Seeks that the Council adopts an integrated approach with the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) in relation to implementing the management of water and land, rather than putting the onus solely on GWRC to implement the NPS-FM.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.12	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PD	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support requests to amend the Proposed District Plan to promote positive effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on freshwater and welcome working with WCC to give effect to the NPSFM.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS-FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that "wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction".</p> <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment² (MfE) specifies that "territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments".</p> <p>It is noted that MfE requires the Council to notify changes to regional policy statements, regional plans, and district plans to give effect to the new NPS-FM 2020 by 31 December 2024. To avoid an additional plan change, it would be prudent for the Council to incorporate this national direction into the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Seeks that the Council work with GWRC to identify any additional sites/areas that should be protected under the Proposed District Plan and RPS in line with the NPS-FM.
Director-General of Conservation	385.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS-FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that "wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction".</p> <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment² (MfE) specifies that "territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments".</p> <p>It is noted that MfE requires the Council to notify changes to regional policy statements, regional plans, and district plans to give effect to the new NPS-FM 2020 by 31 December 2024. To avoid an additional plan change, it would be prudent for the Council to incorporate this national direction into the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Seeks that any policy and rules in relation to wetlands are in line with the NZCPS (New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010).
Director-General of Conservation	385.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that it would be effective and efficient to align the review of the Proposed District Plan provisions with the policy direction and requirements anticipated under the NPS-IB, to avoid an additional plan change.</p> <p>The NPS-IB currently has no legal effect; however, it is expected to come into effect in December 2022 during the Proposed District Plan further submissions and hearing process.</p>	Seeks that the Council undertakes a review of the NPS-IB exposure draft (or the soon to be gazetted NPS-IB document) to confirm the Proposed District Plan is giving effect to this national direction.
Director-General of Conservation	385.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that it would be effective and efficient to align the review of the Proposed District Plan provisions with the policy direction and requirements anticipated under the NPS-IB, to avoid an additional plan change.</p> <p>The NPS-IB currently has no legal effect; however, it is expected to come into effect in December 2022 during the Proposed District Plan further submissions and hearing process.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan should be updated to give effect to the NPS-IB where required.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	<p>Considers that there are also a number of properties held by Taranaki Whānui via Tai Hekenga and Crown properties that offer significant development potential, including land held by Taranaki Whānui that we have aspirations for future development and consider to be special Māori precincts. [see original submission]</p>	Seeks that Council provide a schedule of proposed zone changes for review and included a full schedule of RFR and DSP properties within Wellington City for reference.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that there are also a number of properties held by Taranaki Whānui via Tai Hekenga and Crown properties that offer significant development potential, including land held by Taranaki Whānui that we have aspirations for future development and consider to be special Māori precincts. [see original submission]	Seeks that any decisions made in respect of landholdings over which Taranaki Whānui have an interest in, that Taranaki Whānui are consulted first so as to ensure our interests are given due consideration as required under the RMA and in line with their Memorandum of Understanding with Council.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.13	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.13	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula. Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park. Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar. Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara. Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers replacing the word 'mauri' with 'mouri'.	Seeks that all references to 'mauri' be removed and replaced with 'mouri'
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose in part	Opposes Proposed District Plan in general as it fails to provide an adequate planning framework for Papakāinga.	Opposes the Plan in part, with amendments.
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.16	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Developing papakāinga is a complex process and there is no definition of what the papakāinga might look like.	Not specified
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Opposes Proposed District Plan in general as it fails to provide an adequate planning framework for Papakāinga.	Seeks that a papakāinga chapter is added.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.3	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers it is important that papakainga are allowed for. Considers that there is a problem with Taranaki Whanui's submission is that it is completely open ended about definition, location, size, design, height – and therefore potential impacts. Considers that it is quite reasonable that papakainga be allowed in areas where that level of development is anticipated. For example in residential areas allowing 11 metre heights, and the appropriate level of site coverage. That does not apply in ridgelines, special amenity areas, or open space. For Watts Peninsula this again means that a papakainga could well be a result of a master planning exercise, but it would come with some certainty about location, scale etc. Supports the request in part as it applies to zones where housing development of equivalent scale, height, site coverage is expected. For clarity that excludes open space and recreation zones and limits scale in rural areas. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.11]	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.35	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	The submitter seeks for a papakāinga chapter to be added to the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this part of the submission because we also seek the inclusion of a papakāinga chapter in the plan, as it will provide pathways for tangata whenua to build housing and gain tino rangatiratanga in regard to housing.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	The PDP's approach to implement the NPSUD and the Housing Supply Act by incorporating a Centres hierarchy and intensification provisions is generally supported.	Retain the Proposed District Plan with amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that all standards should be ensured to have an appropriate activity status and/or are referenced in the building and structure activity rules. For instance, NCZ-R18 does not require compliance with standards NCZ-S7 & NCZ-S8 which relate to residential activities.	Seeks that all standards are ensured to have an appropriate activity status and/or are referenced in the building and structure activity rules.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	The inclusion of notification preclusions for restricted discretionary activities across the plan are supported, as this creates certainty to the development market. Further amendments are sought.	Supports the preclusion of public notification for activities under Restricted Discretionary status.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Public notification preclusions should be included in the PDP where impacts may apply beyond the site being developed such as side yards, height, daylight, coverage.	Seeks that the preclusion of public notification is applied beyond a development site, for breaches such as side yards, height, daylight and coverage.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.34	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Stride supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Stride supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decision-maker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.34	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Investore supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Investore supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decision-maker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that limited notification preclusions should apply where effects are limited to the site being developed, such as outdoor living space infringements.	Seeks that the preclusion of limited notification is applied beyond a development site, for breaches such as outdoor living space infringements.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.35	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Stride supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Stride supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decision-maker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.35	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Investore supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Investore supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decision-maker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Considers that references to 'reverse sensitivity' as part of adverse effects is unnecessary and should be removed. Reverse sensitivity can be covered by general considerations relating to adverse effects.	Remove any reference to 'reverse sensitivity' from the Plan.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.4	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Specific to the National Grid, the term reverse sensitivity is used within Policy 10 of the NPSET and therefore its use within the PDP is consistent with and gives effect to the NPSET. On that basis, the relief sought by the submitter is opposed.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove reference of Assisted housing throughout the PDP.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove reference of Comprehensive Development throughout the PDP.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove reference of Demolition throughout the PDP.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.17	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities wishes to remove reference of Demolition throughout the PDP. TRA are mindful that the greenest buildings are those timber buildings that are already built. There's an accumulative benefit from not demolishing older native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.13	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	An amendment is sought to delete any references of 'multi-unit housing' in objectives, policies, rules, and standards throughout the District Plan.	Remove reference of Multi-unit housing throughout the PDP.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.1	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	The amendment to remove reference to 'multi-unit housing' is opposed as special consideration is required to enable this form of housing to fit within the wider street scape and community	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.1	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	The amendment to remove reference to 'multi-unit housing' is opposed as special consideration is required to enable this form of housing to fit within the wider street scape and community.	Disallow
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that restrictions to building and land use affects Tino Rangatira and so encourages Council to consider this and adopt more flexible planning restrictions. Mana Whenua (Taranaki Whānui, Te Ātiawa) own over \$100M in property within Wellington City.	Seeks that WCC considers that restrictions to building and land use affects Tino Rangatira and adopt more flexible planning restrictions i.e. as flexible as possible.
Ministry of Education	400.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Seeks that explicit provision is given to educational facilities throughout the urban environment to enable the submitter to manage the impacts of growth and development on educational facilities, in particular impacts on school capacity. The submitter considers that providing for educational facilities in Wellington through the strategic policy framework will support the provision of new and expansion of existing educational facilities in the Wellington region.	Seeks that educational facilities are enabled as part of urban growth and development and are considered in any zoning changes made.
Oyster Management Limited	404.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Supports the Proposed Plan in part.	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Generally supports the aims of the Proposed Plan.	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the creation of well-functioning urban environments (consistent with the direction set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)).	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the provision of sufficient development capacity to meet long term demands for housing and business land.	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification.	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, considers that it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the district plan [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside of the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.75	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.75	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that it is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the design guides, for example under Rules CCZ-R19 and CCZ-20. This is because the design guides do not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and the submitter considers it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Seeks that all direct references to the design guides be deleted and replaced with references as appropriate and necessary to the specific design outcomes that are being sought, for example "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide". [Inferred decision sought].
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.76	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.76	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Not opposed to the coastal inundation mapping in principle, however considers further nuancing of the provisions that relate to coastal hazards and more specifically, tsunami hazard, is required. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.89 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes the coastal hazard provisions that apply to coastal tsunami hazard overlays.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks an amendment that appropriately recognises and provides for the Airport to operate in a safe, efficient, and effective manner, whilst ensuring that reverse sensitivity effects are avoided.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure and is important in providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities.</p> <p>Considers that given the lack of suitable alternative locations, providing for the ongoing operation, development and growth of Wellington Airport in its current location and safeguarding the Airport's obstacle limitation surface and aircraft noise boundaries to ensure effective and efficient airport operations is therefore of regional significance. So the functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure require appropriate recognition in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the PDP is amended to add functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that a framework is needed to address the significant social and economic benefits that can accrue from the operation of the regionally significant infrastructure [the airport]. The framework needs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognise the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of regionally significant infrastructure; - Protect regionally significant infrastructure from effects of incompatible land use and development, including reverse sensitivity effects; - Manage the effects arising from regionally significant infrastructure, recognising that the operational and/or functional requirements of infrastructure sometimes mean that not all effects can (or should be required to) be avoided, remedied or mitigated. <p>The PDP as notified has complex layering of consent requirements which means the above outcomes are difficult to achieve.</p>	<p>Seeks that further changes are required to the planning framework as it relates to regionally significant infrastructure, to ensure that the framework specified in paragraph 4.14 [and summarised in the reasons column] is achieved.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.14, 4.14.1, 4.14.2, and 4.14.3 in the original submission]</p>
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure and is important in providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities.</p> <p>Considers that given the lack of suitable alternative locations, providing for the ongoing operation, development and growth of Wellington Airport in its current location and safeguarding the Airport's obstacle limitation surface and aircraft noise boundaries to ensure effective and efficient airport operations is therefore of regional significance. So the functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure require appropriate recognition in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the PDP is amended to recognise the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of regionally significant infrastructure.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure and is important in providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities.</p> <p>Considers that given the lack of suitable alternative locations, providing for the ongoing operation, development and growth of Wellington Airport in its current location and safeguarding the Airport's obstacle limitation surface and aircraft noise boundaries to ensure effective and efficient airport operations is therefore of regional significance. So the functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure require appropriate recognition in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the PDP is amended to protect regionally significant infrastructure from effects of incompatible land use and development, including reverse sensitivity effects.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.109	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendments which may result in constraints to urban development surrounding the airport. Furthermore, there is a lack of clarity as to the implications of the relief sought and what would constitute 'incompatible land use and development.'	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure and is important in providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities.</p> <p>Considers that given the lack of suitable alternative locations, providing for the ongoing operation, development and growth of Wellington Airport in its current location and safeguarding the Airport's obstacle limitation surface and aircraft noise boundaries to ensure effective and efficient airport operations is therefore of regional significance. So the functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure require appropriate recognition in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the PDP is amended to manage the effects arising from regionally significant infrastructure, recognising that the operational and/or functional requirements of infrastructure sometimes mean that not all effects can (or should be required to) be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that counter to the intent of the Planning Standards, the Proposed Plan contains a significant degree of repetition. This results in a duplication and layering of planning controls which is inefficient and results in additional resource consent requirements without clear direction around the effects the controls are seeking to manage.</p> <p>Given the change in technology and the change in the air industry that will be required going forward, the submitter notes that change will need to be accommodated within the Airport Zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that all unnecessary duplication should be removed and each chapter should focus on managing the effects that specifically relate to that chapter and are not otherwise managed by the underlying zone rules.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the Sewall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is important infrastructure but is not captured within the definition of "Infrastructure" and therefore any maintenance, upgrading, repair, replacement or development of seawall does not engage infrastructure provisions of the PDP but rather the Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>Submitter questions the efficiency and effectiveness of the Natural Open Space zoning and the associated planning framework insofar as it relates to this area.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the planning framework, insofar as it relates to the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, should be updated to enable the ongoing maintenance, repair, upgrading and renewal of the existing seawall where it protects regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.187	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the majority of the seawall is below MHWS. It is important to understand that this area is a natural open space with impacts of the coastal process on the wall. The sea wall above MHWS needs to recognise RMA s6 matters of natural importance and promotion of the integrated management and consistency with the regional plan.	<p>Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed relating to the removal of the land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from the Natural Open Space Zone to the Airport Zone.</p> <p>Remove any 'bespoke planning framework' from the Natural Open Space land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>Retain the Lyall Bay Sea Wall in the Natural Open Space Zone.</p>
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>The Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand ("CAA") produces guidance on land use activities at or near aerodromes.¹⁰ The following activities are of particular concern to Airport Operators where located within close proximity to an airport due to their potential bird attracting properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refuse dumps and landfills; - Sewage Treatment and Disposal (outdoor); - Certain agricultural activities (cattle feed lots, pig farming); - Fish Processing; - Artificial and natural lakes/waterbodies; and - Abattoirs and freezing works. 	Seeks that a bespoke framework should be established for refuse dumps and landfills, outdoor sewage treatment and disposal, cattle feed lots, pig farming, fish processing, artificial and natural lakes/waterbodies, and abattoirs and freezing works where located within a fixed distance of the Airport. This framework will ensure a consenting pathway is available that requires appropriate consideration of potential increase in bird strike risk. This should include a narrowly framed restricted discretionary activity that restricts discretion to the potential effects of aircraft safety, including the potential risk of bird strike.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.1	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	<p>Considers that, without the proposed amendments specified within the submitters submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Proposed Plan will not promote the sustainable management or efficient use and development of natural and physical resources; - The Proposed Plan is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, particularly when having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means; - The Proposed Plan does not appropriately fulfil the requirements of section 32 of the RMA, particularly in terms of evaluation the costs of implementing the provisions under section 32(2)(a); and - The Proposed Plan does not represent sound resource management practice particularly with respect to planning for Wellington International Airport, as regionally significant infrastructure. 	Not specified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Cheryl Robilliard	409.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Supports overall direction of the plan	Not specified
VicLabour	414.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the plan lacks a focus on affordable housing.</p> <p>Considers that while supply side interventions are important, there remains an issue of a significant proportion struggling financially because their rents have increased faster than wages for many years and house prices have climbed increasingly out of reach.</p> <p>Considers that while there are risks to overall affordability and supply from imposing a tax on new developments, the revenue raised would be redistributed to affordable housing developments, and these stronger measures would provide a strong incentive to developers to consider modest homes that are more affordablng.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Council to revisit including an affordable housing chapter in the plan.
VicLabour	414.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that the plan lacks a focus on affordable housing.</p> <p>Considers that while supply side interventions are important, there remains an issue of a significant proportion of struggling financially because their rents have increased faster than wages for many years and house prices have climbed increasingly out of reach.</p> <p>Considers that while there are risks to overall affordability and supply from imposing a tax on new developments, the revenue raised would be redistributed to affordable housing developments, and these stronger measures would provide a strong incentive to developers to consider modest homes that are more affordablng.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Council investigate ways to target taxes to avoid mid-range housing as part of an affordable housing scheme.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Submitter considers that there needs to be clearer decision-making processes. Submitter is concerned that the decision-making process for restricted discretionary activities could be convoluted and unnecessarily delay development. This will particularly be the case if the Design Guides are retained as they overlap with the PDP in various areas.</p> <p>We have suggested a 'Design Excellence Panel' be constituted for each significant development and be solely responsible for assessing design outcomes of projects. This has the potential to speed up the process, ensure appropriately qualified people are in the room together to assess applications "in the round" and achieve positive design outcomes for Wellington City. We would welcome exploring other suggestions on how to make the planning process more efficient.</p>	Seeks that a 'Design Excellence Panel' be constituted for each significant development and be solely responsible for assessing design outcomes of projects.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the importance of affordability should be acknowledged throughout the Proposed District Plan.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks a thorough review of the City Outcomes Contribution process, to ensure developers receive certainty early on as to the additional height (or floor space) that will apply.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Generally supports the intent of the Design Guides, but opposes their inclusion in the District Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In many areas, the Design Guides overlap with the objectives and policies in Part 3. This will cause confusion for both planners and developers in attempting to interpret the Design Guides alongside Part 3. In particular, the submitter queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan. - It will be simpler to update the Design Guides to reflect best practice if they remain non-statutory. - The way the Design Guides are included as relevant criteria for restricted discretionary activities significantly expands the Council's discretion beyond what could normally be expected, for example, the Residential Design Guide contains various provisions dealing with internal areas such as G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage). 	Seeks that references to the Design Guide in the Proposed District Plan be removed and that the Design Guides should be non-statutory in a similar way to the Auckland Design Manual. They should be used for guidance on how the objectives and policies in Part 3 may be implemented.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.252	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.252	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Josephine Smith	419.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that many sites in the city are under utilised and that filling these gaps will provide for future housing needs without impacting quality, amenity and character.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan add a clear sequence for intensification, done through zoning. Seeks that it follows the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan and that it focus on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of under utilised sites close to public transport.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.9	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Josephine Smith	419.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellingtonians relish the challenge of working together, and that some suburbs are taking the lead in rethinking their areas. This creates a sense of community and enhances democracy.</p> <p>Supports participatory design projects with clear targets, so communities are involved.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.31	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.47	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Josephine Smith	419.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Wellingtonians relish the challenge of working together, and that some suburbs are taking the lead in rethinking their areas. This creates a sense of community and enhances democracy. Supports participatory design projects with clear targets, so communities are involved. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.32	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.112	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act, and contrary to the purpose of the NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.112	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act, and contrary to the purpose of the NPSUD.	Disallow
Josephine Smith	419.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Wellingtonians relish the challenge of working together, and that some suburbs are taking the lead in rethinking their areas. This creates a sense of community and enhances democracy. Supports participatory design projects with clear targets, so communities are involved. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to make new developments Controlled activities in respect of urban design so as to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments, and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.113	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.113	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Josephine Smith	419.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that local government, central government, private developers and communities need to work together. Wellington needs innovative models for public and private land investment. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to identify development partnerships as a method for achieving an increased rate of development on land that is underutilised, and that the Plan also needs to identify the key potential actors.
Josephine Smith	419.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that local government, central government, private developers and communities need to work together. Wellington needs innovative models for public and private land investment. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Josephine Smith	419.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that local government, central government, private developers and communities need to work together. Wellington needs innovative models for public and private land investment. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended so that assessment of housing capacity in Wellington needs to be based on a target of realising at least 50% of the development capacity (as measured under the Operative District Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the Proposed District Plan, and needs to include methods to achieve this.
Josephine Smith	419.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to revised demolition controls.
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the Proposed District Plan should be amended to prioritise Newtown as a Pilot programme and to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in a community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the spatial plan. See original submission has concept designs and 3D models of the proposed community-based planning idea.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to prioritise Newtown as a Pilot programme and to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in a community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the spatial plan.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.27	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	TRA seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to prioritise Newtown as a Pilot programme and to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in a community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the spatial plan.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.48	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.161	Whole PDP	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 420.2 in part to the extent that it is inconsistent with the Kāinga Ora submission.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.49	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.28	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to shading so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.50	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.29	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to privacy so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.51	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.30	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.52	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design so as to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments, and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.53	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to identify the Newtown Suburban Centre area suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing the community-led masterplan for this area, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.54	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Supports the Newtown Residents Association submission.	Not specified.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.55	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Supports the submission of LIVE Wellington.	Not specified.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.56	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	423.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that NZDF facilities are in many district plans throughout the country (including the Proposed Selwyn District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part).	Seeks that any existing and future defence facilities in Wellington City are recognised and provided for in the Proposed District Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that local government, central government agencies, private developers, and communities need to work in partnership not as adversaries.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington needs innovative models for public and private investment working together to rapidly develop Wellington's large areas of underutilised land into high quality housing, greenspace and small business facilities.</p> <p>Current proposals assume a meagre 14% of rezoned areas will be developed.</p> <p>LIVE WELLington wants to see partnerships that can realise the potential of at least half our underutilised land in the next ten years.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identifies development partnerships as a method for achieving an increased rate of development on land that is underutilised, and that the Plan also needs to identify the key potential actors.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.42	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area.</p> <p>Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.</p>	Allow
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that local government, central government agencies, private developers, and communities need to work in partnership not as adversaries.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington needs innovative models for public and private investment working together to rapidly develop Wellington's large areas of underutilised land into high quality housing, greenspace and small business facilities.</p> <p>Current proposals assume a meagre 14% of rezoned areas will be developed.</p> <p>LIVE WELLington wants to see partnerships that can realise the potential of at least half our underutilised land in the next ten years.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellingtons liveability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to revised demolition controls.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.43	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area.</p> <p>Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.</p>	Allow
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington's liveability, and its character and heritage, can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Not every old building needs to be retained, but neither are people's sense of connection and place disposable commodities. Rather than wholesale deregulation and the widespread removal of protections, heritage and character can be considered as part of community dialogue, while new construction focuses first on under-utilised land.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls set out above.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.44	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	<p>Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area.</p> <p>Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the aims of the Proposed District Plan. In particular submitter supports the following features and objectives of the plan: (a) the creation of well-functioning urban environments (consistent with the direction set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD)); (b) the provision of sufficient development capacity to meet long term demands for housing and business land; (c) the provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification; and (d) the hierarchy of centres, and the recognition of the City Centre as the primary centre serving the wider Wellington region.	Not specified.
Paul M Blaschke	435.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	considers that Design Guides could have little effect on development in the City due to the fact much of the intensification building that will take place will not be subject to resource consents under the RMA. The use of the relevant PDP and other guidelines should be promoted as best practice and where possible incentivised through relevant policy provisions in the PDP. Such provisions may help enable the design objectives sought in the PDP and the guidelines, through market forces. It is finally noted that MfE guidelines on the Resource Management Enabling Act also refers to Design Guide guidelines, stating "See the non-statutory national medium density design guide which encourages high-quality and well-functioning design for residential developments that are permitted under the MDRS. This is for voluntary use alongside any design guidance territorial authorities use to assess development that requires resource consent."	Seeks that relevant sections of the PDP be amended to promote the use of the Subdivision and other Guidelines as best practice.
Michelle Rush	436.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that there should be more local provision for recycling and reuse including collection and sorting facilities, in line with Council's signalling of moves to a circular economy. Currently, such activities fall within the definition of heavy industry, and aren't easily provided for at local level. Local recycling facilities should be enabled at neighbourhood or local centre scale as part of supporting a circular economy.	Seeks that the plan provisionally enable the collection and processing of recycled waste at smaller scale, in more places, as a controlled activity.
Dale Mary McTavish	448.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Opposes the Proposed District Plan in its current form.	Seeks that Draft District Plan be reinstated. [Inferred decision requested]
John Wilson	453.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the extent of the zones should be clearly defined, e.g. by lines on a map. If defined by distance from the centre point, this should be defined in terms of distance from the centre point. Not in terms of time eg say five or ten minutes walk from the centre of the zone as this requires a subjective interpretation of how far and how fast a typical pedestrian could walk.	Seeks to clarify how zones are defined in terms of distance from the centre point compared to time in minutes walked. [Inferred decision requested]
Marilyn Head	457.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Does not support housing intensification. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that intensification is not enabled [inferred decision requested].
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that there should be mandatory design requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add mandatory design requirements. [inferred decision requested].
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Opposes upzoning entire suburbs and catchments, leaving developers to pick favoured individual sites.	Seeks that specific areas, where the community as a whole will benefit from development, should be upzoned rather than upzoning entire suburbs and catchments. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.12	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that upzoning heights on swathes of housing is very 'destructive'. Considers high rise sites need to be carefully and individually selected according to topology with pockets of intensity if sites allow.	Allow
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that underutilised and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport should be targetted for development. These are prime sites for apartments close to the city and require less infrastructure spend and coordination than many other sites.	Seeks that underutilised and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport are targeted for development, including the strips along Adelaide Road, Kent Terrace, and Thorndon Quay.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.10	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that land identified as priority for development through community planning processes should be prioritised for intensification, also supported by infrastructure and transport investments.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that community-based planning as a method for intensification is adopted and describe a process for this in the District Plan.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.45	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that a target of at least 50% of the development capacity being realised on underutilised land over the term of the Plan is added.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that policies and methods are incorporated in the District Plan to support faster, high quality development for these sites (i.e. underutilised and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport, and land identified as priority for development through community planning processes).
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD is divorced from actual need because it requires councils to deliver a great deal of new development capacity all at once above the amount required at the time. This includes raising height limits irrespective of need. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Council adopt a strategy of staging the release of new capacity for development, at least in the inner city suburbs, and prioritising areas for redevelopment.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD is divorced from actual need because it requires councils to deliver a great deal of new development capacity all at once above the amount required at the time. This includes raising height limits irrespective of need. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that Priority Development Areas for residential development are specified in the District Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Generally supportive of the aims of the proposed plan. The following features and objectives are supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the creation of well functioning urban environments. - the provision of sufficient development capacity. - the provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification. - the provision of a range of commercial and mixed-use environments. - the hierarchy of centres. - recognition of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre. - the provision for six storey residential development in the wider Johnsonville catchment. 	Not specified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Opposes to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. Considers it inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove all references to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.15	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that adding extra building height in the Inner City for social contribution should not be allowed under any circumstances.	Allow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Opposes NCZ-P10, LCZ-P10, MCZ-P10, and CCZ-P11 and related rules. While FSNI recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.	Remove all references in the PDP and Design Guides to City Outcomes Contributions.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.66	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guide, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the PDP, rather than being formally incorporated into it. Incorporating the design guides into the PDP elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants and is onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Seeks the relevant provisions (which refer to design guides as notified) instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.
Ben Barrett	479.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Submitter wishes to second James Coyel's DP submission.	Supports James Coyle's submission. [Refer to submission 307]
Ben Barrett	479.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Seeks to see more inclusion of the lessons learnt from urban planning around the globe.	Seeks to see more inclusion of the lessons learnt from urban planning around the globe within the plan.
Ben Barrett	479.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that there is very little detail in the DP to prevent poor quality outcomes that meet minimum criteria in planning and consenting phase. Considers that Wellington is at a crucial juncture between needing to rapidly modernise and build more densely, but being in danger of developing over all that makes Wellington a vibrant city, a cultural centre, and a great place to live. What we do has to be of higher quality. To minimise emissions over the longterm we also need to significantly improve the quality of urban planning and building performance.	Seeks that there is greater detail in the DP to prevent poor quality outcomes that meet minimum criteria in planning and consenting phase. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ben Barrett	479.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	<p>Submitter considers that Wellington needs to become denser, and this can happen with carefully considered urban form that relates to the existing surrounding structures, culture and community.</p> <p>Submitter considers that the District Plan does not do this and needs to better encourage the quality of urban form to be highest possible. For example, if we do not consider embodied energy of urban form and building stock, we will not achieve our cities low emissions goals.</p> <p>To meet Climate goals and resource conservation goals, all new urban form needs to be built to last 100 year plus. If we're planning to build for 15 or 20 years, this will not meet the needs of future generations, it will burden them with much higher re-development cost and unnecessarily force more emissions into the atmosphere.</p>	<p>Seeks that the Proposed District Plan should better encourage the quality of urban form with density.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Ben Barrett	479.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Considers that Newtown is unfairly targeted for the highest of intensification. All of Wellington should be subject share the same intensity goals.	<p>Opposes the level of intensification in Newtown.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Ben Barrett	479.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan will ensure building heights are tiered and not haphazard.
Ben Barrett	479.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan will support low embodied emission and high performance building experimentation by reducing red tape and cost.
Ben Barrett	479.13	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Seeks that the highest intensity needs to happen in concentrated pockets, not allowed to be placed haphazardly across anywhere in Newtown. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	<p>Seeks that highest intensity developments needs to happen in concentrated pockets.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.13	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that upzoning heights on swathes of housing is very 'destructive'. Considers high rise sites need to be carefully and individually selected according to topology with pockets of intensity if sites allow.	Allow
Ben Barrett	479.14	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	<p>Seeks that the District Plan will include:</p> <p>a) protections for existing property owners to prevent overshadowing from new multi-story buildings, or</p> <p>b) current market rate compensation options for existing property owners that are overshadowing from new multi-story buildings.</p>
Ben Barrett	479.15	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan will encourage the protection of Newtown's pockets of heritage character, and will pay particular attention to building height and structure in these areas.
Ben Barrett	479.16	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan promotes safe cycle pathways fully separate from traffic.
Ben Barrett	479.17	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan promotes better use of land and urban space by allowing boundary sharing (of walls or partitions on the boundary) if both parties are in agreement.
Ben Barrett	479.18	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan needs to support the removal of private cars and on street car parking, and to make way for active travel, safe cycle paths away from traffic and public transport.
Ben Barrett	479.19	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	<p>Seeks that the District Plan needs to:</p> <p>a) support safe attractive walking corridors;</p> <p>b) with food growing that is cared for by Council staff.</p>
Catharine Underwood	481.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that the PDP does not provide consistent natural and physical features and characteristics that contribute to a unique 'sense of place. Allowing large 22m buildings next to pepper potted heritage and character will create small, disconnected blocks easily compromised or destroyed by high density development adjacent.	Not specified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that there should also be provision for requiring that significant developments that do not in themselves contribute to pedestrian amenity make a financial contribution towards that	Add a new provision requiring that significant developments that do not in themselves contribute to pedestrian amenity make a financial contribution towards that.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.20	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that too many buildings have blank walls, high and solid fences or frontages dominated by spaces such as carparks. This makes these spaces less safe for walkers.	Seeks that buildings are designed so as not to have blank walls and high and solid fences or frontages dominated by spaces such as carparks.[inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.21	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a section on "assisted housing" and the inclusion in that of a financial contribution provision. Considers it is important that the city continues to have a mix of residents in all areas.	Amend the plan to include an "Assisted Housing" chapter.
House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	485.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the regulatory controls in the District Plan need to properly reflect the purpose and intentions of the RMA 1991 as expressed in the decision of the Environment Court in New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc v The Central Otago District Council (Environment Court, C45/2004, Thompson EJ presiding). In that decision the Environment Court held that there was no real difference in effect and amenity value terms between the in situ construction of a new dwelling and relocation of a second-hand dwelling, subject to appropriate permitted activity performance standards.	Seeks that the regulatory controls in the District Plan properly reflect the purpose and intentions of the RMA 1991 as expressed in the decision of the Environment Court in New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc v The Central Otago District Council (Environment Court, C45/2004, Thompson EJ presiding).
House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	485.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports (in general) the change to enable the relocation of buildings as a permitted activity status for those applications involving relocated buildings that meet performance standards and criteria, as set out in the submission's attachment Schedule 1. [Refer to original submission for Schedule 1 attachment].	Retain approach of the plan that relocated buildings are not treated differently to those constructed on site.
House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	485.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the WCC retaining a degree of control over relocated buildings through the use of performance/permitted activity standards.	Retain approach of the plan that relocated buildings are not treated differently to those constructed on site.
House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	485.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports Restricted Discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the Permitted Activity status standards.	Retain approach of the plan that relocated buildings are not treated differently to those constructed on site.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that there is no obvious linkage throughout the plan to Te Mana o Te Wai and is concerned that there are no other references in other chapters.	Seeks that the plan is amended to include more references to Te Mana o Te Wai.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.109	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support direction to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and provide for a more integrated approach by weaving freshwater direction throughout the Proposed District Plan.	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the Papakāinga Design Guide needs to refer to an associated chapter.	Seeks that a Papakāinga chapter be included in the plan.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Concerned that the plan does not provide for Papakāinga	Seeks that the plan provides for Papakāinga on Māori owned land or ancestral land. [Inferred decision requested]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Concerned that the plan does not provide for Papakāinga	Seeks that the plan provides for Papakāinga in zone chapters. [Inferred decision requested]
Jonathan Markwick	490.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the preference for a compact city where growth is concentrated within the existing urban area of Wellington, in particular the city centre, town centres, inner suburbs and along public transport corridors.	Not specified.
Jonathan Markwick	490.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Opposes any rules that make the vision of a compact city where growth is concentrated within the existing urban area of Wellington, in particular the city centre, town centres, inner suburbs and along public transport corridors difficult to achieve. Considers it distressing that council is restricting or effectively banning new housing where demand for new housing is highest during a housing crisis.	Not specified.

Mapping

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that there are areas of Wellington that are much more suitable for intense urban development (than Lower Kelburn).	Seeks that urban development is focussed in areas including Te Aro especially around the state highway 1 (known as the bypass): the flat area to the west of Cambridge Terrace: the area between the Basin Reserve and the Wellington Regional Hospital, and perhaps also central parts of the suburb of Kilbirnie, around or over the Wellington railway station marshalling yards and the adjacent area of Thorndon Quay and the Wellington port (especially if the port is moved further north) and also the flat parts of the area very near the city known as Kaiwharawhara. [Inferred decision requested].
Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand	496.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	The Proposed District Plan is supported in its entirety. The PDP does a good job of establishing the enabling approach needed to allow for the Hospital to respond to changing health needs. the proposed objectives, policies, and rules, are supported, including where thresholds are set for planning involvement.	Retain the Proposed District Plan as notified.
Steve West	2.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Mapping of SNA boundaries in Wellington run through the middle of bushy areas. The use of imprecise maps to show where the SNA boundaries are is inappropriate, these boundaries require proper markings.	Seeks that accurate cadastral markings of the Significant Natural Area boundaries are provided so all parties are clear about the boundaries and where the proposed District Plan rules will apply.
Mark Tanner	24.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks the extent of the PREC-01 is extended	Amend the mapping to reflect extension of the character precincts.
Rod Halliday	25.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the flood ponding and overland flow path zone at 28 Westchester Drive is inaccurate. The presence of the Stebbings Dam upstream and concrete retaining wall structures holding up the road will prevent this hazard. [refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks that the flood ponding and overland flow path zone at 28 Westchester Drive be deleted and re-assessed.
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.10	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	Submitter contends that ephemeral streams in the proposed development area have been incorrectly mapped. GPA are not in a position to comment on the veracity of this statement but if any development is to take place, it is important that the lie of the land including gullies is accurately mapped, that these are not filled in during earthworks and that roads are planned to avoid them. Considers that if any development is to take place, it is important that the lie of the land including gullies is accurately mapped, that these are not filled in during earthworks and that roads are planned to avoid them. [Inferred reference to submission 25.3]	Not specified / Seeks that any development in this area takes place with a minimum of earthworks and that natural gullies are not filled in.
Heidi Snelson	FS24.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submitter seeks to reduce / remove / question previous flood ponding, flow path zone assessments stating existing retention dam and retaining wall structures will mitigate against future risk. The detention dam is upstream of recent flooding and flow path damage across Westchester Drive and on Reedy Block road - to become new access way to development. Upstream mitigation does not protect the area which is being inundated by development activities and significant rainfall, downstream. Flooding and slippage and the resultant damage has already been in evidence in this area. (2020, 2021, 2022)	Disallow / Seeks that the submission is disallowed to uphold floodponding and overflow path zone at 28 Westchester Drive and require appropriate and effective mitigation works from the developer to : 1. Protect the Porirua Stream from continued pollution from the development site. 2. Protect the Churton Park Community and the key roading infrastructure of Westchester Drive from the continuing flooding hazards.
Rod Halliday	25.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Clarify that the implementation of the Medium Density Residential Zone in the Lincolnshire Farm Development Plan will not be taken literally. Re-iterate, through notes in the appendix, that boundaries between areas are not fixed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Halliday	25.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Road alignment be adjusted to show it in the position in the plan approved under the resource consent SR No. 416511 relating to a 360 lot subdivision.
Rod Halliday	25.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the road alignment showing where Grenada Drive and Woodridge Drive will interconnect is now fixed based on the resource consent approved under WCC SR No. 416511, earthworks design, road gradients and topography on site. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].	Seeks that the road alignment where Grenada Drive and Woodridge Drive will interconnect is amended in the Proposed District Plan mapping to reflect the plan approved under the resource consent WCC SR No. 416511 (BECA 3321886-S3-C-0023).
Rod Halliday	25.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the WRC6 designation does not match the flood easement line as defined by survey. As it stands, the designation now sits over road and properties that are well above the RL92.	Seeks that the WRC6 designation (Stebbing's Valley Flood Detention Dam) designation boundary is amended in the mapping layer.
Rod Halliday	25.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers an altered path for the collector road at 160 Lincolnshire Road, in the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area. Currently, part of the collector road on the map goes through upcoming residential and earthworks locations, rather than around them. Resource consent for earthworks for this development has been granted for these areas (WCC SR No. 479845) and the works will commence in Oct 2022. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend Lincolnshire Farm Development Area overlay at 160 Lincolnshire Road to alter the path of the collector road. [As illustrated in the submission]
Gregory Webber	33.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Green Street is classified as a character precinct to match Coromandel Street and Wilson Street as these have similar era housing	Add character precinct layer to Green Street [inferred decision requested]
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.32	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission that Green Street should be a character precinct.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.213	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.107	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Simon Ross	37.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Mixed Use Zones (Centres Zones) are much too sparse and too small.	Amend mapping to reflect requested changes to zones above.
Peter Preston	42.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m high buildings with 5 metre boundaries are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society. Afternoon sun may be blocked from these properties. Degradation and abandonment of these properties may ultimately occur as their heritage or character may be visually destroyed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct or heritage area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.80	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Burnaby	44.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 110 Wakefield St (West Plaza Hotel) should have a maximum height of 73m to match the maximum height of the immediately adjoining building at 103 Wakefield St.	Amend height control at 110 Wakefield St (West Plaza Hotel) to 73m.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Mount Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings. Considers that a critical mass is required to preserve character. Notes that the area that WCC Officers, presumably guided by the Boffa Miskell assessment, originally recommended to be classified as Character Precincts in Mount Victoria was considerably larger than the those in the PDP.	Seeks that the mapping is amended to extend the Character Precinct (Mount Victoria)
Owen Watson	51.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that that the character areas in Mt Victoria should be extended, in line with the recommendations in the Boffa Miskell Report.	Seeks that the mapping is amended to extent the character precincts (PREC-01) in Mount Victoria
Phil Kelliher	58.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Amend Heritage Area overlay to include the following buildings on Tutchen Avenue: 1 Tutchen Avenue 2 Tutchen Avenue 3 Tutchen Avenue 4 Tutchen Avenue 5 Tutchen Avenue 6 Tutchen Avenue 8 Tutchen Avenue [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of Heritage Areas to include 1 to 6 Tutchen Avenue and 8 Tutchen Avenue, as recommended by the Pre-1930 Character Area Review by Boffa Miskell.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.38	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Ellice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow
Judith Ellen Bleach	60.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Amend mapping to extend MRZ-PREC01 in Newtown	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include previously identified character precinct areas in Newtown.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.42	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission seeking textending character precincts in Owen Street Newtown.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that Wellington's character housing areas are a significant and valued resource, which form a tangible connection with our history, and confer a sense of place and identity.	Supports increasing the extent of Character Precincts to include more of the areas identified as Primary and Contributory in the Pre-1930s Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report 2019.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the expansion of character Precincts to the extent that this will create inconsistencies with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Disallow
Tawa Residential Ventures Ltd	71.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 4 William Earp Place is suitable for multi-storey residential apartment development for the following reasons: - Within walking distance to Takapu Railway Station - Within 100 metres of a large Countdown supermarket - Within approx. 120 metres of playground & park - Within walking distance of other amenities (Tawa Outlet City, bus stops & shops) - Building to 21m would have minimal effect on neighbouring properties.	Amend Height Control Area layer with respect to 4 William Earp Place to reflect height change requested. [Inferred decision requested]
Turi & Jane Park	73.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks that 134 Brougham Street is removed from the Moir Street Heritage Area.	Amend the extent of Heritage Area to exclude 184 Brougham Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tim Bright	75.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should be increased to include properties on Tutchen Avenue.	Amend extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area mapping to include the houses on Tutchen Avenue.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.42	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Clarendon Grove; addresses in Ellice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow
Tim Bright	75.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that a new Heritage Area should be created for Clarendon Grove.	Amend the mapping to include a Heritage Area over Clarendon Grove.
Conor Hill	76.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD.	Seeks that the mapping is amended to provide more greenfield areas and commercial land.
Conor Hill	76.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the mapping should be amended to reflect the changes requested in this submission.	Amend mapping to reflect amended zoning requested throughout the submission.
Nico Maiden	77.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Many areas in Wellington are a long distance walk from a corner store or other similar amenity.	Seeks that more properties be zoned as NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone).
Aro Valley Community Council	87.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the sites at 39, 41, 43 and 45 Palmer Street should be included as a Character Precinct.	Amend the extent of the Character Precinct to include 39, 41, 43 and 45 Palmer Street in the mapping.
Generation Zero	FS54.8	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.233	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.93	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that all lots between 109 and 181 Aro Street should be classified as Character Precincts.	Extend Character Precinct on Devon Street to include 24-30 Devon Street.
Generation Zero	FS54.9	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.234	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that all lots between 109 and 181 Aro Street should be classified as a Character Precinct.	Map all lots between 109 and 181 Aro Street as a Character Precinct.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.10	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.235	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Tertiary Education zone should be extended to include the McLean Flats site at 320A The Terrace (outlined in black in Figure 2 on original submission) and the substation site adjoining the Gordon Wilson Flats site on the northern side (outlined in blue in Figure 2 on original submission). Both sites will be utilised for university purposes in accordance with the CDP.	Amend the extent of the Tertiary Zone on the maps to include 320A The Terrace (McLean Flats).
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Tertiary Education zone should be extended to include the McLean Flats site at 320A The Terrace (outlined in black in Figure 2 on original submission) and the substation site adjoining the Gordon Wilson Flats site on the northern side (outlined in blue in Figure 2 on original submission). Both sites will be utilised for university purposes in accordance with the CDP.	Amend the extent of the Tertiary Zone on the maps to include the substation adjoining the Gordon Wilson Flats.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Height Control Area 4 (area shaded blue on PDP figure on original submission) should be extended to include the McLean Flats site at 320A The Terrace. The site is now owned by the University and will be utilised for university purposes.	Amend the mapping to show the 21m height at 320A The Terrace.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Height Control Area 4 should be amended to accommodate the proposed Te Huanui building which is anticipated to be between 8 to 12 metres above the maximum in Height Control Area 4. The Te Huanui project is expected to increase the level of amenity to the southern end of The Terrace and should be accommodated within the Height Control Areas of the Tertiary Education zone to reduce future consenting complexity.	Amend the mapping to show the Height Control Area 2 to those parts of the Te Haunui site that are 20 metres or more away from a residential zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oliver Sangster	112.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Generally supports the use of SNA provisions, including on private land across contiguous vegetation areas to protect indigenous biodiversity.	Amend mapping of Significant Natural Areas to include privately owned land. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Oliver Sangster	112.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	Considers that, should landowners object to specific SNA provisions on their land due to low accuracy of maps/modelling, the council adjust the SNA maps to improve their accuracy in relation to what exists "on the ground".	Seeks that the accuracy of the mapping of Significant Natural Area on private land be improved.
Paul Blaschke	FS129.5	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Agrees with the general thrust of this submission point that the accuracy of the mapping of SNAs on all land (not just private land) must be high, and where there is low accuracy in relation to what exists "on the ground, then this should be rectified before the DP is finalised and becomes Operative. Assumes this ground-truthing process can occur once a specific point of low accuracy is identified - not as a blanket withdrawal of all SNAs on private land.	Allow / Seeks that the accuracy of the mapping of all SNAs is improved where a specific problem is identified.
Gael Webster	114.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review. Considers that the character areas in Mount Victoria should be considerably larger based on evidence from expert Council officers, Boffa Miskell consultants, and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga assessment. Decisions about 'Character Precincts' in Mount Victoria were based on allowing more housing and ignored heritage values and character, and the well-being of residents to receive sufficient light and sunshine. A critical mass is required to preserve character and the PDP creates small, disconnected blocks. Mount Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend the extent of the area covered by the Character Precincts in Mount Victoria within mapping, to increase it to encompass Boffa Miskell's Primary/Contributory Character area (Boffa Miskell, Pre-1930 Character Area Review).
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.188	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Geoff Upton	116.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that there is an inconsistent approach to the zoning height limits in Miramar, north of Miramar Avenue.	Seeks that the same height limit should be applied to areas the same distance from the Local Zone (including areas south of Miramar Avenue).
Scots College Incorporated	117.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the maps do not identify the Scots College Campus for the purpose of recognising and providing for Scots College activities and the development of the Campus.	Opposes the removal of the Educational Precinct notation for Scots College.
Scots College Incorporated	117.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Scots College Campus should be an Educational Precinct.	Amend the District Plan map to identify the "Scots College Campus" as an Educational Precinct.
Scots College Incorporated	117.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the "Educational Precincts" in the Operative District Plan should be retained in the PDP for all existing Educational Precincts, being: · Scots College, Miramar · Samuel Marsden Collegiate School, Karori · Queen Margaret College, Thorndon · St Marks Church School, Basin Reserve .	Seeks that these schools are identified as Educational Precincts.
Scots College Incorporated	117.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the maps do not identify the curtilage around the heritage listed main College building in order to limit the application of HH-R4 to the reasonable vicinity of the listed building. Because the Campus is a very large site this change is sought so that resource consent is not unnecessarily required for building work that is sufficiently far away from the main building.	Amend the District Plan map to identify the curtilage of the College Main Building, with the curtilage being the area occupied by the listed building and the area within 25m of the building footprint.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Scots College Incorporated	117.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 11m building height standard is supported for most of the Scots College Campus but because the Campus is large in area it is possible and desirable for new buildings with an additional 5m in height (to 16m) to be accommodated on the Campus, provided this additional building height is located with a reasonable setback distance (25m) from any boundary of the Campus, including the street boundaries. This will effectively "internalise" the effects of the additional building height to the Campus and avoid any unacceptable adverse effects on the streetscape and any residential properties. The purpose of this is also to encourage the retention of open character of the northern half of the Campus.	Seeks that the mapping is amended to apply the proposed Height Control area 3 from original submission to the area of Scots College Campus that is 25m or more away from any street boundary and any adjoining Medium Density Residential Zone boundary.
Jocelyn Ng	130.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the Newtown Character house protection submission which proposes at a minimum the Officers' Recommended plan is re-instated into the PDP.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) in the mapping to incorporate the area in the Officers' Recommended Plan.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.28	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission that seeks a character protection extension for Owen Street.	Allow
Ella Patterson	138.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Amend the mapping with increased height limits within walking catchments to rail stations.
Janice Young	140.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 14m height limits in the MRZ should be removed.	Amend the mapping to remove 14m building heights in the Medium Density Residential Zone.
Janice Young	140.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 22m height limits in Centres Zones should be removed.	Amend the mapping to remove 22m building heights in Centres Zones.
John Tiley	142.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Marshalls Ridge should be included as an identified ridgeline.	Amend the mapping layer to show Marshalls Ridge as an identified ridgeline.
Andy Foster	FS86.25	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.2].	Allow
John Tiley	142.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that while the map of the Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West is grey and bounded red, as unbuilt, the future intentions attached to the area, revealed by the label "FUZ", suggest residential construction in the future. A coherent plan should not contain any such discrepancy.	Clarity is sought in the mapping to show where residential development can occur in the FUZ (Future Urban Zone) in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West development. [Inferred decision requested].
Grant Buchan	143.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that all inconsistencies between the NPS-UD and MDRS should be removed (in favour of NPS-UD directions).	Amend the walkable catchments in the mapping.
Braydon White	146.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that height limits should be increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations to provide for larger, more comprehensive developments around centres.	Amend the height limits around Centres Zones in the mapping.
David Stevens	151.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Opposes the surrounding area of Khandallah being medium density four storey with a height limit of 14m.	Amend the mapping to zone the area surrounding Khandallah as Medium Density Residential Zone, with a storey /11m maximum height limit throughout. [Inferred decision requested].
David Stevens	151.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the MRZ three storey requirements imposed under the NPS-UD and development along the proposed RTS corridors (excluding JVL) provides ample scope for residential development to meet the expected population growth for the city.	Seeks that the corridor from Broadmeadows to Crofton Downs should be MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) 3-storey 11m throughout, including the Khandallah and Ngaio Centres.
Alexander Hockley	153.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks that the character precincts are extended on the mapping.	Amend the extent of the Character Precincts (MRZ-PREC01) areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.197	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
LIVE WELLington	154.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks that the character precincts are extended on the mapping.	Amend the extent of the Character Precincts (MRZ-PREC01) areas.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.31	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Extend character precincts in the mapping. Improve the definition of character. Avoid erosion of character, especially in Thorndon; the city's (& NZ's) oldest suburb lost much when the urban motorway was carved through it. What remains is of significant cultural and other values. Significant and superior residential character on the eastern side of the suburb, though small in area, should be zoned as Character Precincts because they contribute significantly to the appeal, character and liveability of Thorndon. What remains is of significant cultural and other values. Significant and superior residential character on the eastern side of the suburb, though small in area, should be zoned as Character Precincts because they contribute significantly to the appeal, character and liveability of Thorndon. Inadequate infrastructure, and resilience to natural disasters are additional factors to account for. The natural vulnerabilities should restrain intensification within Thorndon. Thorndon is already a relatively intensely subdivided suburb (compared, say, to equivalent inner suburbs in Auckland).	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.190	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Vivienne Morrell	155.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the Boffa Miskell 2019 report on character areas.	Amend the extent of the area covered by the Character Precincts to encompass all the dwellings identified in the 2019 Boffa Miskell report on character areas.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.191	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Dr Briar E R Gordon and Dr Lyndsay G M Gordon	156.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes zone change of the area of Thorndon east of the motorway to City Centre Zone.	Reject zone change of the area of Thorndon east of the motorway to City Centre Zone and amend mapping.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.67	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	These submissions align with the Association's submissions for the Hobson precinct, the Portland/Hawkestone precinct, and the Selwyn precinct.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.198	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Jocelyn Brandon	158.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the area immediately around Wesley Road contains many historic houses of a character that deserve to be preserved within a Character Precinct.	Amend the mapping to include a Character Precinct (MRZ-PREC01) immediately around Wesley Road.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.175	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Inferred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.19	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
Thomas Brent Layton	164.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Amend that mapping so that the Special Amenities Landscape does not include 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.	Remove the Special Amenities Landscape overlay from 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.
John Schiff	166.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the inner city suburbs, such as Mt Victoria, are an integral part of Wellington's character. Considers that reducing the protection of these character areas by 71% would see the demolition of many character homes in the inner city suburbs to be replaced by six storey apartment blocks. This would adversely affect many of the dwellings in these areas through loss of sun, views and amenity, let alone the character of these areas. The submitter believes that the need for an increase in the housing stock can be achieved without reducing the character precincts as proposed in the PDP.	Seeks that the extent of the area encompassed by Character Precincts is increased in the mapping.
Michelle Leonie Rose	167.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Notes that Donald McLean Street was mentioned in the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area review. The beautiful old homes and gardens/trees add to the history of Wellington. 30 Donald McLean Street, as far as the submitter knows, was built in 1888 and altered in the 1940s, and the back garage was first used as a stables, judging by appearance.	Amend the extent of the Character Precincts to include Donald McLean Street. [Inferred decision requested].
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.40	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts in Newtown.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.223	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.101	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Zaffa Christian	174.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the character areas should be reinstated in accordance with the recommendations in the Officers' Recommended Plan.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) in the mapping to incorporate the area in the Officers' Recommended Plan.
Jon Gaupset	175.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the character areas should be reinstated in accordance with the recommendations in the Officers' Recommended Plan.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) in the mapping to incorporate the area in the Officers' Recommended Plan.
Historic Places Wellington	182.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the Item 46 (Ascot Street) of Schedule 2 - Heritage Areas, but considers it is too small and should be extended north to the motorway intersection opposite Harriett Street and along the west side of Tinakori Road.	Extend the Ascot Street heritage area in the mapping.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington	182.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the creation within the suburb of separate development areas which themselves include many quality character houses and will have no character controls should be avoided.	Amend planning maps to have one large character area or precinct over the heritage suburb.
Ros Bignell	186.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that Lawrence Street includes houses of architectural heritage that contribute to the overall character of the Newtown precinct. The street has several "anchor" houses including 11A Lawrence Street.</p> <p>The "streetscape" of Lawrence is one of the most attractive in Newtown and the positioning of the current housing could be considered sympathetic to the natural topography of the hillside.</p> <p>Considers that Council Officers who are not personally invested in Lawrence Street have considered the qualities of housing and character in Newtown and seen fit to recommend the boundaries and protections of the Newtown character precinct are extended to a further 300 buildings including those of Lawrence Street.</p>	Amend the extent of the area covered by the Character Precincts in Newtown to include Lawrence Street.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.21	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.224	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.102	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Ros Bignell	186.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that Council Officers who are not personally invested in Lawrence Street have considered the qualities of housing and character in Newtown and seen fit to recommend the boundaries and protections of the Newtown character precinct are extended to a further 300 buildings including those of Lawrence Street.</p> <p>Considers that there is a need to be careful that the current character of the precinct is not destroyed; removal of existing heritage character buildings or infilling with housing that is not complementary to the precincts character and topography will slowly erode that character. Once gone, the Newtown precinct's character will be changed irrevocably for future generations.</p>	Amend the extent of the area covered by the Character Precincts to ideally include the 300 houses recommended by Council Officers and/or adopt a site by site character analysis as proposed by the Boffa Miskell Report 2019.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.22	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.225	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Ros Bignell	186.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the existing newer, infill townhouses on Lawrence Street are positioned such that they have a relatively low impact on the overall streetscape. This might be similarly possible with new 3 storey (11 metres height) townhouses or residential buildings but not with 4 storey multi dwelling buildings of up to 14 metres.	Amend the height in the mapping to 11m in Lawrence Street, Newtown.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.23	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow
Churton Park Community Association	189.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Marshalls Ridge should be included as an identified ridgeline.	Amend the mapping layer to show Marshalls Ridge as an identified ridgeline.
Andy Foster	FS86.36	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 189.2].	Allow
Churton Park Community Association	189.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that while the map of the Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West is grey and bounded red, as unbuilt, the future intentions attached to the area, revealed by the label "FUZ", suggest residential construction in the future. A coherent plan should not contain any such discrepancy.	Clarity is sought in the mapping to show where residential development can occur in the FUZ in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West development. [Inferred decision requested].
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Proposed District Plan largely ignores the heritage value of the whole area of Mount Victoria, by choosing instead a piecemeal approach (of individual buildings that have "character"), that is highly likely to destroy this important heritage area. Considers that character in Mount Victoria derives from its historic heritage. Considers that the character areas in Mount Victoria should be considerably larger based on evidence from expert Council officers, Boffa Miskell consultants, and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga assessment. Considers that a critical mass is required to preserve character and the PDP creates small, disconnected blocks. There is a mismatch between WCC's statement that the Plan "protects areas of special character" in "some of the City's original settlements" and its designation of small, discrete areas of Mt Victoria as Character Precincts. Mount Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings. Legislation and a number of key WCC documents make clear the value of heritage and heritage buildings and areas. Considers that the inner suburbs have more than enough housing capacity to meet demand over the next 30 years under the existing Operative District Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend the extent of the area covered by the Character Precincts in Mount Victoria to encompass Boffa Miskell's Primary/Contributory Character area (Boffa Miskell, Pre-1930 Character Area Review) and Heritage New Zealand recommendations.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.117	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that there is inadequate protection provided where 21m high buildings are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by the Mt Victoria Historical Society. Allowing buildings of such heights with a 5 metre height to boundary will destroy the heritage or character from a visual point of view and reduce the well-being of residents due to insufficient light and sunshine. This will likely to lead to degradation and abandonment of these properties.	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zoned land at least one property wide is required between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and the High Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.171	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.81	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the east side of Lipman Street should be a Character Precinct.	Seeks that the east side of Lipman Street is made a Character Precinct.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.188	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.124	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Jane Beale and Lisa Terreni	191.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Green Street and Emmett Streets should be a Character Precinct as they were identified as contributing to the streetscape in the Pre-1930s character area review and are well maintained.	Seeks that Green Street and Emmett Street made a Character Precinct.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.30	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission that seeks Green Street to be a character precinct/heritage area.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.226	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.104	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Andrew Flanagan	198.12	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks that all height limits are removed on developments in the City Centre Zone.	Amend the mapping to remove all height limits on developments in the City Centre Zone.
Avryl Bramley	202.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Extend the character precincts to their extent in the operative district plan. [Inferred decision requested]
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.192	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Opposes the height controls for 236 and 238 Middleton as considers this does not meet the National Policy Standard for housing as this is not a city centre or on a railway line and there are no neighbourhood shops. Considers that garden centre at 238 Middleton Road would no longer be able to exist if the 15m height control was implemented.</p> <p>The properties bound onto the adjacent public reserve which is a gazetted Historic Reserve, with a scheduled heritage building, (the Halfway House) and a heritage garden. Considers that the heights will impact on this reserve and garden, and does not meet documents such as Heritage Design Guide and Conservation Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Delete 15m height controls for 236 Middleton Road (Property report 1071659) and 238 Middleton Road (Property report 1071644) and the correlating height controls on the interactive map and anywhere else they may be on the District Plan.
Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Opposes the height controls for 236 and 238 Middleton as considers this does not meet the National Policy Standard for housing as this is not a city centre or on a railway line and there are no neighbourhood shops. Considers that garden centre at 238 Middleton Road would no longer be able to exist if the 15m height control was implemented.</p> <p>The properties bound onto the adjacent public reserve which is a gazetted Historic Reserve, with a scheduled heritage building, (the Halfway House) and a heritage garden. Considers that the heights will impact on this reserve and garden, and does not meet documents such as Heritage Design Guide and Conservation Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Amend height control for 236 Middleton Road (Property report 1071659) and 238 Middleton Road (Property report 1071644) and the correlating height controls on the interactive map and anywhere else they may be on the District Plan from 15m to 8m.
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the extent to the Character Precincts is extended to match the Boffa Miskell report 2019 and Site by site character analysis in Newtown is Applied to 1277 or 70 percent of the 1600 houses surveyed in the report.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.189	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Character Precincts are extended to that recommended by Council officers for the Final Spatial Plan.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Character Precincts are extended to include Green and Emmett Streets.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.227	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.105	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that there is strong evidence that the character areas in Mt Victoria should be considerably larger than they are.</p> <p>Considers that Boffa Miskell's house-by-house analysis resulted in the definition of a clear Primary/Contributory character area which should be the minimum extent of Character Precincts. Therefore, even the WCC Officers' Final Spatial Plan Recommendation (pre-Council amendment 24 June 2021) area represents a political compromise, not justified by the evidence WCC, itself, commissioned.</p> <p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan creates small, disconnected blocks where the character can be destroyed by high-density development around, for little housing gain on a city-wide scale.</p> <p>Considers that Mt Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings. It is important to both for its accessibility and visibility, and for the cultural, social and economic stories it tells about the development of Wellington.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Boffa Miskell Primary/Contributory Character sub-area; and 2. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's recommendations. <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.119	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.</p>	Allow
Nga Kaimanaaki o te Waimapihi	215.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that we need to preserve and restore indigenous native fauna.</p> <p>As well as preying on our native birds, cats also eat a large number of our native lizards and wētā (which are still in decline).</p>	<p>Add a buffer area around significant natural areas to support recovering populations of endangered (once locally extinct) endemic species where pets would not be allowed to roam.</p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.86	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes this submission due to concerns about the implications for enabling housing intensification, particularly as other submitters seek that urban significant natural areas are also identified.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora notes that the District Plan cannot manage domestic animals.</p>	Disallow
Sam Stocker & Patricia Lee	216.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that far too much historic character areas have been left out of the Newtown and Berhampore areas which will destroy quality of life for their community.</p> <p>The land is not needed to help cope with Wellingtons increasing population.</p> <p>Land values will soar and will lead to unpayable rates bills and loss of sunlight access.</p> <p>New builds more than three storeys high are expensive and won't provide low-cost housing.</p> <p>Average residents will either be forced away or live in ghetto conditions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that any areas that include pre-1935 buildings be included as character precincts.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.48	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Supports submission that seeks character precinct extensions in Newtown.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.229	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.103	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Eva Brodie	217.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the Boffa Miskell 2019 report identified Lower Kelburn as an area that warranted further consideration for it's contributions to Thorndon Character Areas.</p> <p>Lower Kelburn is a similar age to Thorndon and Mt Victoria and has well maintained, functioning old homes with ancient local timbers built by traditional craftsmen.</p> <p>Placement of even one tall building in this neighbourhood would degrade surrounding homes.</p> <p>Developments built to the edge of zones in the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Lower Kelburn will mean losses of privacy, sun, views, and access.</p> <p>The area is on the fault line, steep and is already dependent on many retaining walls, making it unsuitable for large, heavy buildings.</p>	Seeks that Lower Kelburn (Area with boundaries of the Botanic Gardens and Bolton Street Cemetery, motorway and cable car track) should be classified as a Character Precinct.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.271	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.166	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.16	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
Mike Camden	226.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended to encompass all dwellings identified as being "Positive, contributing or neutral" in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review from Boffa Miskell.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.193	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Walmsley	229.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Considers that the site at 1 Carlton Gore Road is at the very end of the view shaft and that any development within this residential area will have no effect on the views out from the Cable Car location to the hill.</p> <p>Correspondence with WCC officers have indicated that they support the decision to reduce the viewshafts to the centre area zone and waterfront zones.</p> <p>Considers that as the viewshafts did not apply to the residential zones in the ODP this cannot be the case for the residential zones.</p> <p>Considers there is very little evidence to support the fact that view shafts are a qualifying matter for the property, or any properties subject to the MDRS.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason and correspondence]</p>	Remove the viewshaft from 1 Carlton Gore Road.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>HRZ-S2 height limit of 21m with regards to Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood.</p> <p>Considers that an 11m height limit will help preserve the unique character of the area.</p> <p>Lower Kelburn is not suitable for 21m height limit because of steep and narrow access, hilly and deeply indented physical character which would require significant infrastructural development to intensify.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the height limit in Lower Kelburn is set to 11m.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.272	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.167	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.17	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings and structures is necessary to protect heritage buildings from inappropriate development, which is a matter of national importance under s6 of the Resource Management Act.	<p>Amend the MRZ-PREC01 (character precincts) in the mapping to include all existing pre-1930s character areas (Appendix 1 of Chapter 5 of the Operative District Plan).</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.6	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submitters seek to include Te Ngākau Civic Square as a heritage area. While Willis Bond and Company Limited appreciate the reasons for the submissions and are supportive of protecting historic heritage, we agree with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga(sub 70.35) that the proposed Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct provisions adequately address heritage considerations within the area.	Disallow / For clarity, we support the inclusion of Wellington Central Library as a heritage building within SCHED1.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.88	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>10min walkable catchment</p> <p>Specific heritage identification and assessment</p> <p>Views contributing to sense of place and identity</p> <p>Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell</p> <p>Boffa Miskell streetscapes</p> <p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>CCZ encroachment on residential zones</p> <p>Old St Pauls height controls</p> <p>Preserve viewshalfs</p>	Allow
Century Group Limited	238.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Opposes the imposition of a Veranda Control along the frontage of the Property and the other properties along the length of Waterloo Quay (northeast of Bunny Street).</p> <p>Considers that the pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the subject site is predominantly generated by the railway and the Wellington Regional Stadium. These are connected by a pedestrian bridge walkway, which also provides a sheltered pedestrian route at the ground level. Waterloo Quay is a vehicular route to the city, and there are no pedestrian-orientated activities fronting the road which would otherwise justify the need for veranda protection along the footpath.</p> <p>Does not consider that there is sufficient justification for imposing a costly requirement to provide veranda protection along the frontage of the Property, relative to the low level of pedestrian activity along the road, the alternative, protected pedestrian routes that exist between major pedestrian destinations, and the inconsistent application of the Veranda Control along Waterloo Quay.</p>	Delete the 'Veranda' control as it relates to the land along both sides of Waterloo Quay, to the north-east of Bunny Street.
Century Group Limited	238.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the spatial extent of the 'Active Frontages' control as shown on the Map Viewer, insofar as the control does not apply to the Property. Considers that the relationship of the Property to the commercial core of the City Centre, and the 'utilitarian' characteristics of the Property and the surrounding land, are such that active building frontages would be an inappropriate and onerous imposition on the development of this land.	Retain the extent of the Active Frontages control as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the spatial extent of Designation KRH1 as shown on the Maps at the time of making this submission, insofar as Designation KRH1 does not apply to the Property.	Retain the extent of Designation KRH1, specifically as it is not applied to the property (83-87 Waterloo Quay).
Alan Fairless	242.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that throughout the city are many sites that sit idle or underutilised. Developing these sites provides a means to addressing much of the future housing demand while avoiding adverse effects on quality, amenity and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that the District Plan sets out a clear sequence for intensification that focusses first on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport, rather than upzoning broad areas of land.
Friends of Khandallah	252.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that large scale residential will lead to erosion of commercial by residential.</p> <p>Theoretical planning from other cities is not necessarily good for Khandallah.</p> <p>Commercial areas need to be protected in Khandallah for resilience and emergencies.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the height control limits in for the Khandallah centre are reduced from 22m - 35m (as part of a resource consent) to 8m.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Massey University	253.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the zone boundary for the Tertiary Education Zone does not fully capture all of Massey Universities interests and buildings within the Massey University campus area. It is proposed that the zone boundary be amended to fully contain all of the Massey University campus.	<p>Amend the district plan zoning map so that the boundary for the Tertiary Education Zone at the Massey University Campus accurately captures all of the campus.</p> <p>See Attachment 2 for boundary changes sought.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero Inc	254.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	GZ Inc supports PDP's identification of areas with high concentrations of character (i.e. areas with a predominance of primary classified buildings). [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain the extent of the character precincts as notified which only include properties that have been identified as having high concentrations of character (i.e. areas with a predominance of primary classified buildings).
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.91	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Disallow
Prime Property Group	256.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the 'Spenmoor Street Area' mapping layer related to policy the submitter seeks deletion of.	Delete the 'Spenmoor Street Area' from the planning maps.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	258.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the application of the Special Purpose Hospital Zone at Bowen and Wakefield Hospitals	Retain the Special Purpose Hospital Zoning at Bowen Hospital (98 Churchill Drive) and Wakefield Hospital (30 Florence Street) as notified.
Mike Robbers	264.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that there are a large number of character homes on Lawrence Street, some of the homes have Māori names in stained glass on the front of the properties. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Character Precincts are extended in the mapping to encompass Lawrence Street, Newtown.
Wellington City Council	266.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the mapped viewshaft 8 (Panama Street) does not match with the VS8 description and picture in Schedule 5 as it extends over Customhouse Quay and Jervois Quay. In the maps, it dog-legs inwards at the boundary with Customhouse Quay. Also, VS8 in Schedule 5 describes the viewshaft as protecting views to the inner harbour and Oriental Bay, with Roseneath and Town Belt as context elements. To achieve this, the mapped overlay needs to extend over Queens Wharf to the water's edge in the same way the other viewshafts do. Otherwise, development in the Waterfront Zone could block the view described and photographed in Schedule 5 (Viewshafts).	Seeks to extend the VS8 (Panama Street) in the Planning Maps to be an even fan (i.e. remove cut-out from Intercontinental Hotel) over Jervois Quay and Queens Wharf to the water's edge.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result. Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment. The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty. Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.297	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.65	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that viewshaft 8 needs amendment to achieve the purpose of protecting views of the heritage waterfront area.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the extent of SCHED3 (Heritage Areas) Item 43 should be amended to exclude the park on 52 Elizabeth St and properties in the park's proximity.	Seeks to remove Schedule 3 overlay as shown in image supplied in full submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).</p>	<p>Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows:</p> <p>79A Todman Street (Sutch-Smith House) Reference: 520 519.</p>
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.3	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.10	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).</p>	<p>Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows:</p> <p>53 Trelissick Crescent (Kahn House) Reference: 521 520.</p>
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.11	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 18 Vera Street (Firth House) Reference: 522 521
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.5	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.12	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 154 Victoria Street Reference: 522 522
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.6	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.13	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).	Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows: 9 Waiapu Road (Hirschfeld House) Reference: 524 523

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.7	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).</p>	<p>Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows:</p> <p>134 Willis Street Reference: 527 524</p>
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.8	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers heritage buildings are incorrectly numbered in the ePlan mapping and do not match the numbered listings in Heritage Buildings (SCHED1).</p>	<p>Amend the ePlan mapping Heritage Building overlay as follows:</p> <p>233 Willis Street Reference: 528 525</p>
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.9	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.16	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the ePlan map needs to be amended to reflect the increase of the Island Bay Parade and Mersey Street shops to 14m.	Amend ePlan mapping to show height of 14m for the Neighbourhood Centre at the corner of Mersey Street and The Parade, Island Bay.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.10	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.17	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers 12A Parliament Street should be identified as a non-heritage building within the Ascot Street Heritage Area as its heritage value is uncertain.	Amend ePlan map so that 12A Parliament Street should be identified as a non-heritage building within the Ascot Street Heritage Area.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.11	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.18	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 16 Parliament Street is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but currently has a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map	Remove the "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map for 16 Parliament Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.12	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.19	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers 6 Glenbervie Terrace is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but currently has a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map.</p>	Remove the "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map for 6 Glenbervie Terrace.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.13	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.20	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers 8 Glenbervie Terrace does not currently have a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map.</p>	Amend ePlan to add a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map for 8 Glenbervie Terrace.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.14	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.21	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers 11 Glenbervie Terrace is currently combined with 8 Parliament Street in the planning maps.	Amend ePlan so that 11 Glenbervie Terrace is made into a separate property from 8 Parliament Street on the map.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.15	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.22	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers 11 Glenbervie Terrace is currently combined with 8 Parliament Street in the planning maps.	Amend ePlan so that 11 Glenbervie Terrace is given a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.16	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.23	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers 11 Glenbervie Terrace is currently combined with 8 Parliament Street in the planning maps.	Retain the "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map for 8 Parliament Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.17	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.24	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that 17 Glenberrie Terrace is currently incorrectly combined with 15 Glenberrie Terrace in the planning maps.</p>	Amend the ePlan so that 17 Glenberrie Terrace is made into a separate property from 15 Glenberrie Terrace on the map.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.18	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.25	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that 17 Glenberrie Terrace is currently incorrectly combined with 15 Glenberrie Terrace in the planning maps.</p>	Amend the ePlan so that 17 Glenberrie Terrace is given a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.19	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.26	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that 17 Glenbervie Terrace is currently incorrectly combined with 15 Glenbervie Terrace in the planning maps.	Retain the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 15 Glenbervie Terrace.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.20	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council’s obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council’s s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city’s ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.27	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 19 Glenbervie Terrace is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – Item 46 but currently has a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Remove the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 19 Glenbervie Terrace.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.21	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council’s obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council’s s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city’s ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.28	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that 19 Glenbervie Terrace is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – Item 46 but currently has a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Remove the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 19 Glenbervie Terrace.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.22	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.29	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that 21 Glenberrie Terrace is currently combined on the map with 19 Glenberrie Terrace. 21 Glenberrie Terrace is also an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 and currently has a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map (from 19 Glenberrie Terrace).</p>	Amend the ePlan so that 21 Glenberrie Terrace is made into a separate property from 19 Glenberrie Terrace on the map.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.23	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.30	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that 21 Glenberrie Terrace is currently combined on the map with 19 Glenberrie Terrace. 21 Glenberrie Terrace is also an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 and currently has a "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map (from 19 Glenberrie Terrace).</p>	Remove the "Heritage Area – Contributing Building" dot on the map for 21 Glenberrie Terrace, once separated from 19 Glenberrie Terrace.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.24	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.31	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that 23 Glenbervie Terrace is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – Item 46 but currently has a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Remove the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 23 Glenbervie Terrace.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.25	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council’s obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council’s s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city’s ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.32	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers 111 Hill Street is an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but currently has a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Remove the “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map for 111 Hill Street.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.26	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council’s obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council’s s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city’s ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.33	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 214 Sydney Street does not currently have a “Heritage Area – Contributing Building” dot on the map.	Add a "Heritage Area - Contributing Building" dot on the map for 214 Sydney Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.27	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.34	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers there is a need to amend the WIAL1 designation boundary as shown on the ePlan maps to be more useable for plan users. Council officers will work with WIAL to confirm the mapping requirements, which could include a new mapping layer.</p>	Seeks to amend the designation as displayed on the ePlan maps, inclusive of polygon boundaries, visual display elements, and any additional mapping elements required to improve useability.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.28	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.244	General / Mapping / General	Support	<p>WIAL supports this submission and is currently working alongside WCC to ensure that WIAL1 is displayed in a user friendly manner for plan users.</p>	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.35	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that WCC9 Christeson Lane Service Lane should be amended because the service lane beyond the formed part of Christeson Lane was not implemented under the Operative District Plan designation, and there are no plans in the foreseeable future to actively pursue the implementation of the service lane.</p>	<p>Amend WCC9 Christeson Lane Service Lane from where it is currently on privately owned land at the rear of 88 Manners Street, 90-92 Manners and 94 (part)-100 Manners Street and 70-72 Cuba Street. Retain WCC9 on the formed part of Christeson Lane.</p> <p>[As illustrated in full submission]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.29	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.36	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that WCC has no plans to either acquire 11 Manners Street or use it for a service land.</p>	Remove 11 Manners Street (Lot 10 DP 1886) from the mapped extent of WCC10 (Bond Street Service Lane).
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.30	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.37	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers the mapping of the viewshafts needs to be amended to provide clarity and certainty around the rule framework. This is to avoid impacts on the development potential of residentially zoned properties in the focal element of VS13-15 (i.e. their ability to achieve MDRS).</p>	Amend the ePlan by adding a new specific control mapping layer 'Viewshaft Control Area' that dissects through TEDZ (Tertiary Education Zone), MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) properties under Viewshafts 13-15
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.31	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.38	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that there is a need to show parts of Kiwi Rail Holdings designation that are aboveground vs underground i.e. substrata.	Amend the Kiwi Rail Holdings designation as displayed on the ePlan maps to differentiate underground and above ground features.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.32	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.93	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Seeks that all parts of the rail corridor be mapped. Provided the amendment clearly shows the rail corridor as a continuous feature and it is made clear (within legend) that the entire corridor length is designated, then this amendment can be supported by KiwiRail.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Amend / Adopt amendment sought subject to it being made clear the entire rail corridor is designated
Wellington City Council	266.39	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that in regard to Upper Stebbings and Glenside West, and Lincolnshire Farm Development Areas - The absence of the Ridgetop area in the PDP maps is an error. Other mapping changes to the Development Plan maps are for the purposes of clarification, and better cross-referencing and linkage to the related District Plan appendices.	Amend the "Ridgetop" area [shown in map in full submission] so that this is put into the Development Area map with an associated amendment made to the PDP map legend.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.33	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.40	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that in regard to Upper Stebbings and Glenside West, and Lincolnshire Farm Development Areas - The absence of the Ridgetop area in the PDP maps is an error. Other mapping changes to the Development Plan maps are for the purposes of clarification, and better cross-referencing and linkage to the related District Plan appendices.	Amend Legend for Development Plan maps for Upper Stebbings and Lincolnshire to add a letter reference that matches the letters shown on the maps i.e. A – J. The legend should state these letters relate to: 'neighbourhood park catchment'.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.34	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial reality.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.41	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that in regard to Upper Stebbings and Glenside West, and Lincolnshire Farm Development Areas - The absence of the Ridgetop area in the PDP maps is an error. Other mapping changes to the Development Plan maps are for the purposes of clarification, and better cross-referencing and linkage to the related District Plan appendices.	Amend current legend reference for both Upper Stebbings and Lincolnshire 'neighbourhood park' to 'neighbourhood park (approx. location)'.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.35	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial reality.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.42	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that in regard to Upper Stebbings and Glenside West, and Lincolnshire Farm Development Areas - The absence of the Ridgetop area in the PDP maps is an error. Other mapping changes to the Development Plan maps are for the purposes of clarification, and better cross-referencing and linkage to the related District Plan appendices.	Amend legend for Development Plan maps for Upper Stebbings and Lincolnshire from 'unbuilt area' to 'no-build area'; also remove the part in parentheses that follows: (open space, cut and fill batters).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.36	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.43	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that in regard to Upper Stebbings and Glenside West, and Lincolnshire Farm Development Areas - The absence of the Ridgetop area in the PDP maps is an error. Other mapping changes to the Development Plan maps are for the purposes of clarification, and better cross-referencing and linkage to the related District Plan appendices.</p>	Amend Development Plan maps for both Upper Stebbings and Lincolnshire so that the location of the letters A – J are moved to be generally in the centre of the white dashed catchment areas.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.37	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.44	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that in regard to Upper Stebbings and Glenside West, and Lincolnshire Farm Development Areas - The absence of the Ridgetop area in the PDP maps is an error. Other mapping changes to the Development Plan maps are for the purposes of clarification, and better cross-referencing and linkage to the related District Plan appendices.</p>	Amend Development Plan maps for Upper Stebbings so the small catchment area currently with two "B" just has 1 "B" in this area.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.38	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Support for the application of the Special Purpose Quarry Zone to the site (and for this zoning to be applied to adjoining sites owned by Horokiwi).	Retain Special Purpose Quarry Zone, with amendments.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that specific to Natural Features, their site and adjoining properties feature Special Amenity Landscapes (SALs) and Ridgelines and Hilltops. There are not Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes (ONFLs) within the vicinity of the site.	Not specified.
McDonald's	274.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support in part	In general, the submitter (McDonald's) supports the zonings that have been applied to their existing restaurants.	Not specified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Opposes extent of the character precincts to the extent that they do not include areas that are currently protected by the pre-1930s demolition control in the operative district plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Extend the extent of the character precincts to that of the operative district plan [Inferred decision requested]
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.194	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports an extension of character precincts to include all the houses in the Officers Recommended Plan from June 19, 2021. The site-by-site analysis found that some 300 houses contributed sufficiently to the character and streetscape of Newtown. These houses also passed the test established by the officers as Qualifying Matters for exemption from the NPS-UD and MDRS. Considers that these houses therefore should be exempt from intensification, and be covered by Character Precinct rules, in particular the pre-1930 demolition rule. Almost all of the houses identified by the ORP are deemed to be primary or contributory by Boffa Miskell. In addition, these houses all demonstrate assemblages of consistent character streetscape [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Amend Character Precincts to match that of the Officer Recommended Spatial Plan which include the following sites: Balmoral Terrace - 3, 5, 7, 9, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10. Blucher Avenue - 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10. Coromandel Street - 1, 1A, 5, 7, 9, 11, 11, 13, 15, 17, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 127, 135, 137, 139, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 22, 90, 92, 96, 100, 102, 104, 106. Daniell Street - 147, 149, 157, 159, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, 92, 94, 124, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134, 136, 162. Harper St 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20. Lawrence St 7, 9, 11, 11A, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24. Owen St 1, 5, 7A, 9/11A, 15, 77, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 121A, 121C, 123, 125, 127, 127A, 129, 131, 133, 135, 137, 139, 141, 143, 154, 20, 22, 24B, 26, 28, 30, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 46, 48, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 70, 74, 76, 78, 88, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 102, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 156, 158, 160, 162, 164. Stoke St 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 33, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 31, 33, 35, 37.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.221	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.109	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that these properties not included in the Officers Recommended Plan are classified as Character Precincts.</p> <p>The sites identified have streetscape appeal and are intact pre-1900 houses in many cases. 50% of the sites identified have a primary categorisation within the Boffa Miskell analysis.</p> <p>Donald Maclean and Normanby streets are over 75% primary or contributory.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend the extent of the Character Precincts to include the following sites:</p> <p>Emmett St 6, 8, 10A, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20.</p> <p>Green St 1, 5, 7, 7A, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 2, 2A, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20.</p> <p>Donald Maclean St 16, 24, 28, 30, 36, 38, 17, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37.</p> <p>Normanby St 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 30, 32, 34, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41.</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.222	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.106	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the area has special historical qualities.	<p>Seeks that the following sites are added as a new heritage area:</p> <p>Emmett St 6, 8, 10A, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20.</p> <p>Green St 1, 5, 7, 7A, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 2, 2A, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20.</p> <p>Donald Maclean St 16, 24, 28, 30, 36, 38, 17, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37.</p> <p>Normanby St 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 30, 32, 34, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41.</p>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.47	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	HPW supports the recognition of heritage within those areas in Newtown, which have specific and identified cultural historical value. These areas should be protected from inappropriate subdivision or development in accordance with s.6 RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.116	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Laura Gaudin	279.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports character precincts and considers that these could be extended.	Seeks that character precincts are extended in the mapping.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the provisions for landslide hazard mitigation in the earthworks section of the PDP are not sufficient, as they rely on individual assessments of sites and could be applied inconsistently. They also allow for developments which do not require earthworks in areas which are at risk of slope failure. Applying a Landslide Hazard overlay (such as the nonregulatory landslide overlay) and restricting development within high-hazard areas will preclude inconsistent application of earthworks rules and prevent subdivision and development on slopes prone to failure. Considers that while there is a restrictive disclaimer on the existing non-regulatory GNS Science SLIDE Geomorphology Map, the uncertainties in a landslide hazard overlay developed from this map can be managed through policy.</p>	Seeks that a landslide hazard overlay is included into planning maps. This overlay would be linked to provisions that restrict development (through sensitive activities) implemented in high-risk areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.126	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Greater Wellington support the submitter's request for additional provisions to control development on land that is at higher risk of slope failure. By identifying and managing this risk, the risk to life, property and well-being of future urban intensification can be appropriately minimised. These changes would have regard to Proposed RPS Plan Change 1, specifically Policy 51.	Allow / Supports the submission in part and seeks additional controls on landslide hazards to manage landslide risk on steep land. Considers that some controls should apply to slopes from ~20-34°. Seeks that the matters of control for these areas include a site-specific geotechnical investigation to ensure slope failure hazards are appropriately managed.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the terminology 'Fault Hazard Overlay' should be consistent with the MfE guidelines i.e. Fault Avoidance Zone, and that including the use of confined, unconfined, distributed and uncertain fault areas where appropriate. Considers that the supporting s32 information indicates that the Fault Hazard Overlay are the mapped Fault Avoidance Zones that are mapped in the supporting report; however, this is not explained in the s32. Considers that the description of 'fault hazard' needs to be clarified or amended to reflect how it is shown on the maps i.e., a band, which are at different widths on the map, which we assume reflects the certainty of the fault location.	Seeks that mapping of any "Fault Hazard Overlay" is changed to "Fault Avoidance Zone" and that mapping includes confined, unconfined, distributed, and uncertain fault areas.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that Khandallah is a small neighbourhood village that only supports its local community. The adjacent centres of Ngaio-Crofton Downs and Johnsonville have all the services Khandallah has, and also contain larger facilities, so do not require such support. The current supermarket and retail shops, plus services including medical, education, recreation, etc. are all small and are at capacity right now. The road the retail centre is on is a constrained one-lane road.</p> <p>They therefore will not support the increased demand coming from the significant medium density development proposed by 14m zones.</p> <p>Considers that the three waters infrastructure in Khandallah will not support intensification.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend the mapping in Khandallah to remove 14m building heights in the Medium Density Residential Zone and replace them with 11m building heights.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that Khandallah Centre does not "Commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services "required by NPS-UD Policy 3 (d).</p> <p>Khandallah as a very small centre built around the single-lane Ganges Road, which is a NWSE wind corridor. 22m development will create an unacceptable wind tunnel effect in this centre, and deprive businesses and residents of sunlight.</p> <p>The scale of residential proposed on top of ground floor retail in Local Centres is an unproven strategy in the suburbs of Wellington that may result in the loss of commercial facilities. This is exacerbated by only requiring a nominal shop window, which can be left unlet without impacting the commercial viability of the development.</p> <p>This is further compounded by the lack of delivery access or any open space around our small centre, which will create congestion and noise for the residents in the 22m development.</p> <p>The resulting loss of the commercial centre facilities then becomes a Catch-22, as only a smaller population can be supported, which confirms that Khandallah must be a Neighbourhood Centre.</p>	Amend the mapping in Khandallah Centre to remove 22m building heights in the Local Centre Zone and replace them with 12m building heights.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Eldin Family Trust	287.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the rezoning of Selwyn Terrace would be a dramatic change and would enable activities that conflict with the current primary use of Selwyn Terrace as a distinct enclave of residential dwellings.</p> <p>Considers that the Council is incorrect to say that Selwyn Terrace already has a mixture of land uses.</p> <p>Does not agree that a land use change is necessary to support a mixture of activities and growth, considering the street is very narrow and steep access, with a single carriageway for much of its length. A change to a commercial zoning would place unreasonable demand on vehicle and pedestrian access.</p> <p>Considers that Selwyn Terrace has a high concentration of pre-1930s character as evidenced by the 2019 Pre-1930s character area review report.</p> <p>Considers that 9 Selwyn Terrace is an excellent example of the work of one of Wellington's pre-eminent architects of the 20th Century, William Gray Young.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace has special historic context as a reminder of the original suburb prior to the construction of the Wellington Motorway.</p> <p>Considers the plan provides sufficient development capacity without needing to change planning settings in Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Selwyn Terrace, Thorndon is included as a Character Precinct in the mapping.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>The Selwyn Tce enclave has a significant visual connection with Thorndon residential character across the urban motorway. Anchored where it is, this enclave of quality character residential Thorndon dwellings marks an important part of the suburb's unique story and history.</p> <p>Many significant residential properties in Thorndon were destroyed by the construction of the urban motorway. Some of the properties in Selwyn Tce lost land to this project.</p> <p>This makes what remains of historic residential character in Thorndon, especially the significant examples on the eastern side of the motorway, all that more precious and appreciated.</p> <p>The Selwyn Tce enclave is a significant contributor to the residential character of Thorndon, and the inner city.</p>	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.288	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers zoning of area of NOSZ being restrictive and would limit building reservoir within the area. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that as an alternative to the provisions of the Natural Open Space Zone, that an area be carved out where reservoirs would be located, subsequently zone Residential.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.43	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.3]</p>	Disallow
Tracey Henderson	FS102.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Living so close to the proposed development we enjoy watching the HUGE amount of bird life flying to the trees. A large amount of Kaka, Piwakawaka, Tui and Keruru can be seen flying here on a daily basis. We frequently take hikes with the kids through the bush track up to Crows Nest, learning as we go. This area of forest is ecological high value as submitted by GWRC in this report: https://www.gw.govt.nz/assets/Documents/2020/04/Key-Native-Ecosystem-Operational-Plan-for-Western-Wellington-Forests-2019-2024.pdf</p>	Disallow / Seeks that any forested area not be rezoned to allowed forest to be developed into housing. The NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) should be applied to this site as per the Proposed District Plan.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers zoning of area of NOSZ being restrictive and would limit building reservoir within the area. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks a designation over the land to accommodate a reservoir.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.3	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.</p> <p>Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.14	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>There is no evidence of need for a reservoir in the area. Designation of such infrastructure needs to go through due process with an assessment of environmental effects etc.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.44	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.4]</p>	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	<p>Considers that it is important that proposed NOSZ is introduced to protect the recreational, natural, landscape and ecological values of the Open Space areas that the Submitter owns.</p> <p>The Submitter currently permits access onto his land for informal recreation by the public. The land holding provide informal connections from Ngaio to Crow's Nest and the Skyline Walkway– both of which are entirely located within the proposed NOSZ.</p> <p>Considers that the proposed SAL provisions will be consistent with the NOSZ provisions which can better deal to the formation of access and buildings and structures to facilitate informal recreation activities.</p> <p>Considers this zoning on the balance of the Submitters land acceptable, subject to agreement being reached by WCC with Submitter on the appropriate tenure of the land.</p>	<p>Seeks that the proposed Natural Open Space Zone is retained, if subsequent tenure of zoning is agreed upon between the submitter and the Council.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.</p> <p>Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.15	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>It's unclear what is meant by 'tenure' of the land. We appreciate that this submitter shows good will to the community by permitting access onto his land for informal recreation by the public. The NOSZ should be retained but we are not clear what is being implied by negotiating tenure with the council. This process should be transparent and possibly subject to a private plan change if necessary.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission supporting the Natural Open Space zoning be allowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	<p>Considers that it is important that proposed NOSZ is introduced to protect the recreational, natural, landscape and ecological values of the Open Space areas that the Submitter owns.</p> <p>The Submitter currently permits access onto his land for informal recreation by the public. The land holding provide informal connections from Ngaio to Crow's Nest and the Skyline Walkway– both of which are entirely located within the proposed NOSZ.</p> <p>Considers that the proposed SAL provisions will be consistent with the NOSZ provisions which can better deal to the formation of access and buildings and structures to facilitate informal recreation activities.</p> <p>Considers this zoning on the balance of the Submitters land acceptable, subject to agreement being reached by WCC with Submitter on the appropriate tenure of the land.</p>	Seeks that alternatively, that the land be rezoned Large Lot Residential Zone (part Medium Density Residential Zone) or equivalent, to enable subdivision consent.
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.24	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m2) as MDRZ. These proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through route to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m2 is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m)and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values. Development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow
Jo McKenzie	FS64.24	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m2) as MDRZ. Considers that these proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through route to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m2 is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m)and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values. Considers that development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.16	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	It is unclear where the rezoning being requested occurs. See above regarding our uncertainty regarding 'tenure.'	Disallow / Seeks clarification of what is being sought regarding submission point 290.6.
Priscilla Williams	293.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the hilly terrain makes this area unsuitable for high rise building.	Seeks that the Height Control in the area spanning Wesley Road, Aurora Terrace and Bolton Street is amended to be no higher than 11m.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.18	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
Johanna Carter	296.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the MRZ objectives, policies and standards	Opposes Medium Density Residential zone chapter as mapped.
Johanna Carter	296.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given for decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	<p>Seeks that the extent of the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to better reflect the conditions of the particular areas of the city, including the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - water supply - wastewater - drainage services
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports site #76 being identified on the planning maps.	Retain presence of site and area of significance #76 - Tapu Te Ranga Marae, as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks amendment to maps as it is noted the property details on the PDP maps incorrectly refer to the site as #73.	Amend maps to reflect Tapu te Ranga Marae as being site #76, not #73.
Matthew Plummer	300.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts should be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review.	Extend the character precincts in the mapping.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.195	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The zoning of the Horokiwi Quarry as a Special Purpose Quarry Zone is supported.	Retain Horokiwi Quarry as a Special Purpose Quarry Zone.
Firstgas Limited	304.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Gas Transmission Pipeline and Corridor, as well as above ground infrastructure should be included in the Planning Maps. The Gas Transmission Pipeline, Corridor and above ground infrastructure is sought to be captured by the rule framework and therefore is sought to be illustrated. [Co-ordinates of the Corridor and above ground infrastructure can be provided by the submitter.]	Amend Planning Maps to include the Gas Transmission Pipeline, Corridor and above ground infrastructure.
Roland Sapsford	305.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the exclusion of the lower part of Mortimer Terrace below Durham Street in the Character Precinct overlay may be an error that has been carried over from the Spatial Plan.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to include the lower part of Mortimer Terrace below Durham Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.251	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.95	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.141	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the inclusion of the upper part of Durham Street in the Character Precinct overlay may be an error that has been carried over from the Spatial Plan.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to exclude the upper part of Durham Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.252	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.96	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.142	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.10	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Holloway road should be included in Character Precincts as it is an area of unique heritage and character that has not been considered by the Boffa Miskell assessment.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to include Holloway Road.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.253	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.97	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.143	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.11	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 1-10 Mortimer Terrace should be identified as Character Precinct.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to include 1-10 Mortimer Terrace.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.254	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.98	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.144	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.12	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 1-9 Durham Crescent should be identified as Character Precinct.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to include 1-9 Durham Crescent.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.255	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.99	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.100	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.145	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.13	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 1-22 Durham Street should be identified as Character Precinct.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to include 1-22 Durham Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.256	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.101	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.146	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the south side of Aro Street should be identified as Character Precinct.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to include the south side of Aro Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.257	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.102	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.147	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Adams Terrace should be identified as Character Precinct.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to include Adams Terrace.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.258	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.103	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.148	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	305.16	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Landcross Street should be identified as Character Precinct.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to include Landcross Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.259	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.104	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.149	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.17	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 139-167 (odd), 166-186 (even) Abel Smith Street and St John Street steps should be identified as Character Precinct.	Amend Character Precinct overlay to include 139 to 167 Abel Smith Street, 166 to 186 Abel Smith Street and St John Street steps.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.260	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.105	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.150	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.18	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	The boundary of the character precinct on Devon Street should be extended to include 30 Devon Street and properties in between to coincide with the start of properties below road level in Devon Gully. The current boundary makes no sense in terms of the actual streetscape, as it omits three properties at street level which are intimately related to the other sites within the character precinct. This may be a mapping error from the Spatial Plan.	Seeks that the Character Precinct overlay on Devon Street be extended to include properties between 21 and 30 Devon Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.261	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.106	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.151	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	305.19	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>The boundary of the character precinct between Waimāpihi reserve and Holloway Road should be adjusted to reflect actual use. Historically, land on the Holloway Road side of the ridgeline has been excluded from open space zoning due to public ownership. This no longer applies.</p> <p>The existing bush covered “reserve” above properties on Holloway Road to the south of Carey St can be reclassified as natural open space and ought eventually to be reincorporated into the Waimāpihi Reserve. Some Holloway Road residents have expressed concern about Significant Natural Areas. This is a distinct issue from the point being made here, which is simply to adjust the zoning of the land currently functioning as natural open space reserve land to reflect that reality.</p>	Seeks that the Character Precinct overlay between Waimāpihi reserve and Holloway Road is adjusted to reflect actual use.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.262	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.107	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.152	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
James Coyle	307.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Newtown's zoning is inadequate. There is a crude circle around the central BRT bus stop that does not adequately take topography, daylight and existing amenities into account. Independent and talented urban design professionals mixed with local knowledge should be employed to do rigorous work for the district plan.	Seeks that Newtown's zoning be re-designed to take topography, daylight and existing amenities into account.
James Coyle	307.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	Considers that some areas are fine with maximum building heights of 21m due to topography. For example where the current Regent St Housing is tucked up against the hill.	Not specified.
David Karl	309.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Council required ground levels be raised by around a metre during the construction of a house on Trent Street. While not easy to check, it appears the current ground level of the house is not reflected in the hazard zones.	Seek hazard zones be amended to reflect latest ground levels (including to meet resource consent conditions that have been complied with).
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the rollover of the Central Park Substation designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR1 (Central Park Substation) in the mapping as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the rollover of the Wilton Substation designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR2 (Wilton Substation) in the mapping as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the rollover of the Takapu Road Substation designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR3 (Takapu Road Substation) in the mapping as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the rollover of the Oteranga Bay Terminal Station designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR4 (Oteranga Bay Terminal Station) in the mapping as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the rollover of the Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR5 (Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station) in the mapping as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the rollover of the Kaiwharawhara Supply Point Substation designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR6 (Kaiwharawhara Supply Point Substation) in the mapping as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Hilary Watson	321.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that PREC01 should be extended to include additional properties in Newtown. The balance between upzoning areas for increased density, and retaining valuable character areas has not been struck appropriately in the Proposed District Plan (PDP), and needs to be changed. A list of properties specifying the addresses of the additional properties that should be added to the Character Precinct has been provided in Appendix One. These properties were included in the Councillor Recommended Spatial plan from July 2021, the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Review and WCC officer recommendations.</p> <p>[See Appendix 1 to original submission for full list of properties]</p>	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) in the mapping to include additional properties in Newtown.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.230	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.110	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.</p>	Allow
Hilary Watson	321.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that Carrara Park should have 11m height control (Building Height Control 1) right round its boundary to get maximum possible sun all year round. Part of the properties around the park are currently inappropriately classified under Building Height Control 2 (21m).</p>	Seeks that all development around Carrara Park is subject to a maximum height limit of 11 metres and this is shown in the mapping.
Richard Murcott	322.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. The stream flowed through a partially surveyed gully across the Thorndon Flat. Stilt foundations, retaining walls and the topography below the houses at 60 & 62 Hobson St are evidence that the houses were built on fill of a gully through which the Tiakiwai Stream flowed. Drainage plans from 1915 as well as the current drainage point on the eastern side of Hobson Street provide further evidence of the former location of the stream. Any qualifying matters that arise from knowing the feature's actual location should be identified.</p> <p>A publication is provided in the submission to show evidence of the stream's accurate location, as well as a map in attachments.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Amend the 'Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (lines)' overlay to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.20	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. They request for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori overlay to be amended to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream. They also seek for the significance of Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua to be considered. They also seek that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building. They consider that the location of the stream, item 60 of SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) is more correctly represented. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission as this site is adequately recorded in the PDP, and its significance to mana whenua is considered as it is recorded in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori schedule.</p>	Disallow
Richard Murcott	322.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the Character Precinct Area over the Hobson Street block in Thorndon should be restored, based upon Boffa Miskell's report.</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts in Thorndon be extended in the mapping to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.41	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.286	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.177	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports zone change from CCZ to MRZ for the residential enclave of Selwyn Terrace.	Rezone Selwyn Terrace Street from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.42	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports zone change from CCZ to MRZ for the residential area of Portland Crescent.	Rezone Portland Crescent from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.43	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports zone change from CCZ to MRZ for the residential area of Hawkestone Street.	Rezone Hawkestone Street from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.44	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Shelly Bay Road Limited	324.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Supports the rezoning of 3 Shelly Bay from General Industrial Zone to Mixed Use Zone. The site known as Burnham Wharf is currently zoned as Business 2 Zone and subject to specific operational port rules. The site is currently being used as a car storage and bus parking area. The proposed district plan is to rezone this as a general industrial zone. The properties on the opposite side of the road are to be zoned either residential or mixed use. The General Industrial Zone does not allow for residential activities. The owners of the property request that the zone is changed from General Industrial Zone to Mixed Use to allow for the potential of future residential activities to occur. This would be in keeping with the surrounding wharf areas, such as Shelly Bay and allow for residential development in a desirable area close to Miramar. As this land is not held by the port authorities, it is not being used for port (or heavy industrial) activities. It will likely never be used as a functioning wharf again as the infrastructure and related buildings are removed from site. Thus, keeping this zoned for shipping or industrial activities will mean that the owners who wish to alleviate the residential housing market strain will need to put in a considerable amount of effort at the consenting stage. As such the most appropriate zone for this land is mixed use as it is a better management of resources. Any reverse sensitivity effects (such as noise and light) can be controlled with standards as is currently achieved in the central and centres area.	Rezone 3 Shelly Bay from General Industrial Zone to Mixed Use Zone.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.245	General / Mapping / General	Oppose	WIAL opposes the proposed rezoning request as it will result in the intensification of noise sensitive activities within the "Inner Noise Overlay" (or Air Noise Boundary) at Wellington Airport, giving rise to potential reverse sensitivity effects on WIAL.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Craig Erskine	325.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	MRZ- PREC01 (Character Precincts) is opposed as there is insufficient evidence or justification to exempt such large areas from the overall intent of the new rules. There needs to be more assessment and refinement of these areas before they can be properly considered as qualifying matters.	Remove MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) in its entirety, and replace with justified provisions.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.92	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Disallow
Khoi Phan	326.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers Ngaio should be classified as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Ngaio as Medium Density Residential Zone.
Khoi Phan	326.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers Khandallah should be classified as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Khandallah as Medium Density Residential Zone.
Khoi Phan	326.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the inner suburb of Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Te Aro and Kelburn should be classified as High Density Residential Zones.	Make Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Te Aro and Kelburn High Density Residential Zones.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.23	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Submitter 326 seeks to rezone Mount Victoria (and other suburbs) as High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.113	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.93	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Disallow
Richard Benge	327.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the rezoning of 33 Hiropi Street from Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone. This new zone is requested for the following reasons: Those included in the NPS-UD which allows for at least a 6-storey maximum height for medium density housing (high density housing according to the WCC PDP) within a walkable distance of the edge of the city centre and metropolitan centre zones, as well as existing and <u>planned</u> rapid transit stops. The existing environment already allows for high density residential developments given existing precedents at 109 and 111 Coromandel Street and 46 Hiropi Street that fall in the 21 m maximum height zone. Rezoning 33 Hiropi Street and neighbouring sites will turn existing developments into "compliant" developments with the maximum height regulations included in the PDP. The planned LGWM mass transit route between Wellington Railway Station and Island Bay from will provide potential for new housing and neighbourhood growth, as all mass transit options put forward by LGWM included a route through Riddiford St. Finally, a co-housing approach will reinforce the city's distinctive compact form, capitalise on lower levels of natural hazard risk in this area, increase the vibrancy of inner city living and support Wellington becoming a Zero Carbon Capital by reducing private vehicle reliance. Additionally, bringing 33 Hiropi St into the HRZ will provide an increase in accessible units at a time of housing need. (Option A) [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that a High Density Residential Zone be introduced on Hiropi Street that includes 33 Hiropi Street..
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.114	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Benge	327.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that Hiropi Street should have an HRZ that includes 33 Hiropi Street. The MRZ height control area 2 (14m) at 33 Hiropi Street is too restrictive. This rezoning is requested for the following reasons:</p> <p>Those included in the NPS-UD which allows for at least a 6-storey maximum height for medium density housing (high density housing according to the WCC PDP) within a walkable distance of the edge of the city centre and metropolitan centre zones, as well as existing and planned rapid transit stops.</p> <p>The existing environment already allows for high density residential developments given existing precedents at 109 and 111 Coromandel Street and 46 Hiropi Street that fall in the 21 m maximum height zone.</p> <p>Rezoning 33 Hiropi Street and neighbouring sites will turn existing developments into “compliant” developments with the maximum height regulations included in the PDP.</p> <p>The planned LGWM mass transit route between Wellington Railway Station and Island Bay from will provide potential for new housing and neighbourhood growth, as all mass transit options put forward by LGWM included a route through Riddiford St.</p> <p>Finally, a co-housing approach will reinforce the city’s distinctive compact form, capitalise on lower levels of natural hazard risk in this area, increase the vibrancy of inner city living and support Wellington becoming a Zero Carbon Capital by reducing private vehicle reliance. Additionally, bringing 33 Hiropi St into the HRZ will provide an increase in accessible units at a time of housing need. (Option B)</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Rezone 33 Hiropi Street from Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	The 6-storey high limit at 35 to 61 Hankey Street is not supported, as these properties are along the ridgeline, steeply sloped, and already suffer from poor pedestrian and vehicle access.	Rezoning 35 to 61 Hankey Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.210	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.115	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Amend / Amend by rezone 35 to 65 Hankey Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	<p>Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone , and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission]</p>
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.280	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.179	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.</p> <p>[Interred reference to submission 158.1]</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone , and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission. [Refer to original submission]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.281	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.180	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Rezone the Portland Crescent / Hawkestone Street residential cluster from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.282	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.181	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Goring Street, along Grant Road and Park Street, should be a Character Precinct. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include Goring Street. [Refer to original submission for schematic]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.283	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.182	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 220-235 Tinakori Road should be included in MRZ-PREC01 similar to the adjacent character precincts. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include 220-235 Tinakori Road.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.284	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.183	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 106 and 110 Hill Street should be included in MRZ-PREC01. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include 106 and 110 Hill Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.285	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.184	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that adjacent property owners, particularly of wooden structures, should be enabled to gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures, and to maintain access to services/utilities and boundary fences. It references standard HRZ - S3 and states that "amend if necessary". 1.5m front yard setback and a 1 metre yard are considered absolute minimums (perhaps should be more).	Seeks that there are adequate setbacks for buildings and structures from neighbouring boundaries in any residential zone. 1.5m front yard setback and a 1 metre yard are considered absolute minimums (perhaps should be more).
Bruce Rae	334.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the walkable catchment for Johnsonville should be 5 minutes. It is appreciated that the walkable catchments took the effects of topography into account, rather than pretending Wellington was flat. A significant amount has been spent fairly recently on the Johnsonville line to ensure it is capable of using the same trains/electric units as the rest of the network. Given the above, it appears inconsistent that while the proposed plan set the tawa walkable catchments at 5 minutes (down from 10) it has deleted the 10 minute Johnsonville line walkable catchments completely, rather than also cutting them down to 5 minutes. Maps should be revised to include 5 minute walkable catchments associated with Johnsonville line stations areas of High density residential, as has been done with the Kapiti line stations in Tawa'.	Amend maps to include 5 minute walkable catchments associated with the Johnsonville line stations as areas of high density residential as has been done with the Kapiti Line stations in Tawa.
Te Marama Ltd	337.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Item WC054 (Makara Peak) should be removed from SCHED8 as it imposes an SNA on Te Marama property. WC054 states "Much of the site is WCC public land" and SNAs being imposed on public land is not opposed.	Remove SNA overlay at Lot 6 DP 477282 and 171 South Makara Road (Part Section 16 Makara DIST).
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.21	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework. The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework. M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Yvonne Weeber	340.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the District Plan maps need to be clearly mapped using the language and classifications from CE-P14. It is understood that there are no "medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard areas" mapped, and that there is an arbitrary mix of hazard and risk overlays instead, which are difficult to discern from each other (Coastal inundation, Liquefaction, Tsunami Hazard Overlay, etc...).	Seeks that the mapping of Coastal Hazards be more clearly categorized and mapped.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.17	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the mapping of character areas in Mount Victoria is not coherent. Many areas that fall outside of the sub-areas contain heritage buildings, such as Brougham St and Port St. Other areas are classified character sub-areas but contain buildings that are not currently subject to the pre-1930s rule and appear to have no particular heritage or character merit.	Seeks that the mapping of character areas in Mount Victoria be clarified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.190	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.120	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.18	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Kent Terrace and Cambridge Terrace partially perform the function of a town centre for Mount Victoria. All of Mt Victoria should be treated as one unit for planning purposes, so transition issues along the boundary between the CBD and Mt Victoria can be addressed. Including Cambridge and Kent Terraces within Mt Victoria will also provide a much-needed buffer/ transition area from the city centre high rises – not just in heights, but in the character-scape – and will support community connection.	Seeks that all of Mount Victoria is treated as one unit that includes Cambridge Terrace and Kent Terrace.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.191	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.121	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.26	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) Policy 13(1)(a) requires that for areas of outstanding natural character, adverse effects are avoided. NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b) requires that for natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment, significant adverse effects are avoided, and all other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Seeks to amend the High Coastal Natural Character layer to the area identified in the 2016 Boffa Miskell coastal natural character assessment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.27	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Overlays shown in the PDP have been sourced from Wellington Water and do not provide a complete picture of the flooding risks across the City. Additional discussion is required to complete the flood hazard information available to users of the Plan.	Seeks that WCC continues to work with Greater Wellington to discuss the City's flood hazards in relation to the proposed intensification.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.17	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support natural hazard overlays based on current and accurate research. Continued collaboration between agencies is important to keep hazard information up to date and consistent across the region.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.28	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Overlays shown in the PDP have been sourced from Wellington Water and do not provide a complete picture of the flooding risks across the City. Additional discussion is required to complete the flood hazard information available to users of the Plan.	Seeks that WCC continues to work with Greater Wellington to discuss the City's flood hazards in relation to the proposed intensification.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.18	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support natural hazard overlays based on current and accurate research. Continued collaboration between agencies is important to keep hazard information up to date and consistent across the region.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.29	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose in part	Considers it is important to identify areas subject to flooding hazard in the Rural area, as well as in the Residential and other zones. Currently the PDP does not provide any information on flooding hazards across the whole Rural zone. These areas will be subject to flooding and this should be shown on the Plan.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.30	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers it is important to identify areas subject to flooding hazard in the Rural area, as well as in the Residential and other zones. Currently the PDP does not provide any information on flooding hazards across the whole Rural zone. These areas will be subject to flooding and this should be shown on the Plan.	Seeks to Include identified overlays in the Rural Zone, based on the regional flood hazard mapping provided: Regional Exposure Assessment 1% AEP RCP8.5 2101-2120 (arcgis.com) [Refer to original submission]
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.19	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Natural hazard overlays are important in rural areas as well as urban and residential zones. Rural communities can be severely affected by flooding and this information is important for land use planning and public information.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.31	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Though Greater Wellington supports WCC's identification of SNAs in line with RPS Policy 23, we oppose the omission of SNAs on private residential land from the Proposed District Plan (PDP) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the removal of identified SNAs from the PDP contradictory to national direction for indigenous biodiversity protection. Section 6(c) of the RMA 1991 states that 'the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is a matter of national importance, and that this matter must be 'recognised and provided for' by all persons exercising functions and powers under the RMA, including local authorities under Sections 30 and 31. the removal of SNAs on private residential land from the PDP is contrary to Policy 24 of RPS. Policy 24 directs district councils to include in their district plans policies, rules and methods to protect the indigenous ecosystems and habitats identified in accordance with policy 23. Policy 24 requires district councils to protect all areas identified in accordance with policy 23 through provisions in their district plans. the removal of identified SNAs on private residential land from the PDP to be inconsistent with WCC's vision and aspirations for protecting and restoring the city's indigenous biodiversity. The Our Natural Capital: Wellington's Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2015[1] states that WCC will protect biodiversity by 'focussing on the protection of priority biodiversity sites on public and private land and rare, threatened, or locally significant species', and that it will build natural capital by 'respect[ing] the importance of indigenous biodiversity to New Zealand and its intrinsic right to exist'. We do not consider the exclusion of SNA on private residential land to align with this direction. 	Seeks to apply SNAs to all zones as intended by section 6 of the RMA and Policy 24 of the RPS.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.72	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports this submission as the existence of SNAs on private land contributes considerably to the character, amenity and attractiveness of the city, as well as its ecological sustainability and climate change resilience.	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.10	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	As per Forest & Bird's original submission, exclusion of SNAs from all zones is contrary to section 6 of the RMA and Policy 24 of the RPS.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.14	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports the identification and mapping of SNAs as individual overlays in the District Plan. However, Kāinga Ora does not support blanket application of SNAs on residential zones. [Inferred reference to submission 351.31]	Disallow
Paul Blaschke	FS129.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Support all submissions requesting the reinstatement of identified and verified Significant Natural Area status on all properties whether public or private and whether residentially or rurally zoned. This is for the reasons stated in submission point 110.1 and most fully stated by submission point 351.31.	Allow / As per submission point 351.31, and "Reinstate the overlay of all properly delineated SNAs or part SNAs on all relevant residential zoned properties, and the regulatory framework in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity section to those SNAs or SNA proportions affected." (my previous submission points 110.1 and 110.2)

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.32	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the primary function of mapping area scale natural character ratings (low – high) in the PDP is to ensure applicants do not have to undertake this work as part of applications for resource consent, to give effect to NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b). It would not be efficient or effective to require applicants for resource consent to undertake this step as part of a consent process, especially when the work has already been commissioned by WCC, presumably to be included in the PDP. Mapping the full range of natural character areas in the PDP also provides more certainty to applicants/developers on areas that are more suitable/less suitable for development based on an improved understanding of the natural character values present.	Seeks to map natural character ratings at all levels (low, moderate, high) at the wider area scale in Schedule 12, as undertaken in the 2016 Boffa Miskell natural character assessment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.33	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers the proposed mapping approach is not appropriate to achieve CE-O1, does not fully incorporate the 2016 Boffa Miskell assessment, and will be less effective in giving effect to NZCPS 13(1)(b).	Map area scale natural character ratings (in addition to the sites of high and very high natural character already included in the proposed approach) identified in Boffa Miskell's natural character assessment (2016).
Richard Herbert	360.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the retention of SNAs as proposed originally, before the Councillor amendment to remove SNAs from residential zones in June 2022.	Amend Significant Natural Areas to re-instate on Residential Zones, as proposed prior to the Councillor Amendment to remove Significant Natural Areas from Residential Zones in June 2022.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that SNAs should not be on private property.	Seeks Significant Natural Areas layer to remove Significant Natural Areas on private property in both urban and rural environments. [Inferred decision requested].
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.26	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework. The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework. M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.	Disallow
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Items WC037, WC042, WC047, WC049, WC050, WC119, WC120 and WC121 should be removed from SCHED8 as it is arbitrarily imposed. The imposition of SNAs will put at risk the voluntary and co-operative conservation programme Te Kamaru Station has made with Capital Kiwi. The programme works to ensure the rural landscape is fit for the return of kiwi. Negative impacts from this SNA may lead Te Kamaru Station to withdraw from the programme, should the legislative risk remain or worsen.	Remove SNA overlay at: - Fee Simple, 1/1 - Lot 2 Deposited Plan 375401 - Section 66, 74, 76-77, 79, 84 Terawhiti District - Part Section 13 Makara District - Part Section 18, 27-28, 54, 60-65, 73, 75, 78, 80-82 Terawhiti District - Lot 3 Deposited Plan 477282, 15, 650, 824 m2 [Refer to original submission for full list]
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the overlay boundaries at Albion Battery and Mine Remains should be redefined. No part of the Albion Battery and mine remains are located on Te Kamaru Station. The Albion Battery is located to the west of the boundary with Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd's land.	Remove the Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains overlay at: - Fee Simple, 1/1 - Lot 2 Deposited Plan 375401 - Section 66, 74, 76-77, 79, 84 Terawhiti District - Part Section 13 Makara District - Part Section 18, 27-28, 54, 60-65, 73, 75, 78, 80-82 Terawhiti District - Lot 3 Deposited Plan 477282, 15, 650, 824 m2 [Refer to original submission for full list]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that there is opportunity to increase the range of open spaces for the public to enjoy.	Seeks that the extent of Open Space Zones be increased.
Waka Kotahi	370.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that planning maps should include state highway corridor. Waka Kotahi is currently mapping noise contours along its entire network and would support the use of those contours to identify the relevant area. This would be likely to substantially reduce the area subject to acoustic attenuation requirements.	Seeks to amend planning maps to include a state highway corridor.
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	Considers that the Ridgetop Overlay would need to offer at least 20 metres of vertical protection in order to offer meaningful visual protection from afar.	Not specified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Schedule 8 should include all the SNAs identified in the draft district plan version provided to the Council's environment committee from officers. "Wellington, wild at heart" is what our unique capital city trades upon - and as the population grows and urban areas densify, preserving and enhancing significant natural areas will become increasingly important. Research shows that access to natural areas, and 'biophilic' environments are keys to human health and well-being and are a critical part of protecting biodiversity. On this matter, Wellington as a city is playing a critical role in providing refuge for formerly at risk native birds, e.g. kaka, and with efforts such as the Halo Project and Predator Free initiatives being undertaken by thousands of Wellingtonians, it is important our city's district plan provides legal and policy support to this. The failure to include SNA areas in residential zones means that the district plan is not in accordance with section 6 of the RMA, nor is it giving effect to relevant provisions of GWRC's regional policy statement and regional plan.	Seeks that Significant Natural Areas layers are added all the SNA areas in the residential zones recommended by officers in the draft district plan version provided to the Council's environment and planning committee on June 23, 2022.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.31	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports this submission as the existence of SNAs on private land contributes considerably to the character, amenity and attractiveness of the city, as well as its ecological sustainability and climate change resilience.	Allow
Caniwi Properties (Boomrock) Limited	381.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose in part	Considers that Proposed District Plan should add new zoning to accommodate rural lifestyle activities. The submitter's land is near the proposed Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct which are more residential in character than those in the wider General Rural Zone. The property adjoining CPBLs land to the east is within Porirua City Council jurisdiction. There is an opportunity to provide consistent rural zoning provisions via the inclusion of a RULZ and/or SEZ over the land. The coastal environment in this location can be enhanced through appropriate rural lifestyle development. The land is a strategic connection to the neighbouring Porirua City which is in growth mode. There is a need to explore alternative land use in the area to provide for strategic connections for the Wellington Region and in a cross District approach.	Opposes Proposed District Plan in its current form and seeks amendment.
Caniwi Properties (Boomrock) Limited	381.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose in part	The Submitters land is near the proposed Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct which are more residential in character than those in the wider General Rural Zone. The property adjoining CPBLs land to the east is within Porirua City Council jurisdiction. There is an opportunity to provide consistent rural zoning provisions via the inclusion of a RULZ and/or SEZ over the land. The coastal environment in this location can be enhanced through appropriate rural lifestyle development. The land is a strategic connection to the neighbouring Porirua City which is in growth mode. There is a need to explore alternative land use in the area to provide for strategic connections for the Wellington Region and in a cross District approach.	Add a Rural Lifestyle Zone (outside of the Natural Environmental Values Overlays and Historical and Cultural Values Overlays).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Caniwi Properties (Boomrock) Limited	381.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>The Submitters land is near the proposed Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct which are more residential in character than those in the wider General Rural Zone.</p> <p>The property adjoining CPBLs land to the east is within Porirua City Council jurisdiction. There is an opportunity to provide consistent rural zoning provisions via the inclusion of a RULZ and/or SEZ over the land.</p> <p>The coastal environment in this location can be enhanced through appropriate rural lifestyle development. The land is a strategic connection to the neighbouring Porirua City which is in growth mode. There is a need to explore alternative land use in the area to provide for strategic connections for the Wellington Region and in a cross District approach.</p>	Add a Settlement Zone (outside of the Natural Environmental Values Overlays and Historical and Cultural Values Overlays).
Margaret Cochran	382.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Oppose the Proposed District Plan's heritage areas boundaries.</p> <p>Submitter wishes to see it (Thorndon Historic Area) amended to retain the existing area boundaries.</p>	Opposes Proposed District Plan's mapping of Thorndon's Heritage Area in its current form and seeks amendment.
Margaret Cochran	382.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Seeks to see the Thorndon Historic Area amended to retain the existing area boundaries.</p> <p>The submitter has lived in and knows intimately the Thorndon historic area centred on Ascot Street and Glenbervie Tce.</p> <p>The re-drawing of the boundaries of this area in the Proposed District Plan make no sense at all, arbitrarily cutting out buildings on its periphery. Historic areas should have clear physical boundaries, not indistinct lines between adjacent properties. Inappropriate development on the edge of an historic area is as damaging as it is within the area.</p> <p>The strong physical boundaries of Tinakori Road, Bowen Street and the Urban Motorway are ideal for defining the Thorndon Historic Area, as they have been since the establishment of the first ever national heritage area zoning — the Residential E Zone in 1975. This single action lead by the community, has preserved the “Thorndon” so valued nationally 47 years later.</p>	Amend the mapping of the Thorndon Heritage Area to retain the boundaries in the Operative District Plan.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.291	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.46	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	HPW supports the addition of those identified heritage areas.	Allow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks for the height limit of 7 Waterloo Quay to be increased to 60m. It is unclear why the height limit	Amend the building height limit of 7 Waterloo Quay to 60m.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Generally supports the height limits imposed on 143 Lambton Quay, 147 Lambton Quay, 15 Stout Street, 8 Willis Street and 360 Lambton Quay.	Retain the building height limits of 143 Lambton Quay, 147 Lambton Quay, 15 Stout Street, 8 Willis Street and 360 Lambton Quay as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers necessary additional provisions to recognise that unmapped areas that meet SNA criteria are still to be managed appropriately as required by section 6(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	<p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to recognise areas that are not mapped but meet the criteria for SNAs stated in the RPS are to be managed in accordance with section 6(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>For example, wetlands and the habitats of At-Risk or Threatened indigenous fauna.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	While Transpower understand the intent of the submission, it supports the identification and mapping on SNA's on the basis it provides certainty for plan users. On that basis, the relief sought by the submitter is opposed.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.52	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Further clarification is needed to understand the implications on land use opportunities of applying significant natural areas. Kāinga Ora supports the protection of the values of SNAs but seeks that these are mapped and identified in the District Plan.	Disallow
Sue Kedgley	387.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the proposals in the PDP that would see a 71% reduction in the protections for character areas in Wellington, especially in Wellington's inner city suburbs such as Mt Victoria, Aro Valley, Thorndon, Mount Cook, and Newtown. These suburbs are already some of the most densely housed areas in Wellington. They are full of Victorian and Edwardian wooden houses which are an important part of our heritage, our history and our sense of place, and as such they are some of the most unique, distinct and liveable areas of Wellington. The densely located houses in these unique inner-city suburbs provide a wonderful sense of neighbourhood and community and provide coherence and interest to the Wellington city scape.	Opposes character areas' mapping as notified and seeks amendments.
Sue Kedgley	387.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Opposes the proposals in the PDP that would see a 71% reduction in the protections for character areas in Wellington, especially in Wellington's inner city suburbs such as Mt Victoria, Aro Valley, Thorndon, Mount Cook, and Newtown. These suburbs are already some of the most densely housed areas in Wellington. They are full of Victorian and Edwardian wooden houses which are an important part of our heritage, our history and our sense of place, and as such they are some of the most unique, distinct and liveable areas of Wellington. The densely located houses in these unique inner-city suburbs provide a wonderful sense of neighbourhood and community and provide coherence and interest to the Wellington city scape.	Amend the mapping to increase the extent of Character Precincts so that, at the very minimum, 50% of existing character areas are allowed to remain under the pre-1930s demolition rule.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason provided other than decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks to extend Public Open Space areas in the Waterfront Zone wherever possible.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the area between the Circa building and the Te Papa building has been omitted from the Waterfront Public Open Space Zone and should be included. This area is a key open space area and one of the most heavily-used in the whole Zone.	Amend the extent of the Waterfront Public Open Space overlay to include the space between the Circa and Te Papa.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.2	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P2	Oppose	Willis Bond and Company Limited consider references to new development and redevelopment within Te Ngākau in CCZ-PREC01-P2 should be retained as they are relevant to certain parts of Te Ngākau such as the Michael Fowler carpark site and they reflect Te Ngākau Civic Precinct Framework adopted by Council.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.12	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands. Taranaki Whānui support the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.	Seeks that the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford is removed; specifically at Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.14	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.25	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer.</p> <p>Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Geoff Todd	FS21.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Opposes submission 389 requested changes to the zoning and overlays as:</p> <p>a) The area has significant historic value reflecting all the periods from the first maori settlers through to European settlement, threat of invasions and recent recreational use.</p> <p>b) The area has recreational and visual values to the poeple living on the peninsula, the people in Wellington, lwi and the nation. This was reported on 3 News on 1/11/2011 and the vision expressed by politicians, local councillors and lwi was of a public reserve with many important sites to be preserved. Sir Ngatata Love said "There are very few options in capital cities in countries like this where we can make such a major decision and look forward to preserving both the history and the future of our nation."</p> <p>c) Open space zoning has been in place for at least 30 years. I believe this has never been contested and is important to the people on the peninsula. Open zoning does not anticipate a built environment.</p> <p>d) The ridge and hilltop overlay , again not new , reflects the visual importance of the skyline across wellington</p> <p>e) the significant natural area overlay reflects the opportunity to restore the natural habitat in a rodent free environment, restoring the presence of the birds that once lived here. Imagine the peace and tranquility possible in the midst of our city. This will build on the big investment in eliminating rodent and other pests on the peninsula</p>	Disallow
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.3	General/ Mapping/ Mapping General/ Mapping General	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whanui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.12].</p>	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.247	General / Mapping / General	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whanui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whanui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.25	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whānui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiara Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.1	General/ Mapping/ Mapping General/ Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.9	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whānui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.12]</p>	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.13	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.</p> <p>Submitter supports the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p> <p>Concerns there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their ancestral lands.</p>	Seeks that the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford is removed; specifically at Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.5	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.15	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.26	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Taranaki Whānui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer. Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.
Geoff Todd	FS21.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	I oppose the submission 389 requested changes to the zoning and overlays as: a) The area has significant historic value reflecting all the periods from the first maori settlers through to European settlement, threat of invasions and recent recreational use. b) The area has recreational and visual values to the people living on the peninsula, the people in Wellington, Iwi and the nation. This was reported on 3 News on 1/11/2011 and the vision expressed by politicians, local councillors and Iwi was of a public reserve with many important sites to be preserved. Sir Ngatata Love said "There are very few options in capital cities in countries like this where we can make such a major decision and look forward to preserving both the history and the future of our nation." c) Open space zoning has been in place for at least 30 years. I believe this has never been contested and is important to the people on the peninsula. Open zoning does not anticipate a built environment. d) The ridge and hilltop overlay, again not new, reflects the visual importance of the skyline across Wellington e) the significant natural area overlay reflects the opportunity to restore the natural habitat in a rodent free environment, restoring the presence of the birds that once lived here. Imagine the peace and tranquility possible in the midst of our city. This will build on the big investment in eliminating rodent and other pests on the peninsula	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.4	General/ Mapping/ Mapping General/ Mapping General	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whanui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.13].</p>	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.248	General / Mapping / General	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whanui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.26	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whānui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.3	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lance Lones	FS81.2	General/ Mapping/ Mapping General/ Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.42	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P4	Oppose	<p>Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and the proposed zoning of the prison land. This is an important part of Wellington's current green space, which Wellington Civic Trust has had a long interest and involvement in, and the overlays and zoning are appropriate.</p>	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.10	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whanui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whanui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whanui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.13]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Crawford	FS118.1	General / Mapping /Mapping General /Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Miramar Peninsula and Shelly Bay need to be protected. The Miramar Peninsula is iconic and a magnificent landmark - an oasis in our capital city of Wellington. We see it when we fly into Wellington or travel in our buses, vehicles, trains and ferries. The Miramar Peninsula is an integral part of our visual landscape, where ever we live or work, for example Newtown, Wellington's CBD, the western hills of Wellington and Lower Hutt, Petone, Eastbourne, driving down the Wainui Hill and on our daily commute on the motorway.</p> <p>Considers that it is so visual that we do not realise that this land mark was such a treasure until urbanization destroyed it with increased building height lines which affects the contours of the hills, the vegetation, the predator free environment, the prison gardens and the fantastic untamed environment, which we all love.</p> <p>Sarah Crawford recognises that both the cultural and historical significance and as well the contribution of this land to the recreational enjoyment of the population of the Wellington region. It must be protected for our children, their children and future generations.</p> <p>Considers that the Miramar Peninsula has not always been valued in the past by central or local government .</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that in addition to retaining Strathmore Park properties as Medium Density Residential Zone, that a precinct with associated objectives, policies, rules and standards is applied across Strathmore Park that seeks to enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that in addition to retaining Strathmore Park properties as Medium Density Residential Zone and establishing a precinct, that any other such amendments that are most appropriate to address their submission.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.16	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose in part	Opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits.	Seeks amendment to zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru. [Refer to original submission for map]
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.16	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.16	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.39	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Crawford	FS118.2	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Miramar Peninsula and Shelly Bay need to be protected. The Miramar Peninsula is iconic and a magnificent landmark - an oasis in our capital city of Wellington. We see it when we fly into Wellington or travel in our buses, vehicles, trains and ferries. The Miramar Peninsula is an integral part of our visual landscape, where ever we live or work, for example Newtown, Wellington's CBD, the western hills of Wellington and Lower Hutt, Petone, Eastbourne, driving down the Wainui Hill and on our daily commute on the motorway.</p> <p>Considers that it is so visual that we do not realise that this land mark was such a treasure until urbanization destroyed it with increased building height lines which affects the contours of the hills, the vegetation, the predator free environment, the prison gardens and the fantastic untamed environment, which we all love.</p> <p>Sarah Crawford recognises that both the cultural and historical significance and as well the contribution of this land to the recreational enjoyment of the population of the Wellington region. It must be protected for our children, their children and future generations.</p> <p>Considers that the Miramar Peninsula has not always been valued in the past by central or local government .</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts should be bigger in spatial area in order to protect the specific character and heritage of Wellington.	Amend the mapping to increase the extent of the area encompassed by the Character Precincts.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.196	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts in Mount Victoria should be joined together in a larger block as proposed by the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021.	Amend the mapping to join together the Character Precincts in Mount Victoria in a larger block as proposed by the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.123	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the spatial extent of Local Centres in Miramar, Tawa and Newtown and other Centre Zones should be expanded to support the plan-enabled residential intensification surrounding them to and support a well-functioning urban environment. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including Appendix 2 & 4]	Amend and increase the extent of Local Centre Zones. [Refer to original submission & Appendix 4 for proposed zone expansions]
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.19	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that zoning in the PDP should be amended according to the mapping proposed in Appendix 4. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including Appendix 4]	Seeks that zoning in the Proposed District Plan be amended according to the mapping proposed in Appendix 4. [Refer to original submission, Appendix 4]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.20	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.16	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that walking catchments should extend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. <p>Notes that mapping changes are required for this and has provided an example of mapping in Appendix 4 of the original submission.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for further details].</p>	<p>Amend the walking catchments within the Proposed District Plan Maps to reflect the below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. <p>Refer to Appendix 4 of the original submission for an example map.</p>
Ann Mallinson	FS3.32	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.7	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking along the seafront without shelter difficult for residents and is unreasonable to adopt a greater walking distance than 10 mins in that specific environment.	Disallow
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.9	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking along the seafront without shelter difficult for residents and is unreasonable to adopt a greater walking distance than 10 mins in that specific environment.	Disallow
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.7	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking along the seafront without shelter difficult for residents and is unreasonable to adopt a greater walking distance than 10 mins in that specific environment.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Jenny Gyles	FS53.7	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking along the seafront without shelter difficult for residents and all citizens and is unreasonable to adopt a greater walking distance than 10 mins in that specific environment.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.34	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.14	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service. Decision of Wellington City Council in the Proposed District Plan as notified to stand. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.21	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Don MacKay	FS94.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The proposal to extend the walking catchment is opposed as this change would have a huge impact on neighbourhoods, is highly controversial, and has already been extensively discussed and agreed by the community. 10 minutes is a suitable walking distance in a city of Wellington's topography and weather.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.36	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Stride supports extending the walkable catchments as proposed. It is appropriate to apply a 15 minute walkable catchment to the Metropolitan zone to reflect the level of amenities and services provided.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.36	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Investore supports extending the walkable catchments as proposed. It is appropriate to apply a 15 minute walkable catchment to the Metropolitan zone to reflect the level of amenities and services provided.	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.17	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Support the proposed amendments to walkable catchments, particularly the inclusion of the Johnsonville Line as a Rapid Transit line for the purpose of walkable catchments.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.33	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Roland Sapsford	FS117.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The proposal to extend the walking catchment is opposed as this change would have a huge impact on neighbourhoods, is highly controversial, and has already been extensively discussed and agreed by the community. 10 minutes is a suitable walking distance in a city of Wellington's topography and weather.</p>	Disallow
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.37	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.11	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.65	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.14	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.17	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Character Precincts overlay be amended to reflect the new title and extent of the Character Areas Overlay mentioned in Appendix 3 of the original submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.18	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Character Precincts be removed in areas with Heritage classification.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The character precincts have been widely consulted on and offer a level of protection for Wellington's streetscape that is appropriate and different to that of heritage. Wellington's character suburbs are part of Wellington's identity and create a sense of place that is valued and worth preserving.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.3	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The character precincts have been widely consulted on and offer a level of protection for Wellington's streetscape that is appropriate and different to that of heritage. Wellington's character suburbs are part of Wellington's identity and create a sense of place that is valued and worth preserving.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.19	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose in part	The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed. Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards and will create unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers.	Remove the Flood Hazard overlay from planning maps.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct is based on the heritage of the suburb's development and it is also essential to the identity of the city	Disallow
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.44	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.51	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Metlifecare Limited	FS87.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the removal of the Flood Hazard overlay from planning maps on the basis that they create unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers. The overlay should be identified on a non-statutory map that is publicly available to provide flexibility to ensure that these maps are continually updated.	Allow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.38	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Stride supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	FS108.38	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Investore supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.74	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.20	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the Flood Hazard Overlay should not be included in the District Plan maps and should instead be included in non-statutory GIS maps that are publicly available. The Auckland Unitary Plan (“AUP”) adopts a set of non-statutory flood hazard overlay maps which operate as interactive maps on the Council’s ‘Geo Maps’ website – a separate mapping viewer to the statutory maps. This approach is different to that of the traditional means of displaying hazard overlays on district plan maps and reflects that these maps do not have regulatory effect.</p> <p>The advantage of this approach is the ability to operate a separate set of interactive maps which are continually subject to improvement and updates, outside of and without a reliance on the Schedule 1 process under the RMA. This separate set of interactive maps are therefore able to be relied upon in a legal sense.</p>	Seeks that data from the Flood Hazard overlay is included in non-statutory GIS maps that are publicly available.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.45	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Removing the regulatory nature of flood hazard maps reduces the ability of the plan to spatially limit inappropriate development in areas at risk from flood hazard, and allows for inconsistent application of rules to minimize flood hazard risk.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.52	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.75	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.21	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support in part	The mapping of other, non-flooding natural hazards to be incorporated into the District Plan is supported, such as Liquefaction and Fault Hazards, as these hazards are less subject to change.	Retain Natural Hazard mapping of risks unrelated to flooding.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.22	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support in part	The District Plan maps are supported but amendments are sought.	Retain District Plan maps with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.23	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the District Plan maps should be amended to display the high, medium, and low coastal hazards as separate layers that can be turned on and off individually in the GIS viewer.	Amend District Plan maps to display the high, medium, and low coastal hazards as separate layers that can be turned on and off individually in the GIS viewer.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.24	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the spatial application of the HRZ should extend across the urban environment and considers that additional height and density should be provided for within a walkable catchment of centres to enable more intensification in areas of high accessibility to key centre. Proposed spatial application is provided in Appendix 4.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission, including Appendix 4]</p>	<p>Seeks that walkable catchments and the spatial extent of the High Density Residential Zone are extended, as detailed in Appendix 4.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission, Appendix 4]</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.22	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.25	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the City Centre building height controls as notified and seeks that the building heights are simplified. Considers the Central Wellington City and the City Centre Zone should provide for unlimited building heights to encourage intensification and development. There are rules and standards in the District Plan that will control bulk, location and height of buildings in the city centre. Considers height should not be limited in the City Centre. Seeks simplification of the height controls.	Seeks to delete any mapping references to height limits in the CCZ.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.23	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submission to create unlimited building heights in the central city is opposed. A liveable city is about buildings of a human scale. It is unnecessary and undesirable in an earthquake prone city to allow skyscrapers.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submission to create unlimited building heights in the central city is opposed. A liveable city is about buildings of a human scale. It is unnecessary and undesirable in an earthquake prone city to allow skyscrapers.	Disallow
Murray Pillar	393.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts should be amended to include all the dwellings identified in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report on character areas, specifically to cover each site that was identified as being "positive, contributing or neutral" in the report.	Amend the mapping of the area encompassed by the Character Precincts to include all the dwellings identified in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report on character areas, specifically to cover each site that was identified as being "positive, contributing or neutral" in the report.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.77	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Boffa Miskell - adoption Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all Add Character Precincts to areas missed 10min walkable catchment Character precincts and rules Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M. Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings	Allow
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.52	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.199	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Murray Pillar	393.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that new Character Precinct areas should be established in areas missed out altogether in the PDP, such as Wesley Road.	Amend the mapping to add a new Character Precinct area for Wesley Road.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.78	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Boffa Miskell - adoption Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all Add Character Precincts to areas missed 10min walkable catchment Character precincts and rules Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M. Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.273	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.168	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.24	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
Murray Pillar	393.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that new Character Precinct areas should be established in areas missed out altogether in the PDP, such as Bolton Street.	Amend the mapping to add a new Character Precinct area for Bolton Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.274	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Murray Pillar	393.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that new Character Precinct areas should be established in areas missed out altogether in the PDP, such as Aurora Terrace.	Amend the mapping to add a new Character Precinct for Aurora Terrace.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.275	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Murray Pillar	393.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that new Character Precinct areas should be established in areas missed out altogether in the PDP, such as Talavera Terrace in Lower Kelburn.	Amend the mapping to add a new Character Precinct for Talavera Terrace in Lower Kelburn.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.276	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.169	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has qualities, including visibility which should qualify it as a character area. The submitter considers that Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has a particularly charming ambience and modification to the houses has generally been in keeping with the Mt Victoria architecture.	Seeks that Earls Terrace, Port Street and Stafford Street are included in the PDP as a character area.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.193	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.125	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	405.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the provision of a broad area of six storey High Density Residential zoning in the wider Johnsonville catchment. Submitter considers that this gives effect to the NPS-UD and reflects the status of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre.	Retain the High Density Residential Zone 21m building heights in the wider Johnsonville catchment as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the hierarchy of centres, and the recognition of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre of significant sub-regional importance.	Seeks that the heirachy of centres remains, including Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre
Investore Property Limited	405.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the height limit for the Tawa Site at 5 William Earp Place and surrounding Mixed Use zone should be increased to 18m. This height is appropriate having regard to the location of the site, and its boundaries with State highway 1, Main Road and the railway line.	[inferred deision requested] Seeks that mapping of Height Control Area 4 is amended to provide for the Mixed Use zone applying to 5 William Earp Place to have a height limit of 18 m.
Investore Property Limited	405.10	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the 35 m maximum height limit within Johnsonville and extent is generally appropriate; but considers that central parts of the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre should enable up to 50 m. This will enable sufficient development needed in Johnsonville and is consistent with the NPS-UD. The area identified for this 50 m maximum height is shown in Appendix D of the submission.	Seeks that Height Control Area 1 (Johnsonville) is nuanced to set a 50 m building height limit within central Johnsonville being an area identified between Moorfield Road and Johnsonville - Porirua Motorway [Refer to original submission for map]; and 35 m for the remainder of Johnsonville.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.21	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	While the JCA is a strong long term supporter of redeveloping the Johnsonville Shopping Centre, it is very concerned of any development that is out of scale to the Johnsonville Suburban Centre. The key purpose of the Johnsonville Shopping Centre is to provide the range or retail and services required to support surrounding residential areas. The JCA is concerned the WCC emphasis on building high-rise residential development within the Johnsonville Shopping Centre will compromise the focus of the centre and possibly further delay redevelopment of the Johnsonville Mall. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Seeks to amend the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre height limit from 10 storeys to the previous Metropolitan Centre maximum height limit of 8 storeys
Investore Property Limited	405.11	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Support the Height Control 2 (Kilbirnie) of the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Retain the Height Control 2 (Kilbirnie) mapping as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.12	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support in part	The Korokoro - Takapū Ara is identified as a category B Site and Area of Significance to Māori (SASM).This SASM has a very small encroachment into a built-up part of the submitter's Tawa site at 5 William Earp Place, before extending several kilometres to Korokoro. While the submitter generally supports the identification of this SASM, the submitter seeks clarification that this SASM is mapped at a level of detail, to provide sufficient certainty that it is intended to encroach into 5 William Earp Place.	Retain SCHED-7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori) and seeks clarification and amendment if necessary.
Investore Property Limited	405.13	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	The Korokoro - Takapū Ara is identified as a category B Site and Area of Significance to Māori (SASM).This SASM has a very small encroachment into a built-up part of the submitter's Tawa site at 5 William Earp Place, before extending several kilometres to Korokoro. While the submitter generally supports the identification of this SASM, the submitter seeks clarification that this SASM is mapped at a level of detail, to provide sufficient certainty that it is intended to encroach into 5 William Earp Place.	Seeks that the SASM extent identified in SCHED-7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori) for Korokoro - Takapū Ara is clarified, provided in further detail with the identification on planning maps amended if necessary.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.13	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Not opposed to the coastal inundation mapping in principle, however considers further nuancing of the provisions that relate to coastal hazards and more specifically, tsunami hazard, is required. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.89 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes the Coastal Tsunami Hazard overlay

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Not opposed to the coastal inundation mapping in principle, however considers further nuancing of the provisions that relate to coastal hazards and more specifically, tsunami hazard, is required. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.89 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that provisions relating to Tsunami Hazard Overlay are amended to have further nuancing. [Inferred decision requested].
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Submitter acknowledges its siting within the coastal environment, as defined by the NZCPS and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement. Submitter expresses concern that the complex relationship between the Coastal Environment, Infrastructure and Airport Zone provisions creates an inefficient consenting pathway for airport and airport related activities.	Opposes the Coastal Environment overlay at the Airport Zone.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.178	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that Wellington International Airport is in the coastal environment. Considers that it is something they need to consider with all their decisions. Considers that removing the airport out of this overlay would be a nonsense when both ends of the airport north Evans Bay and south with Lyall Bay surrounded by sea.	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the coastal environment overlay.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.16	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Submitter acknowledges its siting within the coastal environment, as defined by the NZCPS and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement. Submitter expresses concern that the complex relationship between the Coastal Environment, Infrastructure and Airport Zone provisions creates an inefficient consenting pathway for airport and airport related activities.	Seeks that the Coastal Environment overlay is removed from the Airport Zone.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.179	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that Wellington International Airport is in the coastal environment. Considers that it is something they need to consider with all their decisions. Considers that removing the airport out of this overlay would be a nonsense when both ends of the airport north Evans Bay and south with Lyall Bay surrounded by sea.	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the coastal environment overlay.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.17	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the mapping of ANB and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary. Considers that this boundary identifies an area within which specific land use controls apply, and identifies the point of compliance with respect to aircraft noise, as defined by WIAL's Main Site and East Side Area Designations.	Retain Air Noise Boundary as notified.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.110	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers this should be renamed as 'inner air noise overlay'.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.13	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.18	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that this boundary identifies an area within which specific land use controls apply, and identifies the point of compliance with respect to aircraft noise, as defined by WIAL's Main Site and East Side Area Designations,	Retain 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.14	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.19	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Opposes Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to the extent that they cover the Airport Zone. Considers that the engineering and design requirements of airport infrastructure, including the requirements under the CDEM to remain operational following a natural hazard event, mean that liquefaction and flood hazard inundation cannot occur on site for operational reasons.	Amend the extent of the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to remove it from the extent of the Airport Zone. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.181	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that parts of Wellington airport are made up of 1950s reclaimed land from sea therefore should be part of the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the liquefaction hazard overlay.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.83	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The liquefaction hazard overlay in the Proposed District plan is based on the High and Very High liquefaction susceptibility areas in Griffin et al (2020) ⁶ . These zones are based on cone penetrometer tests, and analysis of geomorphology, hydrology and site conditions, and do not take into account likely post-event remediation of liquefaction effects. The part of the Airport within the liquefaction overlay is an area of anthropogenic fill, which is in all cases highly susceptible to liquefaction. If geotechnical engineering has been done to mitigate liquefaction risk, the risk may be lessened, but the submission does not provide examples of this.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.20	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Opposes Flood Hazard Overlay to the extent that they cover the Airport Zone. Considers that the engineering and design requirements of airport infrastructure, including the requirements under the CDEM to remain operational following a natural hazard event, mean that liquefaction and flood hazard inundation cannot occur on site for operational reasons.	Amend the extent of the Flood Hazard Overlay to remove it from the extent of the Airport Zone. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.183	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that a vast catchment of Strathmore feeds through Wellington Airport and it should be part of the Flood Hazard overlay	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the flood hazard overlay.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.84	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The flood inundation overlay is based on probability maps by Wellington Water of likely ponding areas in the event of a flood. It does not take into account likely post-event remediation of flooding effects. If geotechnical engineering has been done to mitigate flood inundation risk, the risk may be lessened, but the submission does not provide examples of this.	Disallow
Guy Marriage	407.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the extension of the CCZ down Adelaide Road is flawed, as this is the lowest point on the path from Newtown to the Basis and is also the former boggy route of a wetland stream, so will be unsuitable for the creation of high rises.	Amend the mapping so that the City Centre Zone chapter is not extended along Adelaide Road.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	The extent of KRH1 is incorrect should be amended. KiwiRail seek a minor correction to the Johnsonville Line designation extent of Tunnel 6. The shapefile does not accurately cover the existing rail infrastructure and KiwiRail seek amendment to ensure the tunnel is accurately designated.	Amend the extent of KRH1 to ensure the Johnsonville Line designation extent of Tunnel 6 is accurately designated. [Refer to original submission for map].
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	The extent of KRH1 is incorrect should be amended. KiwiRail seek amendment to the designation label for KRH2. This designation, located at Hawkins Hill, is identified with both labels KRH1 and KRH2 on the online maps.	Amend the planning maps to remove the KRH1 label from the KRH2 designation at Hawkins Hill. [Refer to original submission for map].
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Oppose SNAs on private property. Considers that sites have been incorrectly identified. Considers that a regulatory regime puts voluntary conservation programmes at risk. [See original submission for full reasons]	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that significant natural areas do not apply to privately owned land.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the current extent The current overlay is far too broad, and covers significant area of land not associated with the Albion Battery and Mine Remains.	Amend the mapping of the Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains Heritage area (#40) to more accurately define the heritage features.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the character precincts should be as mapped in the existing district plan because of the lack of evidence upon which the reduction in scale is based including the flawed analysis by Boffa Miskell and the information in the HBA. [See original submission for further detail including appendices]	Seeks that the character precincts be extended to that in the operative district plan.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.200	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
VicLabour	414.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that character precincts restrict space for development and are a hindrance for the proposed mass rapid transit route. Considers that many owners will choose not to sell their homes to be developed given how valuable many are in their current state. Those that are less appealing will be more likely to be sold for development which is considered a good outcome. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that character precincts be removed from the plan. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.92	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.94	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Disallow
VicLabour	414.10	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers Significant Natural Areas are important in order to protect our environment and native plantlife. Considers that while the city is built denser, the environment and our wildlife should be protected. Considers that it is ironic that the argument for being anti-density is to protect the 'character' of our housing but yet there is no consideration for the 'character' of our nature, which is arguably much harder to restore than the character amenity gained from what the Council deems as character housing.	Seeks that significant natural areas provisions apply to residentially zoned sites.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The Heritage Building listing of 28 Robieson Street is opposed. Considers the house is deemed to be in poor condition and remediation work is estimated to cost as much as \$800 - \$1million. Detailed renovations plans from the owners have been provided, which include repurposing the timber from the house and other special aspects of the building. Considers a heritage listing on the property would incur risks, costs and stress to the owners, who wish to renovate the house. It is argued that the heritage value of the building is low, and that the listing would not result in any positive net benefits for society or the owners. It is considered that the listing would instead lead to a worse heritage outcome for the community due to the significant impacts on the owners linked to the condition of the building. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Building and map.
Ian Attwood	FS16.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Scheduling will inevitably incur additional costs and constraints on developments and improvements and will consequently be counterproductive to the preservation of architectural heritage. Council has not provided substantiated independent evidence that 28 Robieson Street has significant or architectural merit and heritage value to the community.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sophie Kahn	FS76.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The owner (of 28 Robieson Street) points to the crippling costs that urgently-needed renovations to the house will incur on them if Heritage standards are to be met, and states that the potential of being unable to meet these costs will merely result in worse outcomes for Heritage - the very opposite of what WCC aims for. This reflects the Kahn House situation.	Amend / Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings and map - Do not force private homes on the Plan unless there is full commitment to full and fair financial compensation in perpetuity for the financial burdens private homeowners will face if the listing is truly historically significant, offer to purchase private homes proposed for listing when the owner disagrees should be considered. Only propose for listing private homes that have had an independent body's full analysis of outcomes the homeowner will face and that concludes, with robust evidence, that the public need is such that the rights of the homeowner, as well as the mental and financial well being of the homeowner can indeed be justly considered secondary to the needs of an abstract entity (i.e. the 'public'; future generations)
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	If height limits are retained, 35m should apply across both Metropolitan Centres. This is in line with the purpose of Metropolitan Centres and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD), Policy (3)(b). [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that if height limits are retained, amend Kilbirne to 35m in the mapping.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers for the Wellington Train Station Precinct that intensification should be most prevalent where major existing public infrastructure is available, particularly public transport. Submitter considers to that end, building height limits (not withstanding earlier comments regarding height limits in general) around the Train Station should be maximised. Submitter notes the 50m height limit above the rail corridor enabling a potential over-station development – the submitter strongly supports this initiative and believe even further height is warranted here. This height should be extended to nearby sites including the station itself, and around Thorndon Quay, Waterloo Quay and Lambton Quay – the majority of which is currently constrained to between 27m and 40m. The submitter believes there are sufficient other controls in place to manage responsible use of height.	Seeks that for the Wellington Train Station precinct CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended in the mapping.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that for the Tasman Street block, that the block bounded by Buckle Street, Tasman Street, Rugby Street and Sussex Street appears as an anomaly (28.5m) to the height limits of the similarly-zoned blocks immediately to the north (42.5m) and to the south (42.5m). Submitter considers that it is clear that 28.5m is utilised as a transitional height from the 42.5m zone to the lower 21m and 11m height limits, however it is unclear what justification there is for the anomaly on this block given the intensification of the entire Adelaide Road precinct immediately south, and the Te Aro precinct immediately north.	Seeks that the Tasman Street block CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended in the mapping.
Josephine Smith	419.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Considers that the demolition controls in pre-1930s areas (as defined in the Operative District Plan) should be retained, while identifying areas of particular character within these (for example as identified in the revised draft Spatial Plan) to enable a more granular level of control over demolition. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the character precincts are extended in the mapping to encompass the areas in Appendix 1 of the Operative District Plan.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.201	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	The Meridian Building at 33 Customhouse Quay is located adjacent to a Minimum Sunlight Access Public Space in relation to Kumutoto Park Fabric seeks deletion of WFZ-S2.	Option 2: If WFZ-S2 (Minimum Sunlight Access - Public Space) is not deleted in its entirety, then: Seeks the Minimum Sunlight access Public Space overlay is deleted in relation to Kumutoto Park.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.13	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Protection of sunlight access is essential for the Waterfront Zone. The request to remove one protected area is unreasonable and contrary to the interest of users and the wider public.	Disallow
Johnsonville Community Association	429.13	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the key purpose of the Johnsonville Shopping Centre is to provide the range of retail and services required to support surrounding residential areas. Submitter is concerned that the WCC emphasis on building residential development within the Johnsonville Shopping Centre will compromise the focus of the centre and possibly further delay redevelopment of the Johnsonville Mall.	Opposes the height limit change from 8 storeys to 10 storeys in the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the key purpose of the Johnsonville Shopping Centre is to provide the range or retail and services required to support surrounding residential areas. Submitter is concerned the WCC emphasis on building residential development within the Johnsonville Shopping Centre will compromise the focus of the centre and possibly further delay redevelopment of the Johnsonville Mall.	Seeks that The Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone has it's height limits amended to 8 storeys.
Kat Hall	430.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	The extent of Character Precincts should be amended. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Increase the extent of the Character Precincts in the mapping.
Peter Fordyce	431.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Heritage Areas should be expanded. Wellington's built heritage comprises a vital part of the city, featuring a cityscape that is not only unique within New Zealand, but the world. This contributes to not only tourism, but fosters a sense of "place" for residents. While the rules as they currently exist provide some protection, this does not go far enough, and irreplaceable buildings and streetscapes are at risk of being lost.	Seeks that Heritage Areas be expanded in the mapping.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.43	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Elice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow
Peter Fordyce	431.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that there should be wider coverage for the rules preventing demolition of pre-1930s dwellings in areas with that protection.	Seeks that the character precincts are extended in the mapping.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.208	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Garvin Wong	432.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Character Precincts in Thorndon are opposed. Some old properties under character protection in Thorndon are over 100 years old. Renovating these properties will be more expensive than building new ones, as most of them: - have rotten weatherboards and borer holes in their structure frames, - have been left "as it is", - are cold and damp in winter and costly to warm up, - were built very close to each other and get very little sunlight, - have sunken foundations. It is expected that the life span of a newly built property is 50 years and houses built 100 years ago should not be expected to last longer.	Seeks that the extent of Character Precincts be amended in the mapping to remove properties in Thorndon.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.37	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	WCC Summary reads: Considers that Character Precincts should not be a qualifying matter. Seeks that the extent of Character Precincts be amended to remove properties in Thorndon.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.55	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers Thorndon character precincts protect significant heritage and character values.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.95	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Disallow
Miriam Moore	433.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the maps for the mixed use zone adjacent to train stations in Tawa are misleading with the 12m height limit displayed on them, as the zone (MUZ R16.2) allows for 18-22m height limit for new residential buildings at these sites (as a matter of discretion under the rule). Considers that additions and alterations appear more incentivised as permitted activities, rather than residential redevelopment of this land.	Seeks to amend the heights in the planning maps
Miriam Moore	433.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Oppose the extent of the character protected areas. The inaccessibility of our character housing stock forces out older populations, if our ageing population can age in place in their home suburbs like Mount Victoria, this will free up more affordable land in the fringe suburbs	Reduce the extent of the character precincts in the mapping.
Anna Kemble Welch	434.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts should be increased through the application of character as a qualifying matter in the mapping.	Seeks that the extent of the character precincts is increased.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.209	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Michelle Rush	436.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the HRZ and MRZ should be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville line as a rapid transit route. All other consequential amendments to the plan's sections should also be made to give effect to this.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville Line as a Rapid Transit Line
Michelle Rush	436.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the zone coverage of the Medium Density Zone should be adjusted in respect of the Johnsonville Line Catchment, the City Centre Zones and Metropolitan Centre Zones, as per the 'walkable catchments' requirements of Policy 3 in the NPS-UD. This is important to ensure that the district plan fulfils its own strategic objectives, as well as contributing fully as a supporting document to the councils wider objectives and outcomes, e.g. towards carbon zero, liveability, thriving businesses and better housing availability. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of the Medium Density Residential Zone to respect walkable catchment requirements from Policy 3 in the NPS-UD.
Michelle Rush	436.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the zone coverage of the High Density Zone should be adjusted in respect of the Johnsonville Line Catchment, the City Centre Zones and Metropolitan Centre Zones, as per the 'walkable catchments' requirements of Policy 3 in the NPS-UD. This is important to ensure that the district plan fulfils its own strategic objectives, as well as contributing fully as a supporting document to the councils wider objectives and outcomes, e.g. towards carbon zero, liveability, thriving businesses and better housing availability. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of the High Density Residential Zone to respect walkable catchment requirements from Policy 3 in the NPS-UD.
Michelle Rush	436.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the extent of mixed zones should be widened in neighbourhood and local centre zones, taking in part of the medium density and high density residential zones. This would ensure the ability for people to work, live, and seek services within a walkable, or micro-transport catchment while achieving carbon reduction, increasing liveability and amenity, contributing to public health and wellbeing, and community vibrancy. Increasing provision for mixed uses is part of this.	Seeks to extend Mixed Use Zones in and around Neighbourhood Centre Zones, Local Centre Zones, Medium Density Residential Zones and High Density Residential Zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kirsty Woods	437.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the current character areas identified, but considers that the character precinct should be extended to Newtown.	Retain Character Precincts as notified and seeks amendment to extent to Newtown.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.231	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.111	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Kirsty Woods	437.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the current character areas identified, but considers that the character precinct should be extended to Newtown.	Seeks that the extent of the character precinct in Newtown is increased in the mapping.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.232	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.112	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Newtown Residents' Association	440.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 14m height are unnecessary in Newtown and should be reduced to 11m.	Seeks that Newtown be classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 1 (11m).
Newtown Residents' Association	440.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 14m height are unnecessary in Berhampore and should be reduced to 11m.	Seeks that Berhampore be classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 1 (11m).
Kathryn Lethbridge	442.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that WCC should be including character / heritage recognition for the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway). The zone is a jewel in the Wellington character / heritage crown and appropriate houses in the area should be protected to prevent unnecessary loss to this key cultural asset for the city.	Seeks that Hobson Street (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) is included within a character precinct in the mapping.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.69	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	WCC summary reads: The zone is a jewel in the Wellington character / heritage crown and appropriate houses in the area should be protected to prevent unnecessary loss to this key cultural asset for the city. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.185	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Save Our Venues	445.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that a further solution to the issue of low acoustic insulation standards in new residential developments in the immediate vicinity of existing live music venues, could include the rezoning of existing music venues into Special Entertainment Precincts. This will allow for a higher level of sound output.</p> <p>For the purposes of immediate protection, these overlays could be directly applied to existing music venues but the development of broader zoning classifications that incorporate the sound of live music into city planning could make the development of new music venues in the future more achievable.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the WCC consider creating a Special Entertainment Precinct Zone to protect existing and new music venues, and amend the mapping accordingly.
Save Our Venues	445.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that standards (which provides for entertainment venues and associated noise) can already be seen in the High Noise Area zoned for Courtney Place and could extend further protections to the venues such as Meow, San Fran and Valhalla which are currently located in the Central Area Zone with higher restrictions on noise output standards.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks extension of the Courtenay Place Noise Area to include Cuba Street venues. [Inferred decision requested]
Dale Mary McTavish	448.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the Newtown housing stock is mostly around 100 years which says a lot about the quality and resilience.</p> <p>Newtown is already high density on a human scale and is well-placed for sun and green spaces. People enjoy living here and there is the pleasure of 19th century views. Every single house has a story.</p> <p>The most recent infill housing is a blot on the landscape.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the mapping to increase the extent of the Character Precincts in Newtown to include the Council Officers Recommended Plan areas. [Inferred decision requested].
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.113	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the need to amend the Airport Precinct Plans to include a new Bridge Street Precinct the area between existing boundary fence of the airport to the eastern side of the Bridge Street formed road.	Amend the planning maps to include a new Bridge Street Precinct for the area between existing boundary fence of the airport to the eastern side of the Bridge Street formed road.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.246	General / Mapping / General	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission and considers it is appropriate for the Bridge Street area contained within the Airport Zone to remain as notified. Creating a new precinct is inefficient and unnecessary, noting that the obstacle limitation surface limits the development potential of this area in any case.	Disallow
John Wilson	453.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the extent of the zones should be clearly defined, e.g. by lines on a map. If defined by distance from the centre point, this should be defined in terms of distance from the centre point. Not in terms of time eg say five or ten minutes walk from the centre of the zone as this requires a subjective interpretation of how far and how fast a typical pedestrian could walk.	Seeks to clarify how zones are defined in terms of distance from the centre point compared to time in minutes walked. [Inferred decision requested]
Chris Horne, Sunita Singh, Julia Stace, Paul Bell-Butler	456.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that SNA-status should be restored to all residential-zoned properties. In particular considers that the Planning and Environment Committee vote to remove SNAs from all residential-zoned properties over-rode the purpose of the ECO chapter which "... is to identify significant natural areas within Wellington City in order to protect and maintain the remaining areas of indigenous biodiversity".	Amend mapping of Significant Natural Areas to include all residential-zoned properties.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rachel Underwood	458.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the plan should give more protection for older, heritage, wooden buildings because upgrading existing houses is more sustainable than demolition and replacing with concrete structures. Considers that it is unacceptable that planning should allow high-rise buildings that deprive older houses of sunlight and air flow and intensify dampness in living conditions.	Seeks to alter the Character Precincts to reflect the recommendations of the Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report 2019.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.202	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Rachel Underwood	458.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers further character protection is needed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that new areas of character precinct be established in areas missed out altogether, such as Wesley Rd, Bolton St and Aurora Terrace; and Talavera Terrace in lower Kelburn.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.277	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.170	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.23	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the height limits at 2 and 5 Todman Street to be inappropriate. Considers that to have 22m on the north side will create shading issues and reduce sunlight.	Seeks that the 22m height limits on 5 Todman Street and 2 Todman Street be removed and that the height limits in the Operative District Plan be re-instated.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers 22m height limit too high for for Brooklyn and Kingston villages. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks a height limit on Cleveland street of 14m on the south side of the street and 11m on the north side of the street.
Grant and Marilyn Griffiths, Griffiths Family Trust	460.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Opposes Significant Natural Areas on Private land.	Seeks to remove all Significant Natural Areas from Private Land.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.11	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Requests that 31 and 33 McFarlane Street, and 4 Vogel Street are included in the Townscape Precincts as they form an important part of the character of the precincts.	Include 31 and 33 McFarlane Street, and 4 Vogel Street in the Townscape Precincts Overlay.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.194	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.131	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.12	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Requests that 11 Vogel Street is included in the Mount Victoria Character Precinct. Notes that the Boffa Miskell character report classified the property as having contributory character but was ultimately excluded from the overlay. Notes that 11 Vogel Street is the only property south of Hawker Street that within the Townscape Precinct but not within the Character Precinct. While the Townscape Precinct offers certain protections, the Character Precinct would be better suited to protecting the character values of the property. [see original submission for further details and maps]	Include 11 Vogel Street in the Mount Victoria Character Precinct.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.195	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.132	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Bruce Hay-Chapman	462.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers in appropriate to reinstate the character areas as proposed in the Spatial Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks to alter the Character Precincts to reflect the recommendations of the Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report 2019 [inferred decision requested].
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.53	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission because it supports character extensions in Harper Street, Newtown.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.203	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Kiri Saul	463.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers in appropriate to reinstate the character areas as proposed in the Spatial Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks to alter the Character Precincts to reflect the recommendations of the Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report 2019 [inferred decision requested].
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.38	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts in Harper Street, Newtown.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.204	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Philip Cooke	465.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the Claremont Grove/Austin Street precinct should be included as a Character Precinct.</p> <p>Considers that the heritage listed buildings are reliant on the contribution of surrounding buildings, which also need preservation as part of a character area, not just a few isolated buildings.</p> <p>Considers that 20 Austin Street together with the immediate surrounding buildings, and others nearby in Claremont Grove and Austin Street, form a group of character buildings that warrant protection in a character precinct.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the mapping to increase the extent of the area encompassed by the Character Precincts to include the Claremont Grove/Austin Street precinct.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.196	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.134	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Hannah Ouellet	466.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers removal of 290 Rintoul Street from the Character Precinct appropriate, as character should be secondary to more pressing issues such as housing affordability.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove 290 Rintoul Street from being included within the character precinct.
Therese Reedy	469.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers removal of 290 Rintoul Street from the Character Precinct appropriate, as character should be secondary to more pressing issues such as housing affordability.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove 290 Rintoul Street from being included within the character precinct.
Smith Geursen	475.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas fit the description in WC135 and should be protected as a SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that some parts of the site have been cleared recently, as a complying activity, and as such do not represent the habitat that would benefit from protection. These areas should be excluded from the SNA as the ecological value is now largely lost.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full detail, including diagrams].</p>	<p>Seeks that the mapping for the extent of the area encompassed by WC135 (Carey Gully scrub and shrubland, South Coast) in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas is altered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encompass the 3m+ vegetation that is north and west of the loop shaped farm track; and - Also encompass the stand of 3m+ vegetation in the centre to the south of the site. <p>The new boundaries suggested for WC135 are approximated in Figure 8 in the submission.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.67	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Railway Metro (2 Bunny Street, Pipitea).	Retain the mapping of City Centre Zoning for New World Railway Metro (2 Bunny Street, Pipitea) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.68	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Willis Street Metro (70 Willis Street, Wellington Central).	Retain the mapping of City Centre Zoning for New World Willis Street Metro (70 Willis Street, Wellington Central) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.69	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Wellington City (279 Wakefield Street, Te Aro).	Retain the mapping of City Centre Zoning for New World Wellington City (279 Wakefield Street, Te Aro) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.70	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Thorndon (150 Molesworth Street).	Retain the mapping of City Centre Zoning for New World New World Thorndon (150 Molesworth Street) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.71	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the Metropolitan Centre Zoning of Pak'n'Save Kilbirnie (5 Onepu Road).	Retain the mapping of Metropolitan Centre Zoning for Pak'n'Save Kilbirnie (5 Onepu Road) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.72	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Newtown (195 Riddiford Street).	Retain the mapping of Local Centre Zoning for New World Newtown (195 Riddiford Street) as notified.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.60	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks alignment with its primary submission which requests that Newtown is classified as a Town Centre.	Disallow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.73	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Miramar (54 Miramar Avenue).	Retain the mapping of Local Centre Zoning for New World Miramar (54 Miramar Avenue) as notified.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.61	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks alignment with its primary submission which requests that Newtown is classified as a Town Centre.	Disallow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.74	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Island Bay (8 Medway Street).	Retain the mapping of Local Centre Zoning for New World Island Bay (8 Medway Street) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.75	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Karori (236 Karori Road).	Retain the mapping of Local Centre Zoning of New World Karori (236 Karori Road) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.76	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Khandallah (26 Ganges Road).	Retain the mapping of Local Centre Zoning of New World Khandallah (26 Ganges Road) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.77	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Newlands (1 Bracken Road).	Retain the mapping of Local Centre Zoning of New World Newlands (1 Bracken Road) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.78	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Churton Park (103 Westchester Drive).	Retain the mapping of Local Centre Zoning of New World Churton Park (103 Westchester Drive) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.79	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Tawa (37 Oxford Street).	Retain the mapping of Local Centre Zoning of New World Tawa (37 Oxford Street) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Owhiro Bay Residents Association	477.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the Carey's Gully Landfill Designation (WCC- 61) as Refuse Disposal and other works should be reduced to the footprint required for the current landfill plus 'Piggyback' extension and associated facilities.</p> <p>Considers there are environmental values as indicated on the plan and possible in the future that indicate a reduction in size of the designation is needed.</p> <p>Considers reducing the extent of the designation would align with commitments by Council.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reasons]</p>	Amend extent of designation to be reduced for WCC8 to the area only of the current landfills and planned SLEPO works.
Christina Mackay	478.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers the proposed district plan does not promote enough character houses.	<p>Opposes the size of character precincts within the Proposed District Plan and seeks amendment.</p> <p>Submitter supports the scope and size of character areas be increased in line with the recommendations of the following reports prepared by professional urban design, planning and heritage experts.</p> <p>9.1 Boffa Miskell report of February 2019; 9.2 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) submission on the draft spatial plan; and 9.3 WCC officers recommended final spatial plan of 24 June 2021.</p>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.205	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.</p> <p>[Interred reference to submission 158.1]</p>	Allow
Christina Mackay	478.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers the proposed district plan does not promote enough character houses.	<p>Seeks that the extent of the character precincts be amended consistent with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boffa Miskell report of February 2019; 2. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) submission on the draft spatial plan; and 3. WCC officers recommended final spatial plan of 24 June 2021.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.206	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	<p>Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.</p> <p>[Interred reference to submission 158.1]</p>	Allow
Catharine Underwood	481.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the MRZ for Brooklyn should be removed and the status quo remains until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed for the Brooklyn Area. Allowing 11 and 14 metres in height is likely to undermine potential character areas could create towering buildings dominating the neighbourhood.	Seeks that Brooklyn not be zoned Medium Density Residential.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.293	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Catharine Underwood	481.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the height limits in the central Brooklyn Zone be limited to 14m on the south side and 11m on the north side. Any higher than this will impact on sunlight onto the street, create a canyon effect for what is a narrow street and cause much shading on the street.	Seeks that Height Controls in the Local Centre Zone of Brooklyn be reduced to 14m on the south side and 11m on the north side.
Catharine Underwood	481.16	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the north side of Upland Road in the Kelburn Village zone should be limited to 11m in height and the south side be limited to 14m. 22m height is way out of proportion to the available area, will destroy to street scape, will reduce sunlight on the south side of the street. And not provide a 'transition' between the centre and the houses.	Seeks that the North side of Upland Road in Kelburn Village be limited to 11m in height and the south side be limited to 14m.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Catharine Underwood	481.17	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the proposed height limit of 18m for the local centre in Karori should be increased to match those of the other centres at 22m. Karori has more shops, more room, flatter land and a catchment that is almost fully catered for without leaving the suburb. Brooklyn Village, Aro Village and Kelburn Village seem to be being pushed for development when to do the buildings at the proposed height will impact the liveability, sunshine, shading, biodiversity. If Karori cannot be increased, Kelburn and Aro St should be reduced.	Seeks that the centre of Karori be limited to 22m in height, rather than 18m.
Jonathan Markwick	490.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that restrictive rules protecting Character Precincts should not be a priority and is morally wrong when we are experiencing a massive shortage of housing and a housing crisis.	Amend the mapping to reduce the coverage of the Mount Victoria Character Precincts to match the boundaries of the SCHED3 - Heritage Areas.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.96	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Disallow
Jonathan Markwick	490.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that restrictive rules protecting Character Precincts should not be a priority and is morally wrong when we are experiencing a massive shortage of housing and a housing crisis).	Amend the mapping to allow six storey high density residential buildings in the areas currently encompassed by Mount Victoria Character Precincts which are outside the SCHED3 - Heritage Areas.
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians / cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition. Limited sun hours are available. The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the mapping to add a Character Precinct that encompasses the Lower Kelburn area (Easedale St; Kinross St; Bolton St; Wesley Rd; Aurora Terrace; Clifton Terrace; San Sebastian Rd; Everton Terrace; Onslow Terrace, Talavera Terrace; Clermont Terrace; Salmont Place; Salamanca Road (as far as Kelburn Park), Gladstone Terrace and Rawhiti Terrace near the cable car).
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.278	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.171	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians/cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition.</p> <p>Limited sun hours are available.</p> <p>The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the mapping to add a Character Precinct that encompasses the area of west of Kinross Street and Clifton Terrace, broadly bounded by San Sebastian Road, Wesley Road and Bolton Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.279	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.172	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians/cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition.</p> <p>Limited sun hours are available.</p> <p>The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the mapping to add a Character Precinct that encompasses the area broadly centred around Clifton Terrace and Talavera Terrace.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John Mulholland	497.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas fit the description in WC135 and should be protected as a SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that some parts of the site have been cleared recently, as a complying activity, and as such do not represent the habitat that would benefit from protection. These areas should be excluded from the SNA as the ecological value is now largely lost.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full detail, including diagrams].</p>	<p>Seeks that the mapping for the extent of the area encompassed by WC135 (Carey Gully scrub and shrubland, South Coast) in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas is altered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encompass the 3m+ vegetation that is north and west of the loop shaped farm track; and - Also encompass the stand of 3m+ vegetation in the centre to the south of the site. <p>The new boundaries suggested for WC135 (Carey Gully scrub and shrubland, South Coast) are approximated in Figure 8 in the submission.</p>
Panorama Property Limited	10.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Seeks that the land at 1 Upland Road is zoned MUZ not OSZ.</p> <p>The commercial use of the buildings at 1 Upland Road is established and would be inconsistent with the purpose and policies of the OSZ in OSZ introduction, OSZ-O1, and OSZ-P3. The buildings are not used in a way that is ancillary to the Botanic Garden.</p> <p>MUZ introduction, MUZ-O1 and MUZ-P2 better align with the established use of the buildings at 1 Upland Road.</p>	Rezone 1 Upland Road from Open Space Zone to Mixed Use Zone or equivalent appropriate zone.
Rod Halliday	25.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the edge of the Medium Density Residential Zone in the Lincolnshire Farm Development Plan should be amended to reflect the approved boundaries based on the plan approved under the resource consent SR No. SR416511.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>	Seeks that the Lincolnshire Farm Development Plan residential boundary is updated based on the plan approved under the resource consent WCC SR No. 416511 (BECA 3321886-S3-C-0023).
Rod Halliday	25.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the mapped SNAs within the Lincolnshire development area that have already been consented for earthworks and subdivision under SR416511 have already been identified to achieve development so it makes no sense to keep them.</p> <p>[Refer to map in original submission for details]</p>	Amend the Significant Natural Area overlay of the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area to remove those Significant Natural Areas already consented for earthworks and subdivision under the resource consent WCC SR No. 416511.
Rod Halliday	25.11	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 305 Mark Avenue (Lot 11 DP 544975) (Lincolnshire Farm) should not be zoned General Industrial Zone (GIZ) as this is located over a stream and on steep, undevelopable land. The majority of this area should fall under Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ). Does not want to be charged the rates for GIZ zoning.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason including map]</p>	Rezone part of the overlay at 305 Mark Avenue (Lincolnshire Farm) from 'General Industrial Zone' to 'Natural Open Space Zone'. [As illustrated in the submission]
Rod Halliday	25.12	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 305 Mark Avenue (Lot 11 DP 544975) (Lincolnshire Farm) should not be zoned General Industrial Zone (GIZ) as this is located over a stream and on steep, undevelopable land. A portion of this area should be zoned MRZ into where the current open space zoning is shown.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason including map showing area to be rezoned MRZ]</p>	Rezone part of the site at 305 Mark Avenue (Lincolnshire Farm) from 'General Industrial Zone' to 'Medium Density Residential Zone'. [As illustrated in the submission]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Halliday	25.13	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone should be extended to reflect the boundaries shown in the approved subdivision plans for the site at 224 Westchester Drive (resource consents WCC SR Nos. 338514, 421772, 501793)</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	<p>Rezone part of the overlay at 224 Westchester Drive from 'General Rural Zone' to 'Medium Density Residential Zone'.</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>
Heidi Snelson	FS24.14	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Submitter is looking to re-zone a general rural zone to medium density.</p> <p>In the original submission, the submitter is looking to discount the importance of ephemeral streams and the existence of important streams due to a supposed error in mapping they alone have identified. This is against Boffa Miskell's Upper Stebbings Valley Wellington Landscape and Ecology Analysis (2018) map of streams.</p> <p>Of greatest concern in relation to FUZ Glenside West is the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. submitter is looking to significantly alter council stipulated/designated no build areas in order to expand and increase non consulted development areas b. submitter is looking to significantly alter the roading plans and housing density across a wider area to further develop the area c. submitter is looking for rezoning of no build areas to Large Lot residential. <p>Overall, with no public consultation in an area of FUZ for which public consultation has been a requirement over the past 4 plus years - the submitter is asking for significant housing number increases, roading and housing density alterations.</p> <p>This is done via one sentence p59/62: Amend the Glenside West Development Area to reflect the attached marked up plan. (p62/62). A hand drawn plan involving none of the considerations given previously via both WCC and GWRC via Boffa Miskel and no public consultation should be disallowed at this stage of the District Plan process. The hand drawn map includes no SNA, no stream markings and does not take into account the extreme steepness of the terrain. It does not take into account the ecological values of the area. It does not show any mitigations for watershed management, nor does it follow UN Sustainable Development Goals to address climate change in such a high risk area.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed to reject the rezoning amendments sought within the Glenside West Development Area.</p> <p>Seeks that the Glenside West FUZ should be zoned Large Lot Residential only given it's extremely steep hillsides, it's areas of SNA, it's ecological values and the climate change risks posed to: Middleton Road below, Porirua Stream below, and National Railway line below.</p>
Rod Halliday	25.14	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that MDRZ overlay does not follow property boundaries at Atherton Terrace as shown in the approved subdivision plans (resource consents WCC SR Nos. 405728, 514495).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Rezone part of the overlay behind Atherton Terrace from 'Natural Open Space Zone' to 'Medium Density Residential Zone'.</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>
Rod Halliday	25.15	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that Lot 5 (DP524106) at 35 Bickerton Rise has recently transferred to WCC as reserve.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Rezone part of the overlay at 35 Bickerton Rise from 'Medium Density Residential Zone' to 'Natural Open Space Zone'</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>
Rod Halliday	25.16	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that a section of 15 Antigua Way has been incorrectly zoned as a Natural Open Space Zone and should instead be categorized as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Rezone the site at 15 Antigua Way from 'Natural Open Space Zone' to 'Medium Density Residential Zone' in its entirety.</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>
Rod Halliday	25.17	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that a section of 47 Grenada Drive within the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area could be rezoned as Medium Density Residential Zone. This section does not contain high quality native bush and is suitable for residential development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Rezone part of the site at 47 Grenada Drive from 'Natural Open Space Zone' to 'Medium Density Residential Zone'.</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Vik Holdings Ltd	31.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 15 Brougham Street should be rezoned from MRZ to HRZ.</p> <p>15 Brougham Street is a multi flat dwelling associated with the adjoining owners of 13 and 11 Brougham Street which are classified as HRZ. Together these three sites are approximately 2283m2 and would be suitable for total redevelopment.</p> <p>Under the Draft District Plan, 15 Brougham Street was classified as HDRZ.</p> <p>This property is set back 50 metres from the road and is not visible from Brougham Street. Any redevelopment would have no or minimal impact on the streetscape.</p>	Rezone 15 Brougham Street from Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Submitter 31 seeks to rezone 15 Brougham Street as High Density Residential Zone. Further submitter oppose this because it is an enclave of very historic, including 1 architecturally very significant, homes. It also abuts Claremont Grove, which we have proposed as a Heritage Area, and was originally considered part of it. (Ref our submission on the Proposed District Plan, where we submit that it should be part of the Claremont Grove Heritage Area.)</p>	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.115	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.</p>	Disallow
Gregory Webber	33.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that Green Street is classified as a character precinct - requiring rezoning to MRZ</p>	Rezone Green Street to Medium Density Residential Zone [inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.214	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.108	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.</p>	Allow
Gregory Webber	33.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes six storey buildings in Green Street and believes that two-three storey housing is acceptable.</p>	Seeks that only two-three storey housing is permitted in Green Street.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.215	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Robert and Chris Gray	46.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the transition between the Porritt Avenue heritage area and adjacent HRZ street does not adequately take account of areas where 21m or 28.5m buildings are permitted up against Character Precincts.</p> <p>As most properties on the eastern side of Porritt Avenue backs onto Austin Street (high density street), allowing for such heights with a minimum 5 metre boundary will destroy the heritage or character of the Porritt Avenue houses.</p>	Rezone Austin Street to a character area and decrease its height levels and site usage.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.197	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Margaret Ellis	48.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that DEV3 should not be approved and should be rezoned, as the current proposal has 122 dwellings and 3 cul-de-sacs in Glenside West. Large lot residential would be a more suitable use considering the topography of the land, which has steep gullies and ephemeral streams flowing through it, making the land unsuitable for intensive cut and L.L.R. would be more suited to the rural nature of Glenside.	Rezone DEV3 (Development Area: Upper Stebbings and Glenside West) from Future Urban Zone to Large Lot Residential Zone.
Scot Plunkett	57.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Lot 1 at 64B Peterhouse Street would benefit from being zoned as MRZ in its entirety. Lot 1 is more moderate and suitable for residential development, as shown in subdivision scheme plan 20W4-262. Zoning Lot 1 as MDRZ makes more sense as this land is not suited to rural or ridgeline & hilltops restrictions and it would allow potential development. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Rezone Lot 1 at 64B Peterhouse Street from Large Lot Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone in its entirety.
Andrew Gall	59.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	No other areas as close to CBD as 110 Mitchell Street are zoned as LLRZ. LLRZ is unsuitable zoning given the context of the area. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone 110 Mitchell Street and other nearby properties from Large Lot Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Coronation Real Estate Ltd has made significant investment in the development of the site. The site is currently subject to existing resource consents, a pending resource consent and an existing building consent relating to development on the residentially zoned (northern) part of the site. The proposed NOSZ zoning of the site in its entirety would make any potential future changes, additions or alterations inconsistent with the underlying zoning.	Rezone 9 Comber Place from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone .
Graham Mexted (No 2) Family Trust	66.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes HRZ zoning of 130 Main Road, Tawa. The building has been office space from the Tawa Borough Council use and rated commercially (rates & water) i.e. non-residential. It is currently used commercially as a cafe. At no time has the current owner used the building for residential use, as the Tawa Borough Council converted it into offices.	Rezone 130 Main Road, Tawa from High Density Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Conor Hill	76.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that significantly more land should be zoned for residential development to comply with Objective 2 of the NPS-UD. Considers that Takapu Valley was an option for Planning for Growth 2019 consultations and is therefore still a good option.	Seeks that Takapu Valley is rezoned to allow for more housing.
Conor Hill	76.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that significantly more land should be zoned for residential development to comply with Objective 2 of the NPS-UD. Considers that Ohariu Valley was an option for Planning for Growth 2019 consultations and is therefore still a good option.	Seeks that Ohariu Valley is rezoned to allow for more housing.
David Stephen	82.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre and seeks that it is rezoned as a Neighbourhood Centre.	Rezone Khandallah from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone)
Aro Valley Community Council	87.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 137 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to OSZ as this site forms part of Aro Park and there is a Mapping error.	Rezone 137 Abel Smith Street (Aro Park) from High Density Residential Zone to Open Space Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.11	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Oppose and further submit that:</p> <p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon.</p> <p>Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to jobs, shops, schools, community amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. The land is often the most resilient land in the city (being developed by colonists first). More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb.</p> <p>The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions.</p> <p>Therefore, the development capacity (and its associated positive outcomes) lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified.</p> <p>It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed.</p> <p>The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3).</p> <p>Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.236	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.8	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers the site at 39 Palmer Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ in order to classify the site as Character Precinct.</p>	<p>Rezone 39 Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.12	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.237	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 41 Palmer Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ in order to classify the site as Character Precinct.	Rezone 41 Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.13	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskell report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.238	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 43 Palmer Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ in order to classify the site as Character Precinct.	Rezone 43 Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.14	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskell report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.239	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.11	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 45 Palmer Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ in order to classify the site as Character Precinct.	Rezone 45 Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.15	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.240	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.12	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 141 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ for protection of Heritage and avoiding casting shadows on Aro Park.	Rezone 141 Abel Smith Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.16	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.241	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.135	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.13	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 143 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ for protection of Heritage and avoiding casting shadows on Aro Park.	Rezone 143 Abel Smith Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.17	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.242	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.136	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.14	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 145 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ for protection of Heritage and avoiding casting shadows on Aro Park.	Rezone 145 Abel Smith Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.18	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.243	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.137	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.15	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 147 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ for protection of Heritage and avoiding casting shadows on Aro Park.	Rezone 147 Abel Smith Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.19	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.244	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.138	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.16	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 290 Willis Street should be rezoned from CCZ to MRZ at the site contains a listed heritage building.	Rezone 290 Willis Street from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.21	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.246	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.18	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the sites on Boston Terrace should be zoned MRZ.	Rezone Boston Terrace from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.22	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.247	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.140	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.19	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the sites to the north and east of 95A Aro Street should be zoned MRZ.	Rezone the properties to the north and east of 95A Aro Street as Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.23	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.248	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.20	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the sites to the north and east of 95A Aro Street should be zoned MRZ.	Rezone the properties at 72, 82 and 84 Aro Street as Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.24	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.249	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.21	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 24 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.	Rezone 24 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.25	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.250	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.94	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 25 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.	Rezone 25 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.26	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.23	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 26 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.</p>	<p>Rezone 26 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.27	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.24	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 27 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.</p>	<p>Rezone 27 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.28	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.25	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 28 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.</p>	<p>Rezone 28 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.29	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.26	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 29 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.</p>	<p>Rezone 29 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.30	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.27	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 30 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.</p>	<p>Rezone 30 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.31	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.28	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that all lots between 109 - 181 Aro Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ. This is to allow their classification as Character Precinct.</p> <p>This areas has been identified by Boffa Miskell " ... seven broad sub-areas within this area that exhibit a noticeably coherent concentration of pre-1930 properties with primary and contributory characteristics". These sub-areas included:" An area extending along the southern edge of Aro Street".</p>	<p>Rezone all lots between 109 and 181 Aro Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.32	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Ian Law	101.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre and wants it rezoned as a Neighbourhood Centre.	Rezone Khandallah LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone)
Julie Patricia Ward	103.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Seeks that Khandallah is rezoned as LCZ in the maps.	Rezone Khandallah LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone).
Julie Patricia Ward	103.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Seeks that the shops at the corner of Box Hill and Baroda Street is rezoned as a NCZ in the maps.	Seeks that the LCZ (Local Centre Zone) at corner of Box Hill and Baroda Street be rezoned to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone)
292 Main Road Limited	105.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes 292 Main Road, Tawa being zoned as MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and seeks that it is rezoned as a HRZ (High Density Residential Zone). The site is within 700m walking distance from Lindon Station in Tawa which is a rapid transit stop and is therefore within a walkable catchment. WCC Spatial Plan puts the site within NPS-UD Policy 3 (c) areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone 292 Main Road, Tawa from MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) to HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tawa Business Group	107.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 1 Redwood Avenue, Tawa should be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>This site is currently used alongside 3 Redwood Avenue and 85 Main Road, Tawa for the purposes of the BestStart Tawa preschool and day-care centre. Rezoning to Mixed Use would acknowledge the current established activity taking place on site, and allow for future educational facilities to be subject to MUZ permitted activity standards.</p> <p>Rezoning 1 Redwood Avenue would match the MUZ of the property at 89 Main Road, and, being situated on a corner site, would not result in an inconsistent pattern of development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 1 Redwood Avenue, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.
Tawa Business Group	107.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 3 Redwood Avenue, Tawa should be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>This site is currently used alongside 1 Redwood Avenue and 85 Main Road, Tawa for the purposes of the BestStart Tawa preschool and daycare centre. Rezoning to Mixed Use would acknowledge the current established activity taking place on site, and allow for future educational facilities to be subject to MUZ permitted activity standards.</p> <p>Rezoning 1 Redwood Avenue would match the MUZ of the property at 89 Main Road, and, being situated on a corner site, would not result in an inconsistent pattern of development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 3 Redwood Avenue, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.
Tawa Business Group	107.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 85 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>This site is currently used alongside 1 Redwood Avenue and 3 Redwood Avenue, Tawa for the purposes of the BestStart Tawa preschool and day-care centre. Rezoning to Mixed Use would acknowledge the current established activity taking place on site, and allow for future educational facilities to be subject to MUZ permitted activity standards.</p> <p>Rezoning 1 Redwood Avenue would match the MUZ of the property at 89 Main Road, and, being situated on a corner site, would not result in an inconsistent pattern of development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 85 Main Road, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.
Tawa Business Group	107.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 105 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to High Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>This site (105 Main Road, 107 Main Road, 109 Main Road, 111 Main Road, 113 Main Road, and 115 Main Road, Tawa) includes a series of car yards, shops, eateries and offices but is entirely residential in use.</p> <p>Rezoning to High Density Residential would match the current lawful activity of the site and increase the capacity for residential development. NCZ permitted activity standards would require consent for any future residential activities on the ground floor level or any alterations that will result in the creation of new residential units. Under HRZ, these activities would remain as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Rezoning as HRZ would be consistent with the adjoining properties and create a contiguous area of HRZ properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 105 Main Road, Tawa from Neighbourhood Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tawa Business Group	107.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 107 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to High Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>This site (105 Main Road, 107 Main Road, 109 Main Road, 111 Main Road, 113 Main Road, and 115 Main Road, Tawa) includes a series of car yards, shops, eateries and offices but is entirely residential in use.</p> <p>Rezoning to High Density Residential would match the current lawful activity of the site and increase the capacity for residential development. NCZ permitted activity standards would require consent for any future residential activities on the ground floor level or any alterations that will result in the creation of new residential units. Under HRZ, these activities would remain as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Rezoning as HRZ would be consistent with the adjoining properties and create a contiguous area of HRZ properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 107 Main Road, Tawa from Neighbourhood Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
Tawa Business Group	107.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 109 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to High Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>This site (105 Main Road, 107 Main Road, 109 Main Road, 111 Main Road, 113 Main Road, and 115 Main Road, Tawa) includes a series of car yards, shops, eateries and offices but is entirely residential in use.</p> <p>Rezoning to High Density Residential would match the current lawful activity of the site and increase the capacity for residential development. NCZ permitted activity standards would require consent for any future residential activities on the ground floor level or any alterations that will result in the creation of new residential units. Under HRZ, these activities would remain as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Rezoning as HRZ would be consistent with the adjoining properties and create a contiguous area of HRZ properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 109 Main Road, Tawa from Neighbourhood Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
Tawa Business Group	107.8	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 111 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to High Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>This site (105 Main Road, 107 Main Road, 109 Main Road, 111 Main Road, 113 Main Road, and 115 Main Road, Tawa) includes a series of car yards, shops, eateries and offices but is entirely residential in use.</p> <p>Rezoning to High Density Residential would match the current lawful activity of the site and increase the capacity for residential development. NCZ permitted activity standards would require consent for any future residential activities on the ground floor level or any alterations that will result in the creation of new residential units. Under HRZ, these activities would remain as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Rezoning as HRZ would be consistent with the adjoining properties and create a contiguous area of HRZ properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 111 Main Road, Tawa from Neighbourhood Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tawa Business Group	107.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 113 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to High Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>This site (105 Main Road, 107 Main Road, 109 Main Road, 111 Main Road, 113 Main Road, and 115 Main Road, Tawa) includes a series of car yards, shops, eateries and offices but is entirely residential in use.</p> <p>Rezoning to High Density Residential would match the current lawful activity of the site and increase the capacity for residential development. NCZ permitted activity standards would require consent for any future residential activities on the ground floor level or any alterations that will result in the creation of new residential units. Under HRZ, these activities would remain as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Rezoning as HRZ would be consistent with the adjoining properties and create a contiguous area of HRZ properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 113 Main Road, Tawa from Neighbourhood Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
Tawa Business Group	107.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 115 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to High Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>This site (105 Main Road, 107 Main Road, 109 Main Road, 111 Main Road, 113 Main Road, and 115 Main Road, Tawa) includes a series of car yards, shops, eateries and offices but is entirely residential in use.</p> <p>Rezoning to High Density Residential would match the current lawful activity of the site and increase the capacity for residential development. NCZ permitted activity standards would require consent for any future residential activities on the ground floor level or any alterations that will result in the creation of new residential units. Under HRZ, these activities would remain as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Rezoning as HRZ would be consistent with the adjoining properties and create a contiguous area of HRZ properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 115 Main Road, Tawa from Neighbourhood Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
Tawa Business Group	107.11	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 130 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.</p> <p>This site is currently used for commercial purposes by the Fusion Food Haus Grocery & Café. Rezoning to Neighbourhood Centre Zone would match the current lawful activity of the site and allow for future commercial activities to remain as a permitted activity thus increasing capacity for commercial development. NCZ permitted activity standards would arguably be more suitable to the existing and future land uses of these properties, particularly in terms of height and active frontage controls.</p> <p>Rezoning as HRZ would be consistent with the adjoining properties on the southern boundary of 130 Main Road and 157 Main Road. As a property situated at the edge of the HRZ and NCZ, rezoning as NCZ would maintain contiguous zoning.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 130 Main Road, Tawa from High Density Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the western edge of Mt Victoria should not be CCZ (City Centre Zone)</p> <p>Considers that CCZ is incompatible with various definitions of Mt Vic as a suburb.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend mapping so that the western edge of Mount Victoria that is within the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Area.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.198	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Brian McKenna	113.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the zoning of Khandallah Village as LCZ should amended to NCZ. Considers that this area is not significantly different in size or level of business than any other "Centre" zones in the North-western suburbs. It is significantly smaller than the Karori "Local Centre".	Amend the zoning of Khandallah Village from Local Centre Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Pam Wilson	120.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the zoning of Khandallah Village as Local Centre Zone.	Amend the zoning of Khandallah Village from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone).
Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	121.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the smaller 10 minute walkable catchment from the city centre from the draft District Plan would have no benefits and shift development to less well-suited areas.	Amend the high density zoning and around the city centre to cover at least the area within a 15 minute walkable catchment (rather than the current 10 minute catchment)
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.35	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks to disallow in so far as the submission point relates to the classification of the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.45	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.49	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Retain 10 min walking catchment as this is most suitable for Wellington's topography and weather.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.79	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.45	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Retain 10 min walking catchment as this is most suitable for Wellington's topography and weather.	Disallow
Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	121.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that failing to identify the Johnsonville train line as a mass rapid transit in the PDP is contrary to other planning documents and would have significant negative impacts with respect to provision of housing.	Rezone the land within the walkable catchment around the Johnsonville train line as High Density Residential Zone.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.36	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks to disallow in so far as the submission point relates to the classification of the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.12	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.124	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Greater Wellington consider Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified a rapid transit service to align with the RLTP which support the 'up-zoning' of walkable catchments. Johnsonville Rail Line is recognised as a key part of the region's transport network.	Allow / Seeks review of walkable catchments and reclassification of Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.40	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Janice Young	140.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes Khandallah being zoned as a Local Centre and wants it to be zoned as a Neighbourhood Centre.	Rezone Khandallah as a Neighbourhood Centre in the mapping.
David Stevens	151.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre Zone and wants it rezoned to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Rezone Khandallah from Local Centre Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone in mapping.
David Stevens	151.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes Crofton Downs being a Local Centre Zone and wants it rezoned to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Rezone Crofton Downs from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone).
David Stevens	151.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the area at the junction of Box Hill/Burma Road/Station Road being an 11m MRZ.	Rezone the area at the junction of Box Hill/Burma Road/Station Road from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) with a height limit of 11m.
Ciampa Family Trust	165.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the northern part of the site at 50 Cleveland Street, Brooklyn should be rezoned as LCZ so that the site does not have split zoning and the northern part could be developed for non-residential purposes as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Considers that this is logical as it will enable greater intensification of a finite resource (land) on a site that is favourably located in close proximity to amenities, public transport routes, and the CBD.</p>	Rezone the northern part of the site at 50 Cleveland Street, Brooklyn from Medium Density Residential Zone to Local Centre Zone.
Brian Sheppard	169.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that LCZ are defined as having easy access to rapid transit public transport and that Churton Park should not be zoned as LCZ as its meagre bus service cannot be considered rapid transit public transport.	Seeks that Churton Park is not zoned as a Local Centre Zone.
Historic Places Wellington	182.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the Inner Residential suburbs should be zoned Medium Density Residential Zone. This means that all areas of character protection under the operative DP would have similar rules and height controls of 11metres (3 storey).	Rezone the Inner Residential Suburbs to the Medium Density Residential Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.101	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>All inner Residential suburbs should be MDZ</p> <p>Exemption from upzoning</p> <p>Importance of character areas</p> <p>Character Precincts, rules & design regime</p> <p>Extended Character Precincts in line with Boffa Miskell</p> <p>Demolition be a restricted activity for pre-1930 buildings</p> <p>New viewshaft for views of St Paul's</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.76	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is concerned about the potential loss in intensification opportunities if the proposed relief is granted.	Disallow
Emma Baines	185.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre and wants it rezoned as a Neighbourhood Centre. Khandallah has no more amenities than Ngaio or Crofton Downs and should not be treated differently to these other Neighbourhood Centres. The submitter travels from Khandallah to either Johnsonville or Crofton Downs to use the larger Countdown supermarkets and petrol stations.	Rezone Khandallah from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone).
Emma Baines	185.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the Station Road area being a Local Centre Zone. Considers that making this area of one café, a garage, and a restaurant a Local Centre Zone is completely overstated and must be an error given the number of shops in Ngaio which is still considered a neighbourhood centre.	Rezone the Station Road from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone)
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that there is inadequate protection provided where 28.5m high buildings are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by the Mt Victoria Historical Society. Allowing buildings of such heights with a 5 metre height to boundary will destroy the heritage or character from a visual point of view and reduce the well-being of residents due to insufficient light and sunshine. This will likely to lead to degradation and abandonment of these properties.	Amend the mapping to require a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zoned land at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and the City Centre Zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.172	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.82	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that an area of specific concern where afternoon sun can be blocked by 28.5m buildings is the Moir Street Heritage Area.	Amend the heights on the mapping to provide a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.173	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.83	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.8	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that an area of specific concern where afternoon sun can be blocked by 21m buildings (in Brougham, Roxburgh and Austin Streets, and Claremont Grove) is the current Elizabeth/Queen St and Pat Lawlor Close, Caroline Street and Scarborough Terrace Character Precincts.	Amend the heights on the mapping to provide a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.174	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.84	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that an area of specific concern where afternoon sun can be blocked by 21m buildings (in Tutchen Avenue) is part of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area.	Amend the heights on the mapping to provide a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.175	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.85	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that an area of specific concern where afternoon sun can be blocked by 28.5m buildings is the east side of Lipman Street.	Amend the heights on the mapping to provide a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.176	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.86	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.11	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the western edge of Mt Victoria should not be CCZ (City Centre Zone) Considers that CCZ is incompatible with various definitions of Mt Vic as a suburb. The current low-rise but historically dense residential area extends well into the area currently designated City Centre Zone and intended for building at least 10 storeys high. [refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend the mapping so that the western edge of Mount Victoria that is within the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred Decision Requested].
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.189	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.118	General / Mapping /Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Michael O'Rourke	194.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission.]	Amend the mapping to extend heritage area from 30% to 50% of the existing heritage area.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Michael O'Rourke	194.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that HRZ four storey or 21m high buildings will effectively mitigate most of the liveability rules about outdoor space, glazing, boundaries, sun angle boundary heights and site coverage. Considers that we need to minimise the spread of individual high rise building pockets. [Inferred reason given].	Seeks that high rise buildings are concentrated in zones already high (the CBD and faded warehouse spine in lower Adelaide Road).
Michael O'Rourke	194.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that height zoning should be applied more microscopically and be graduated based on neighbourhood, topography, and position on block in order to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.	Seeks that height zoning should be applied more microscopically and be graduated based on neighbourhood, topography, and position on block to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.
Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that it is contradictory to permit building intensification in the Kilbirnie, Lyall Bay, and Miramar suburbs, which are flood and tsunami prone, when the Government are not willing to invest in transport infrastructure (light rail) in the area due to its environmental vulnerability. In addition, the aging and unmaintained infrastructure will not tolerate this level of housing intensification.	Amend the mapping to reduce building intensification in the Eastern Suburbs area. [Inferred decision requested].
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace being zoned as High Density Residential Zone and seeks that it is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. Considers the impact of a 21m height limit on neighbouring properties. 21m height limit is inappropriate for the character of the surrounding area. Loss of solar access leads to damp homes and less energy efficient, loss of Biodiversity to the Newtown area, loss of wellbeing, and loss of Privacy. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace from HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.228	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.114	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that allowing buildings of heights of 21m or 28.5m with 5 metre boundaries will destroy heritage or character from a visual point of view and lead to degradation of such properties. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct or heritage area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.31	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	It is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent buildings.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.170	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.95	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.66	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.79	General / Mapping /Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes the western edge of the legal suburb of Mt Victoria being included in the CCZ (City Centre Zone).</p> <p>Considers that Cambridge Terrace forms the logical eastern boundary of the CCZ.</p> <p>Considers that CCZ is incompatible with the current, historical, Wellington City Council and Geographic Board definition of Mount Victoria as a suburb.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that the CCZ (City Centre Zone) east of Cambridge Terrace in Mount Victoria be rezoned to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.181	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.96	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and reduction of the city centre zone.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.67	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.87	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is necessary to protect heritage values of Mt Victoria heritage area (curtilage).	Allow
Boston Real Estate Limited	220.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the Natural Open Space Zone is inappropriate on a portion of the site because:</p> <p>The current operative plan has split the site into two separate zones, a business area zone and a residential zone.</p> <p>The Natural Open Space Zone is intended to recognise high natural, ecological and historic heritage values.</p> <p>The surrounding properties are maintaining similar zones from the operative district plan to the proposed district plans.</p> <p>it is held in private ownership. This means that the public will have no access along this area or be able to use it.</p> <p>This site is extremely steep and no development has occurred yet due to the difficult site conditions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Rezone the NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) at 62 Kaiwharawhara Road to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
RR Ventures (2018) Ltd	227.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes 166 Glanmire Road (Part Lot 8 DP 2205) being zoned as Large Lot Residential Zone and seeks that it is rezoned as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Considers that this section is 20,491 sq. mtr in area and is currently undeveloped. Considering the size and proximity to council's infrastructure, we believe the potential of the section can be further enhanced if it can be zoned residential, subdivided and developed to accommodate low to medium density housing.</p>	<p>Rezone 166 Glanmire Road (Part Lot 8 DP 2205) to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes Khandallah Village being a Local Centre Zone.</p> <p>Considers that Khandallah is similar to Ngaio, and Ngaio has an NCZ.</p> <p>All the elements required of an NCZ are present in Khandallah.</p> <p>There is a large distinction between Khandallah and other suburbs with LCZ.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Rezone Khandallah Village from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone)
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes Station Road/Baroda Street satellite shops being a Local Centre and seeks that it is rezoned as a Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>Considers that LCZ is inappropriate zoning for this area.</p> <p>This area is consistent with the PDP's description of NCZ.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Rezone Station Road/Baroda Street satellite shops from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone)
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the Brooklyn LCZ should be rezoned on the mapping to Mixed Use Zone.	Rezone Brooklyn from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to MUZ (Mixed Use Zone) on the mapping.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the Kingston LCZ should be expanded.	Seeks that the LCZ (Local Centre Zone) in Kingston is expanded.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the Vogeltown LCZ should be expanded.	Seeks that the LCZ (Local Centre Zone) in Vogeltown is expanded.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the Mornington LCZ should be expanded.	Seeks that the LCZ (Local Centre Zone) in Mornington is expanded.
Karepa Dell Developments	241.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Considers that the PDP states that Large Lot Residential Zone is for lower density developments that are generally located on the periphery of urban areas. The site that is located at 11 Makomako Road is located in Brooklyn and is approximately 4km from the CBD of Wellington. This is barely the periphery of the urban areas. The surrounding residential properties encapsulate this area. The zone encourages semi-urban setting, however the surrounding properties are all higher density properties and all of these properties can be further developed to hold three dwellings. The site is currently subject to a 20-lot subdivision under the resource consent SR 374681. This is currently being completed, however due to the Covid Pandemic and supply shortages has delayed this project being completed. A time extension was granted in April of 2022, with the works intended to be completed in 2025. This consent will create similar sized lots of the surrounding medium density residential properties. As such these future lots should be zoned as medium density residential zones and would allow for the future development of these properties just like the surrounding areas. The large lot residential zone will not be reflective of the property or a suitable outcome consistent with the NPS UD upon completion of the subdivision.</p>	Opposes the zoning of 11 Makomako Road as Large Lot Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Karepa Dell Developments	241.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the PDP states that Large Lot Residential Zone is for lower density developments that are generally located on the periphery of urban areas. The site that is located at 11 Makomako Road is located in Brooklyn and is approximately 4km from the CBD of Wellington. This is barely the periphery of the urban areas. The surrounding residential properties encapsulate this area. The zone encourages semi-urban setting, however the surrounding properties are all higher density properties and all of these properties can be further developed to hold three dwellings. The site is currently subject to a 20-lot subdivision under the resource consent SR 374681. This is currently being completed, however due to the Covid Pandemic and supply shortages has delayed this project being completed. A time extension was granted in April of 2022, with the works intended to be completed in 2025. This consent will create similar sized lots of the surrounding medium density residential properties. As such these future lots should be zoned as medium density residential zones and would allow for the future development of these properties just like the surrounding areas. The large lot residential zone will not be reflective of the property or a suitable outcome consistent with the NPS UD upon completion of the subdivision.	Rezone the property at 11 Makomako Road to a Medium Density Residential Zone to reflect the development that is occurring.
Adam King	246.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose in part	Opposes the zoning of 12a Parliament Street as Medium Density Residential.	Retain as notified with amendment below.
Adam King	246.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to add retain Operative District Plan zoning of the Inner Residential Zone for 12a Parliament Street.
Peter Charlesworth	248.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the portion of the site 11B Wilmshurst Place containing the existing dwelling should be zoned Medium Density Residential Zone to be consistent with the current Outer Residential Area zoning, as the LLRZ zoning will result in development that is inconsistent with the proposed zoning and form of development that surrounds the site directly to the north, east and west. Considers that there is no rationale for zoning the Outer Residential Area portion of the site as LLRZ to a less enabling zone, as this will be contrary to the NPS-UD. [Refer to submission for area of the site that the submission applies to] [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone the annotated portion of 11B Wilmshurst Place from LLRZ (Large Lot Residential Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone). [Refer to original submission for map of the area]
Generation Zero Inc	254.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that building heights of at least six storeys are enabled within a walkable catchment of the Johnsonville Rail line in accordance with the requirements of Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD.	Seeks that High Density Residential Zone is applied to all residential sites within a 15-minute walkable catchment of the rapid transit stops on the Johnsonville Rail line except where a justifiable qualifying matter applies.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.39	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet the National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.67	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NNPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Prime Property Group	256.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers the development area identified at 14 Epic Way to be an appropriate site for rezoning to Medium density residential, including because the site has services, has been designed to avoid impact on SNAs and would be in keeping with the area around [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks to rezone the development area within S17-1095-PDP1 (14 Epic Way) to Medium Density Residential.</p> <p>[See original submission for attachment]</p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.243	General / Mapping / General	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the rezoning could further exacerbate protrusions into the obstacle limitation surface due to the current 11m height limit specified in the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Disallow
Pauletta Wilson	257.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes the Mt Cook Area being zoned as High Density Residential Zone and seeks that it is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Considers that the effect of new 6-storey blocks on surrounding neighbours in existing houses, making them shadier, damper, less healthy, and unpleasant to live in.</p> <p>The provisions such as recession planes, privacy, outlook space and solar access are not adequate because the buildings in the HRZ can go right to the boundary.</p> <p>Supports intensification in the Mt Cook area but wants it done effectively and without unnecessary destruction of the diversity of the community, it's valuable assets and character,</p>	<p>Rezone the Mt Cook area from HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) with a height limit of 11m.</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.209	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wheeler Grace Trust	261.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the opportunity for residential intensification would be better reflected with HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).</p> <p>Changing from Inner Residential to City Centre Zone would drastically change Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>Opposes the element of the NPS-UD application regarding commercial activities.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace does not have a mix of land uses - it is all residential except the British High Commission, which has its frontage on Hill Street.</p> <p>For Selwyn Terrace to be CCZ it would need better road access.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace is unique and has character, making CCZ inappropriate.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Rezone Selwyn Terrace, Thorndon from CCZ (City Centre Zone) to HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.187	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.</p> <p>[Interred reference to submission 158.1]</p>	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.45	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the second access to St Gerards Monastery, Oriental Bay should be re-zoned from Open Space to MRZ. This is to match the zoning in the Operative District Plan. [shown in image in the full submission]</p>	<p>Seeks to re-zone second access to St Gerards Monastery, Oriental Bay should be re-zoned from Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>[shown in image in full submission].</p>
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.39	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial reality.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.46	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers 39 Chapman Street, Johnsonville should be re-zoned from Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to reflect the current residential use of the land.</p>	Seeks to re-zone 39 Chapman Street, Johnsonville as shown in image supplied in full submission from OSZ (Open Space Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.40	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Wellington City Council	266.47	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers part of 9 Comber Place, Johnsonville should be re-zoned from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to correct a mapping error. The part of 9 Comber Place to the east of the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay should be MRZ. This reflects the zoning of the Operative District Plan.</p>	Seeks to re-zone part of 9 Comber Place, Johnsonville (east of the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay) from NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as shown in image supplied in full submission.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.41	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial realty.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Supports that the Horokiwi site is zoned Special Purpose Quarry Zone, however two sites are not included, and amendments are sought to rezone two areas (being Pt Sec 17 Harbour District and Pt Sect 18 Harbour District from General Rural zone to Special Purpose Quarry zone, and part of Pt Sec 16 Harbour District from Open Space zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone). This would provide for the full utilisation of the quarry site and provide a more efficient consenting regime. Pt Sec 16 Harbour District is owned by Horokiwi Quarries Ltd, is included within the existing use certificate, and part of the site features the existing sediment pond. Public access within the site is restricted and the site has no passive or active recreational assets or activities. The land is not subject to a reserves management plan and other than its historical zoning, there appears no basis or justification for an Open Space Zoning in the PDP. A consistent zoning would therefore be logical and efficient.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	<p>Rezone Pt Sec 16 Harbour District from Open Space Zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for figures and attachments showing the area sought to be rezoned].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.8	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports that the Horokiwi site is zoned Special Purpose Quarry Zone, however two sites are not included, and amendments are sought to rezone two areas (being Pt Sec 17 Harbour District and Pt Sect 18 Harbour District from General Rural zone to Special Purpose Quarry zone, and part of Pt Sec 16 Harbour District from Open Space zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone). This would provide for the full utilisation of the quarry site and provide a more efficient consenting regime. Pt Sec 18 is owned by Horokiwi Quarries Ltd and is included within the existing use certificate. Pt Sec 17 Harbour District is not in the existing use certificate, but is owned by Horokiwi and is positioned between the existing quarry site and Pt Sect 18. A consistent zoning would therefore be logical and efficient. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Rezone Pt Sec 18 Harbour District and Pt Sec 17 Harbour District from General Rural Zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone. [Refer to original submission for figures and attachments showing the areas sought to be rezoned].
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) within the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West development should be zoned LLRZ (Large Lot Residential Zone). [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone Medium Density Residential Zone land at 395 Middleton Road in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Future Development Zone to Large Lot Residential Zone.
Mary Sullivan	277.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in the Prospect Terrace, Woodland Road, and the up-hill section of Frankmoore Avenue area. Considers that the area includes areas which are difficult to access on foot by most people, particularly elderly and people with young children or disabilities. Some of the area zoned as High density is up steep hills, with narrow roads, and have either no footpaths or footpaths on one side only. They are not therefore suitable for high density developments.	Rezone the area at Prospect Terrace, Woodland Road, and the up-hill section of Frankmoore Avenue from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Seeks that the Khandallah Centre is rezoned from Local Centre Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Rezone the Khandallah Centre from Local Centre Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Seeks that the area at Box Hill Road, Khandallah is rezoned from Local Centre Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Considers that the zoning of LCZ here is an error in the District Plan. This extends the MRZ beyond reasonable limits. Also, there is no footpath that makes the southern end of Simla Crescent accessible in its entirety within a reasonable walking catchment of the Khandallah centre.	Rezone the area at Box Hill Road, Khandallah from Local Centre Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Eldin Family Trust	287.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Considers that the rezoning of Selwyn Terrace would be a dramatic change and would enable activities that conflict with the current primary use of Selwyn Terrace as a distinct enclave of residential dwellings.</p> <p>Considers that the Council is incorrect to say that Selwyn Terrace already has a mixture of land uses.</p> <p>Does not agree that a land use change is necessary to support a mixture of activities and growth, considering the street is very narrow and steep access, with a single carriageway for much of its length. A change to a commercial zoning would place unreasonable demand on vehicle and pedestrian access.</p> <p>Considers that Selwyn Terrace has a high concentration of pre-1930s character as evidenced by the 2019 Pre-1930s character area review report.</p> <p>Considers that 9 Selwyn Terrace is an excellent example of the work of one of Wellington's pre-eminent architects of the 20th Century, William Gray Young.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace has special historic context as a reminder of the original suburb prior to the construction of the Wellington Motorway.</p> <p>Considers the plan provides sufficient development capacity without needing to change planning settings in Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes the rezoning of Selwyn Terrace in the Operative District Plan from Inner Residential Zone to City Centre Zone in the Proposed District Plan.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.2	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>This is a significant small enclave of quality residential character dwellings in Thorndon. Selwyn Terrace has a special historic context as a residential area that reminds us of the original extent of the residential suburb.</p>	Amend / Seeks that the submission be allowed and change Selwyn Terrace to Medium Density Residential Zone, and do this in harmony with the Portland residential enclave, and the Hobson residential precinct of Thorndon.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.289	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Eldin Family Trust	287.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the rezoning of Selwyn Terrace would be a dramatic change and would enable activities that conflict with the current primary use of Selwyn Terrace as a distinct enclave of residential dwellings.</p> <p>Considers that the Council is incorrect to say that Selwyn Terrace already has a mixture of land uses.</p> <p>Does not agree that a land use change is necessary to support a mixture of activities and growth, considering the street is very narrow and steep access, with a single carriageway for much of its length. A change to a commercial zoning would place unreasonable demand on vehicle and pedestrian access.</p> <p>Considers that Selwyn Terrace has a high concentration of pre-1930s character as evidenced by the 2019 Pre-1930s character area review report.</p> <p>Considers that 9 Selwyn Terrace is an excellent example of the work of one of Wellington's pre-eminent architects of the 20th Century, William Gray Young.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace has special historic context as a reminder of the original suburb prior to the construction of the Wellington Motorway.</p> <p>Considers the plan provides sufficient development capacity without needing to change planning settings in Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Selwyn Terrace, Thorndon is rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.290	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.176	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Phillippa O'Connor	289.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should be rezoned to HRZ because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university. <p>[See original submission for full details]</p>	Seeks that the western side of Kelburn Parade is rezoned to the High Density Residential Zone with a maximum building height of 21m.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that if agreement cannot be reached with Council on appropriate tenure for the land currently identified as MRZ, seeks that Large Lot Residential for the remaining land and a portion of land comprising some 5,500m² next to Silverstream Road as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Considers request of alternative approach is to the balance land is because it is not appropriate to zone private land for what is considered essentially a public work (Reserve).</p>	Seeks that If agreement cannot be reached with Council on appropriate tenure for the land currently identified as Medium Density Residential Zone, then the submitter seeks Large Lot Residential for the remaining land and a portion of land comprising some 5,500m ² next to Silverstream Road as Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.25	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m2) as MDRZ. These proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through rouse to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m2 is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m)and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values. Development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow
Jo McKenzie	FS64.25	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m2) as MDRZ. Considers that these proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through rouse to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m2 is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m)and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values. Considers that development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.17	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Forest & Bird strongly opposes alternative zoning of land adjoining Silverstream Road to enable the submitter's Kilmarnock subdivision. The land adjoining Silverstream Road is a high-quality SNA (WCO60) with some of the best primary forest remnants left within the city limits. Large Lot Residential zoning and a small area of Medium Density Residential or equivalent zoning adjoining Silverstream Road would be contrary to the ECO provisions of the plan and not give effect to policies 23 & 24 of the RPS or s6 of the RMA.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.45	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.7]	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.60	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Oppose	Considers that it is reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.70]	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Parsons Green Trust	291.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that The current and ongoing childcare centre use of the PGT land would better align with the purpose of the MUZ, and the MUZ provisions would better enable commercial and mixed use development opportunities to service the surrounding residential catchment,</p> <p>A MUZ and MDRZ zone interface is not out of the ordinary. The PGT land is similarly located on the corner of Redwood Avenue / Main Road and adjoins the General Industrial Zone to the east. Furthermore, in order to address the interface with residential zones The MUZ contains rules relating to buildings and standards, noting that Rule MUZ-S5 requires windows on walls adjacent to Residential Zones to comprise of opaque privacy glazing to mitigate privacy or overlooking onto adjoining residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>MUZ is the most appropriate zoning for the PGT land. Applying the MUZ to the PGT land would create a practical zoning boundary and the MUZ contains provisions which manage potential privacy and amenity effects on adjoining MDRZ sites.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Rezone 1 & 3 Redwood Avenue and 85 Main Road, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.
Priscilla Williams	293.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the hilly terrain makes this area unsuitable for high rise building.	Rezone the area spanning Wesley Road, Aurora Terrace and Bolton Street from HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.173	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Tawa Community Board	294.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that land at 10 Surrey Street is one of the largest parcels of single-ownership land on the valley floor, very near the town centre and Tawa Station, and one of the most suitable sites for the highest height limit to encourage future development of centre-like mixed housing and business use.	Rezone 10 Surrey Street, Tawa from Mixed Use Zone to Local Centre Zone in the mapping.
Tawa Community Board	294.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Rezone 105 - 115 Main Road, Tawa from NCZ to HRZ.</p> <p>Considers that if zoned as NCZ, 105 - 115 Main Road, Tawa they could be subject to specific controls around active frontage and non-residential activity, should the owners wish to amend their building in the future and could cause issues should they wish to sell. These properties currently contain residential-only buildings.</p>	Rezone 105, 107, 109, 111, 113 and 115 Main Road, Tawa from Neighbourhood Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
Dawid Wojasz	295.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that Johnsonville Rail line should be considered as rapid transit for the purposes of its impact of Zoning and walkable catchments.</p> <p>It is a significant rail corridor and high density housing should be encouraged along its route to allow efficient access to public transport.</p>	<p>Seeks that high density residential zone be located within a 15 minute walkable catchment from stations along the Johnsonville rail line.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Submitter would like to amend the extent of residential zoning within the PDP to reflect the existing split of residential and open space zoning of 44 Rhine Street in the operative district plan.</p> <p>This is to reflect the aspirations the submitter has for the site in the next 10-15 years. At this stage, the Trust do not have the resources to comprehensively address contamination and geotechnical issues, so would like to revert to the zoning shown in the operative district plan (changing additional Medium Residential Zone back to Open Space).</p>	Seeks that land at 44 Rhine Street, Island Bay that has been rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone from Natural Open Space Zone, be rezoned back to Natural Open Space Zone in the mapping.
Paul Blaschke	FS129.2	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Supports submission points relating to land that has been rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone from Natural Open Space Zone, be rezoned back to Natural Open Space Zone in the mapping. This position reflects the historical understanding reached between the Trust and the Manawa Karioi Society, which retains and protects the Open Space reserve nature of the bush areas, at the same time as identifying land within the 44 Rhine Street lot that could be developed to support the aspirations of the Trust and of the wider Maori and city populations.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Submitter requests their land be returned to zoning which existed within the Operative District Plan (Open Space Zone - Conservation). [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Open Space Zone - Conservation to the Proposed District Plan. [Inferred decision requested]
Paul Blaschke	FS129.3	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Supports submission points relating to land that has been rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone from Natural Open Space Zone, be rezoned back to Natural Open Space Zone in the mapping. This position reflects the historical understanding reached between the Trust and the Manawa Karioi Society, which retains and protects the Open Space reserve nature of the bush areas, at the same time as identifying land within the 44 Rhine Street lot that could be developed to support the aspirations of the Trust and of the wider Maori and city populations.	Allow
Parkvale Road Limited	298.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that part of site (200 Parkvale Road), immediately adjacent to the existing urban area, are suitable for rezoning to Medium Density Residential Zone. Considers area proposed for rezoning is a discreet and naturally contained area that while physically connected to the existing urban area is visually separated by existing topography. The area currently contains 3 existing dwellings, provides access to a further two existing dwellings adjacent to the site (173 and 175 Parkvale Road), and resource consent is in place for the construction of five additional dwellings. Rezoning of the site will provide for additional urban development capacity on this site that will give effect to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) as a logical extension of the existing urban footprint. Rezoning of this area and its subsequent development would not interfere with the Skyline walkway.	Seeks that part of property (200 Parkvale Road) is rezoned from General Rural Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.39	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	We can see that a change from General Rural Zone to MRZ in the vicinity of Parkvale Ave has merit given the proximity to existing urban development. Appropriate ecological assessment is required to ensure biodiversity values are protected however.	Allow
Andy Foster	FS86.67	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes the request from Parkvale Road Limited to rezone both parts of the site. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 298.1].	Disallow
Parkvale Road Limited	298.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that part of site (200 Parkvale Road) is suitable for rezoning to Large Lot Residential Zone. This area is accessed from the end of Montgomery Avenue and is traversed by a number of tracks, notably the Skyline Walkway. Considers that the topography of the area results in a number of gully systems that fall away to the west and that a small number of large residential allotments can be created in these gully systems in a discreet manner that does not adversely affect the landscape and amenity values of the site.	Seeks that part of property (200 Parkvale Road at Parkvale Road) is rezoned from General Rural Zone to Large Lot Residential Zone. [Refer to original submission, including map of the area]
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.40	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Large scale residential allotments in gully systems would, in our view, adversely impact the ecology of these systems. Any properties in these locations would require road and services access and effectively have an impact on the skyline walkway experience. It would also conflict with the purpose of the Outer Green Belt as a buffer zone between urban and rural lifestyle and its value as a natural wildlife corridor.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.68	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes the request from Parkvale Road Limited to rezone both parts of the site. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 298.2].	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Parkvale Road Limited	298.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that part of site (200 Parkvale Road), suitable for rezoning to Large Lot Residential Zone and Open Space Zone due to purpose of LLRZ and ability to enable public access. [Refer to original submission for full details]	Seeks that part of property (200 Parkvale Road at Montgomery Avenue) is rezoned from General Rural Zone to a mixture of Large Lot Residential Zone and Open Space Zone.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.41	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	As per comment above, it is not appropriate to enable development in sensitive gully systems.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.69	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes the request from Parkvale Road Limited to rezone both parts of the site. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 298.3].	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Adelaide Road should not be classified as CCZ. The street is likely unsuitable for the creation of further high-rise areas due to it being the former boggy route of a wetland stream. Medium-rise development to the level of 5-6 storeys and the occasional nine storey tower should be continued.	Rezone Adelaide Road from City Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.212	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.20	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 2, 4 and 6 Boston Terrace should not be zoned HRZ, as the six storey heights in this location would adversely affect a large number of existing infill dwellings on Boston Terrace, creating shade, dampness and privacy issues for many people.	Rezone 2 Boston Terrace, 4 Boston Terrace and 6 Boston Terrace from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.263	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.108	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.153	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.21	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Palmer Street should not be surrounded on four sides by buildings with permitted heights of six storeys. Palmer Street is identified in the Proposed Plan as a "character precinct" with an 11m height limit for new buildings. Palmer Street already experiences significant shading from the existing high rise located between Palmer and Abel Smith Streets.	Seeks that all High Density Residential Zones adjoining Palmer Street be rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.264	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	FS96.109	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.154	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Palmer Street should not be surrounded on four sides by buildings with permitted heights of eight storeys. Palmer Street is identified in the Proposed Plan as a "character precinct" with an 11m height limit for new buildings. Palmer Street already experiences significant shading from the existing high rise located between Palmer and Abel Smith Streets.	Seeks that all City Centre Zones adjoining Palmer Street be rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.265	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.110	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.155	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.23	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from CCZ to MRZ at the sites on the west side of Willis Street between Aro Street and Abel Smith Street. Considers these sites are only included in the City Centre zone due to an historical mapping error repeatedly acknowledged but unaddressed by WCC. In essence this area was 10 covered by the 1960s designation for the Te Aro motorway, but when that designation was removed the boundary was not adjusted. Ten storeys over 100% of the site is not appropriate for this location. These sites would still be zoned up to six storeys once rezoned.	Rezoning the sites on the west side of Willis Street between Aro Street and Abel Smith Street from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.266	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.111	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.156	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	305.24	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from NCZ to MRZ between 72 and 82 Aro Street. This section of the North side of Aro Street was zoned to reflect its residential nature until rezoned around a decade ago as a result of a further submission by a single land owner (the owner of the Garage Project site). There is no well founded resource management reason to zone this residential section of Aro Street as "centre". Indeed, there are at least two shops currently used as flats, one vacant shop, and one shop operating as a ground floor office.	Rezone 72 - 82 Aro Street from Neighbourhood Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.267	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.112	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.157	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Wilma Sherwin	306.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from LCZ to NCZ in Khandallah.	Rezone Khandallah from Local Centre Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Amend the zoning of Aro Street from HRZ to MRZ.	Rezone Aro Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.159	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 313.2]	Allow
Penelope Borland	317.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the rezoning of Mount Victoria from HRZ to MRZ. The balance between upzoning areas for increased density and retaining valuable character areas has not been struck appropriately by the Council and needs to be changed. More character areas can be retained without affecting the required housing needed.	Rezone Mount Victoria from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.182	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.130	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Penelope Borland	317.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ at the top of Marjoribanks Street.	Rezone the top of Marjoribanks Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.183	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Penelope Borland	317.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ on Hawker Street. Removing access to sunlight with 6 storey buildings in front of houses will result in poor mental and physical health outcomes, damp houses and overall negative impacts on wellbeing.	Rezone Hawker Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.184	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.126	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Penelope Borland	317.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ for the entirety of Earls Terrace. The street has and will remain constrained by poor access and infrastructure and therefore should not be zoned for high density.	Rezone Earls Terrace from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.185	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.127	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Penelope Borland	317.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ for the entirety of Port Street. The street has and will remain constrained by poor access and infrastructure and therefore should not be zoned for high density.	Rezone Port Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.186	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.128	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Penelope Borland	317.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ for the entirety of Stafford Street. The street has and will remain constrained by poor access and infrastructure and therefore should not be zoned for high density.	Rezone Stafford Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.187	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.129	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Hilary Watson	321.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the upzoning of 73.2 percent of Newtown as HRZ is not respectful of the City's historic heritage and will result in the irretrievable loss of character, distinctiveness and identity across the suburb, including Character Precincts. The HRZ in the area will not effectively achieve the strategic direction supporting the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing, as well as their health and safety. High Density zoning will also cause new housing to only be affordable to those with incomes above the median. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Reduce the extent of the High Density Residential Zone in Newtown and rezone as Medium Density Residential Zone in the mapping. [Inferred decision requested]
Richard Murcott	322.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ at the block bounded by Hobson St, Davis St, Moturoa St, Murphy St, Turnbull St, and Fitzherbert Tce in Thorndon.	Rezone the residential area bounded by Hobson St, Davis St, Moturoa St, Murphy St, Turnbull St, and Fitzherbert Tce in Thorndon from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.45	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.287	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.178	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.19	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the rezoning of Mount Victoria from HRZ to MRZ, aside from Kent Terrace.	Rezone Mount Victoria from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone, except Kent Terrace. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.192	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.98	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.122	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the North Bolton St Character Area should be expanded to include Wesley Road as a Character Precinct. Notes that the 2019 Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Area Character Review concluded that the Wesley Rd area needed to be further investigated as a potential Character Area. This area had not been studied in detail for the Report as had other areas such as Thorndon and Mt Victoria. Therefore many submissions were made to WCC in the previous round from ninety concerned Lower Kelburn residents, adding to our earlier written and oral submissions that had provided strong evidence that this area should have Character Precinct status, and not be kept as high density with a 21 m height limit. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendix]	Amend the extent of the North Bolton St Character Area to include Welsey Road as a Character Precinct.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.269	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.164	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the rezoning of the Wesley Street area from HRZ to MRZ, with height limits of 11m for dwellings. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendix]	Rezone Wesley Road from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.270	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.165	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the rezoning of all addresses adjacent to the open Community Centre grounds and the community recreational area on Aro Street from HRZ to MRZ. A High Density zoning is inappropriate for the requirements of this well-used inner city community area, that includes a basket ball court and a pedestrian cycle access way through the park to the top of Palmer street and into Wellington city. This is most likely an accident and should be corrected, as sunlight needs to reach the park.	Rezone all addresses adjacent to the open Community Centre grounds and the community recreational area on Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Residential Zone.
U.S. Embassy Wellington	366.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	As identified on a provided map [see original submission], seeks an amendment to the mapping to exclude all properties highlighted in red on the supplied map from the proposed 27m height limit and subject to a 10m height limit. This is for security reasons.	Amend the CCZ (City Centre Zone) Maps so that all properties highlighted in red on the supplied map [see original submission] are exempt from the 27m height limit and subject to a 10m height limit.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.29	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	The U.S. Embassy Wellington's desire for neighbouring properties to be restricted to a maximum height of 10m aligns with the TRA's submission to add a character precinct for the Hobson area and to rezone the entire Hobson precinct as MDRZ. TRA respectfully highlight that this concern (or similar) would be matched by other 'special' properties situated in the vicinity. The Hobson precinct of Thorndon is valued for its special character, and height and other controls have very effectively maintained these special character values, and charm to this part of the city. TRA submit that the TRA's submission (#333) to change the PDP to medium density residential zoning in the Hobson precinct, and introducing a character precinct for the Hobson area, would help address the concerns of this submitter. [Refer to Further Submission for full reasons including extract from U.S. Embassy submission].	Allow
U.S. Embassy Wellington	366.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	As identified on a provided map [see original submission], seeks an amendment to the mapping to exclude all properties highlighted in red on the supplied map from the proposed 22m minimum height and subject to a 10m height limit. This is for security reasons.	Amend the CCZ (City Centre Zone) Maps so that all properties highlighted in red on the supplied map [see original submission] are exempt from the proposed 22m minimum height and are subject to a 10m height limit
Elizabeth Nagel	368.12	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Retain all pre-1930s areas as they are in the Operative District Plan.	Retain all pre-1930s areas as they are in the Operative District Plan.
Waka Kotahi	370.8	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct is more appropriate to apply as an overlay and/or the area to be rezoned to high density residential.	[Inferred decision requested] Rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct that is within the Medium Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.2	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone, and ask the council to disallow this parts of the submission from Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.103	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant amenity value and character in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.2	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value,for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified as a rapid transit service. As a permanent transit route capable of large capacity carriage of people, the Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified as a rapid transit service. GWRC's Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 recognises the route as a rapid transit route. The line also fits the definition of a rapid transit route in the NPS-UD definitions for the purpose of giving effect to Policy 3(c). With the suburbs along this line well served by commercial and community facilities, and with land available that could accommodate denser development, it makes no sense for this route not to be classified in this way, and provision made for higher density development. We are facing a climate crisis and a housing crisis: this area must shoulder some of the change necessary to reduce Wellingtonian's carbon footprint, and increase housing availability and affordability along transport routes well served by community facilities, which this is.	Amend the Maps to add the Johnsonville Rail Line as a Rapid Transit Service and adjust the walking catchments to reflect this.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.42	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	The walking catchments used in the district plan are inconsistent between the rapid transit stops they relate to. These are also more conservative than those being proposed by both Porirua and Hutt City, and considerably more conservative than those proposed by Auckland City. In light of the urgent need to reduce Wellingtonians' carbon footprint, reduce congestion, and significantly improve housing options, this makes no sense. We seek that the plan takes a consistent approach, applying the definition provided by Section 5.5 the MfE guidance in relation to the NPS-UD, and revising its walking catchment definitions to at least match those of its adjacent cities.	Amend the walkable catchments associated with the central city, any areas classed as 'metropolitan centres' and with rapid transit stops to bring them in line with the approach being taken by Hutt City, Porirua and Auckland City, as follows: (a) A 15-minute walk (around 1200 metres) from the edge of the City Centre Zone; and (b) A 10-minute walk (around 800 metres) from existing and planned rapid transit stops (c) A 10-minute walk (around 800 metres) from the edge of a Metropolitan Centre Zone Within these areas, amend the zoning requirements accordingly, to reflect, as a minimum, increased building heights provisions of 6 storeys, and other bulk and location elements as relevant to a higher density zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.52	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.86	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.43	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ann Mallinson	FS3.22	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.24	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.32	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.37	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.46	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Ann Mallinson	FS3.23	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.25	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.17	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential with a 'Te Motu Kairangi Precinct' with associated objectives, policies, rules and standards to recognise the cultural and environmental overlays over the site whilst enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.17	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.27	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Taranaki Whānui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer. Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.
Geoff Todd	FS21.3	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes any amendment to the natural open space zone on Watts Peninsula and in the vicinity of the prison: a) This request goes against what I understood was agreed by government and Iwi as part of the Waitangi settlement process in which Iwi acquired Shelley Bay for redevelopment and the parties agreed that "Watts Peninsula should be protected, preserved and developed as a distinctive national destination that brings together the natural environment, national heritage, recreation, culture and the arts" b) As described above the area has important historical features to be preserved, recreational benefits, visual and natural features and is important as a site for regenerating the biological diversity once present on the peninsula. Any further habitation will negatively impact the area.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.5	General/ Mapping/ Rezone/ Rezone	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.17].</p>	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.249	General/ Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.17	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.27	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whānui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.17	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lance Lones	FS81.3	General/ Mapping/ Rezone/ Rezone	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.116	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.43	Part 3 / Designations / General point on Designations / General point on Designations	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and the proposed zoning of the prison land. This is an important part of Wellington's current green space, which Wellington Civic Trust has had a long interest and involvement in, and the overlays and zoning are appropriate.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.11	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whanui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whanui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whanui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.17]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.97	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that there is significant heritage buildings (Mount Crawford Prison and WWI gun emplacements are located on Watts peninsular and require heritage recognition and protection, currently provided by the open space and town belt designations.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.18	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone that would include objectives, policies, rules and standards to recognise the cultural and environmental overlays over the site whilst enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.
Geoff Todd	FS21.4	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes any amendment to the natural open space zone on Watts Peninsula and in the vicinity of the prison: a) This request goes against what I understood was agreed by government and Iwi as part of the Waitangi settlement process in which Iwi acquired Shelley Bay for redevelopment and the parties agreed that "Watts Peninsula should be protected, preserved and developed as a distinctive national destination that brings together the natural environment, national heritage, recreation, culture and the arts" b) As described above the area has important historical features to be preserved, recreational benefits, visual and natural features and is important as a site for regenerating the biological diversity once present on the peninsula. Any further habitation will negatively impact the area.	Disallow
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned. Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment. Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula. [Inferred reference to submission 389.18].	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.250	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.18	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.4	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.117	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.44	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Rezone	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and the proposed zoning of the prison land. This is an important part of Wellington's current green space, which Wellington Civic Trust has had a long interest and involvement in, and the overlays and zoning are appropriate.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.12	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whānui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.18]</p>	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.98	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that there is significant heritage buildings (Mount Crawford Prison and WWI gun emplacements are located on Watts peninsular and require heritage recognition and protection, currently provided by the open space and town belt designations.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.19	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to any other suitable zone that will enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social, and economic wellbeing.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.28	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer.</p> <p>Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Geoff Todd	FS21.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Opposes any amendment to the natural open space zone on Watts Peninsula and in the vicinity of the prison:</p> <p>a) This request goes against what I understood was agreed by government and Iwi as part of the Waitangi settlement process in which Iwi acquired Shelley Bay for redevelopment and the parties agreed that "Watts Peninsula should be protected, preserved and developed as a distinctive national destination that brings together the natural environment, national heritage, recreation, culture and the arts"</p> <p>b) As described above the area has important historical features to be preserved, recreational benefits, visual and natural features and is important as a site for regenerating the biological diversity once present on the peninsula. Any further habitation will negatively impact the area.</p>	Disallow
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.7	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.19].</p>	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.251	General/ Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.28	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whānui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.19	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks.</p> <p>This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.118	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.45	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Rezone	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and the proposed zoning of the prison land. This is an important part of Wellington's current green space, which Wellington Civic Trust has had a long interest and involvement in, and the overlays and zoning are appropriate.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.13	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whanui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whanui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whanui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.19]</p>	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.99	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that there is significant heritage buildings (Mount Crawford Prison and WWI gun emplacements are located on Watts peninsular and require heritage recognition and protection, currently provided by the open space and town belt designations.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.20	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that in addition to any amendment from rezoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST is amended from Natural Open Space Zone, that any other such amendments that are most appropriate to address this submission.
Geoff Todd	FS21.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Opposes any amendment to the natural open space zone on Watts Peninsula and in the vicinity of the prison:</p> <p>a) This request goes against what I understood was agreed by government and Iwi as part of the Waitangi settlement process in which Iwi acquired Shelley Bay for redevelopment and the parties agreed that "Watts Peninsula should be protected, preserved and developed as a distinctive national destination that brings together the natural environment, national heritage, recreation, culture and the arts"</p> <p>b) As described above the area has important historical features to be preserved, recreational benefits, visual and natural features and is important as a site for regenerating the biological diversity once present on the peninsula. Any further habitation will negatively impact the area.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.8	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.20].</p>	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.252	General/ Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.20	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks.</p> <p>This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lance Lones	FS81.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.119	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.100	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that there is significant heritage buildings (Mount Crawford Prison and WWI gun emplacements are located on Watts peninsular and require heritage recognition and protection, currently provided by the open space and town belt designations.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.21	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the proposed Mixed-Use Zone only extends across the areas of existing built development. The Shelly Bay Taikuru site is proposed to be rezoned 'Mixed-Use Zone' with a maximum building height of 12m.	Seeks that Mixed-Use Zone is amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings. [Refer to original submission for map]
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.18	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.18	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.40	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.26	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that notified Local Centres in Miramar, Tawa and Newtown should be classified as Town Centre zones for their role and function within Wellington City.</p>	Rezone the Miramar, Tawa and Newtown Local Centre Zones from Local Centre Zones to Town Centre Zones.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.24	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.27	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details] . 4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone. 6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details]. 7. Any consequential updates to maps.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.25	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.28	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details] . 4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone. 6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details]. 7. Any consequential updates to maps.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.29	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Seeks that the Kilbirnie Bus Barns are re-zoned from Medium Density Residential Zone to the High Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the Kilbirnie Bus Barns are re-zoned from Medium Density Residential Zone to the High Density Residential Zone.
Bus Barn Ltd	FS95.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Kāinga Ora seeks to rezone the development from MDRZ to HDRZ. Bus Barn Limited supports this proposal as it will align with the increase in height control and allow for a more permissive development.	Allow / Rezone Bus Barn from MRZ to HRZ
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has qualities, including visibility which should qualify it as a character area. The submitter considers that Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has a particularly charming ambience and modification to the houses has generally been in keeping with the Mt Victoria architecture.	Amend zoning from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone for Earls Terrace, Port Street and Stafford Street.
Investore Property Limited	405.14	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the current zoning disregards the NPS-UD direction. The Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such it should apply full NPS-UD zoning (six-storey). [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Rezone the Johnsonville line from MRZ to HRZ and provide building heights of at least six storeys within a 10-minute walkable catchment of the stations on the Johnsonville Rail Line. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.18	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Agree that the current zoning disregards the NPS-UD direction. The Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such it should apply full NPS-UD zoning.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	405.15	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that the exclusion of the Johnsonville rail line from "rapid transit" and high density residential zoning within catchments of a train station is inappropriate and inconsistent with the NPS-UD, Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan and Change 1 to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement.	Seeks that 10-minute walkable catchments of a the Johnsonville train line are rezoned to High Density Residential.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.7	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.21	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Submitter acknowledges that the margins of its site at Lyall Bay and Evans Bay are within the coastal environment, as defined by the NZCPS and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement. However both margins are heavily modified for airport activities and roading infrastructure. Submitter expresses concern that the complex relationship between the Coastal Environment, Infrastructure and Airport Zone provisions creates an inefficient consenting pathway for airport and airport related activities.	Seeks to delete the Airport Zone within the Coastal Environment overlay (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.180	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that Wellington International Airport is in the coastal environment. Considers that it is something they need to consider with all their decisions. Considers that removing the airport out of this overlay would be a nonsense when both ends of the airport north Evans Bay and south with Lyall Bay surrounded by sea.	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the coastal environment overlay.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or, A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Remove the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from the Natural Open Space zone and rezone to an alternative more appropriate zone (such as Airport Zone) or sub zone. (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.185	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the majority of the seawall is below MHWS. It is important to understand that this area is a natural open space with impacts of the coastal process on the wall. The sea wall above MHWS needs to recognise RMA s6 matters of natural importance and promotion of the integrated management and consistency with the regional plan.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed relating to the removal of the land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from the Natural Open Space Zone to the Airport Zone. Remove any 'bespoke planning framework' from the Natural Open Space land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. Retain the Lyall Bay Sea Wall in the Natural Open Space Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.23	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) zoning in the area on the Sea Wall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and seeks that it is rezoned.</p> <p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Rezone the area on the Sea Wall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from Natural Open Space Zone to Airport Zone.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.186	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Considers the majority of the seawall is below MHWS. It is important to understand that this area is a natural open space with impacts of the coastal process on the wall. The sea wall above MHWS needs to recognise RMA s6 matters of natural importance and promotion of the integrated management and consistency with the regional plan.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed relating to the removal of the land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from the Natural Open Space Zone to the Airport Zone.</p> <p>Remove any 'bespoke planning framework' from the Natural Open Space land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>Retain the Lyall Bay Sea Wall in the Natural Open Space Zone.</p>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires district plans to enable building heights of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of the edge of metropolitan centre zones (Policy 3(c)).</p>	Seeks that the areas surrounding the Kilbirnie Metropolitan Centre Zone be rezoned as High Density Residential Zone (in a similar way to the inclusion of areas surrounding the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone and within Newtown).
Johnsonville Community Association	429.15	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that re-zoning rural land for urban purposes is needed to provide more space for affordable housing.</p> <p>Takapu Valley and Ohariu Valley has been land-banked by developers. These areas can potentially account for 25% of future population growth.</p>	Seeks that Takapu Valley is rezoned to residential zones.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.16	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that re-zoning rural land for urban purposes is needed to provide more space for affordable housing.</p> <p>Takapu Valley and Ohariu Valley has been land-banked by developers. These areas can potentially account for 25% of future population growth.</p>	Seeks that Ohariu Valley is rezoned to residential zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Miriam Moore	433.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan provides a good opportunity to rezone the general industrial pocket along Main Road (south of Tawa Street) in Tawa to Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>Considers that this is a water sensitive area, adjacent to Redwood Train Station and multiple schools. General industrial activity often requires car access and can be sensitive to surrounding residential activities - ample GIZ area is now provided in Grenada North, which has more appropriate setting for this type of activity. The existing activity isn't overly sensitive, and would largely be permitted in a Mixed Use Zone, so there is an opportunity to rethink this area as a Mixed Use Zone that would be better fitting with the surrounding context. Zoning this area Mixed Use Zone would provide higher amenity, more compact and efficient land-use, and a better arrival experience into Tawa along the Main Road.</p> <p>Considers that the more mixed-use activity that can be enabled in our key areas (by MRT and schools), the more neighbourhoods will thrive people will be able to live in sustainable ways that are better for our climate and our social well-being. Ensuring our main streets are attractive, walkable and safe are a part of this.</p>	Seeks that the land along Main Road, Tawa is rezoned from General Industrial Zone to Mixed Use Zone.
Miriam Moore	433.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the mapping should be amended to reflect a 15 minute walkable catchment around train stations.	Amend the high density zoning and around all train stations to cover at least the area within a 15 minute walkable catchment.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.19	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.56	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen — seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow
Miriam Moore	433.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the mapping should be amended to reflect the 15 minute walkable catchments around the City Centre Zone.	Amend the high density zoning and around the city centre to cover at least the area within a 15 minute walkable catchment.
Miriam Moore	433.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the mapping should be amended to reflect the 15 minute walkable catchments around the Metropolitan Centre Zones.	Amend the high density zoning and around the city centre to cover at least the area within a 15 minute walkable catchment around the Metropolitan Centre Zones.
Kirsty Woods	437.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the High Density Residential zoning for suburban Newtown. High density zoning in this area fails to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight, adverse effects associated with demolition and rebuiting and loss of green spaces. Considers that there is an excess of housing provided through the proposed district plan above what is required. By creating much larger areas to enable 6 storey buildings than is likely to be required, the council is promoting unnecessary adverse effects on existing housing. Considers that the alternative extent provided in the The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects submission is more appropriate.	Seeks that High Density Zoning in Newtown is limited / concentrated to the extent indicated in the Red Design Architects and Newtown Residents Association submissions. Seeks that all other areas are rezoned as Medium Density Residential.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.61	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kirsty Woods	437.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that if character precincts are not extended, high density zoned land in Newtown should be rezoned as Medium Density with an 11m height limit.	Rezone High Density Zone land in Newtown as Medium Density Zone.
Ross Judge	438.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the rezoning of 39 Chapman Street from Open Space Zone to High Density Residential Zone. The 282m2 area is in the process of being purchased from the WCC and has already been surveyed prior to the sale. The site is intended for housing development in conjunction with the subdivision at the back of 15 Chesterton Street. The site would be within the same walking distance to the Johnsonville railway station and other public transport as other Chesterton Street and Chapman St properties that will be classified as HRZ. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone 39 Chapman Street from Open Space Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Newtown's residential streets outside the suburban centre should be classified as MRZ. In particular the zoning of several blocks around the Newtown suburban centre for heights of up to 21m seems unnecessary and counter productive to maintaining a well functioning urban environment. Allowing 6-storey development blocks in low-rise residential areas would have damaging effects on the value of neighbouring houses. Furthermore, combining terraced homes, typically of 3 storeys, with 6 storey apartment blocks doesn't give good results unless the sites are carefully planned. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone Newtown's residential streets from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.207	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Newtown Residents' Association	440.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the the Neighbourhood Centre in Berhampore should be classified as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Rezone the Neighbourhood City Centre Zone in Berhampore to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.208	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Kathryn Lethbridge	442.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the High Density Residential Zoning of the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) and considers that this should be rezoned as MRZ. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Rezone the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.70	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	WCC summary reads: The zone is a jewel in the Wellington character / heritage crown and appropriate houses in the area should be protected to prevent unnecessary loss to this key cultural asset for the city. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.186	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kay Larsen	447.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the make up of the area is already dense enough to be considered High-Density.</p> <p>Considers that the terrace is too small to accommodate further traffic from high density development.</p> <p>Considers that the infrastructure on TheTerrace South is insufficient for further development.</p> <p>Considers that the hillside is steep and innappropriate for 6 storey development.</p> <p>Considers that there are many pathways, shortcuts, large old trees, housing and Boyd Wilson Sports Field scattered in the area.</p>	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Southern Terrace (Area between Abel Smith Street, Ghuznee Street, Terrace and including St John Street and Abel Smith Street extension).
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.268	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.160	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Kay Larsen	447.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the proximity of the south end of the Terrace the Aro Valley and Park means that the Aro Valley Character Precinct could be extended to capture South Terrace.	<p>Seeks that the area between Abel Smith Street, Ghuznee Street, Terrace and including St John Street and Abel Smith Street extension is attached to the Aro Valley Character Precinct.</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.161	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Kay Larsen	447.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that infrastructure is now inadequate and it would all have to be replaced with greater capacity before more houses were built.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the area between Abel Smith Street, Ghuznee Street, Terrace and including St John Street and Abel Smith Street extension is attached to the Aro Valley Character Precinct.</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.162	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Kay Larsen	447.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the Terrace near the corner of Vivian Street is not really designed for a major increase of people living in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the area between Abel Smith Street, Ghuznee Street, Terrace and including St John Street and Abel Smith Street extension is attached to the Aro Valley Character Precinct.</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.163	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
John Wilson	453.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes zoning of "Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone". [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
John Wilson	453.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes zoning of "Keneperu and Tawa railway stations Zone". [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
(Vivien) Jane Kirkcaldie and Denis Maxwell Kirkcaldie	455.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood be recognised as a special character area.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks to rezone Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood as a special character area.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.174	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.22	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that any medium density housing for Brooklyn not be implemented until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed. Considers that without character assessment, large 22m buildings will create small, disconnected blocks easily compromised or destroyed by high density development adjacent. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain the Operative District Plan Zoning for the Brooklyn suburb.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.294	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan will maintain the existing or 50% protected heritage/character areas within the central city and those suburbs like Thorndon, Mount Victoria, Mount Cook and Aro Valley and Brooklyn.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.13	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Notes that there are a cluster of a dozen properties on McFarlane Street that are not included in the Mount Victoria Character Precinct that should be included [see original submission for maps and images identifying these properties]. Notes that any redevelopment of these sites may make the area less conforming to the general pattern of development and that the hillside location makes these properties visible from the City. Notes that the whole hillside face where these properties are located needs to be treated as one cohesive block under one set of consistent rules, and valued as a whole.	Include a cluster of up to a dozen properties on McFarlane Street in the Mount Victoria Character Precinct. [see original submission for maps and images identifying these properties].
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.133	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Rachel Leilani	464.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the smaller 10 minute walkable catchment from the city centre from the draft District Plan would have no benefits and shift development to less well-suited areas.	Amend the high density zoning and around the city centre to cover at least the area within a 15 minute walkable catchment (rather than the current 10 minute catchment)
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.44	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.78	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.79	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.28	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers all stations on the Johnsonville Rail Line should be included as rapid transit stops and that building heights of at least six storeys within a 10-minute walking catchment is provided.</p>	Seeks that building heights of at least six storeys within a 10-minute walkable catchment of the stations on the Johnsonville rail line.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.49	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Stride submission that the Johnsonville Rail Line is designated as a rapid transit stop and considers that Stride provides no justification for this and may be gaining competitive advantage through their submission and considers they have used none of their recent resource consents to create the better centre the community needs [Inferred reference to submission point 470.5]</p>	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.10	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Catherine Penetito	474.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes the HRZ of Arlington Street.</p> <p>Considers that the District Plan encourages a variety of housing types, sizes and tenure which will be lost in Arlington Street without a zone change.</p> <p>CC-03 (Urban form and scale) states that development should be consistent with the strategic goal (5) of a natural environment protected, enhanced and integrated into the urban environment. Without a zone change, the very small reserve at the corner of Arlington and Torrens Terrace, enjoyed by locals for its sunshine, could be overshadowed by high-rise development.</p>	<p>Rezone the part of Arlington Street currently occupied by privately owned housing from High Density Residential to General Residential Zone.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.211	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.80	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes the Residential Zoning of 3 Dekka Street.</p> <p>Considers that 3 Dekka Street and 31-33 Nicholson Road should be rezoned as LCZ as these three properties are all owned by FSNI and a resource consent application is currently being considered by Council (Ref. SR 517439) to extend the supermarket activity.</p>	Rezone 3 Dekka Street from Medium Density Residential Zone to Local Centre Zone
Judith Ridley-Smith	FS47.1	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Foodstuff's North Island, who have a wish to redevelop 3 Dekka St to an at grade level carpark (do not broadly object to - subject to some mitigation effects). Foodstuffs North Island should proceed with a planning application to get this at grade carpark consented within the existing planning framework. Khandallah Village is a "village" and the zoning change sought by Foodstuffs North Island would allow development inconsistent with that village atmosphere. 6 levels on the site would be detrimental to the further submitter, as a neighbour.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 476.80]</p>	Disallow / No zoning change should be made in respect of 3 Dekka St.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Opposes Local Centre Zoning of 3 Dekka Street.</p>	Disallow
Rebecca Morder	FS90.1	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Oppose 476.81 seeking to rezone 3 Dekka St to the Local Centre Zone. Considers that it is more appropriate that they seek resource consent for their plans than to rezone the site. Also, Khandallah Village is a small village and it is not suitable to be classified as a "local centre" like Newtown or Karori. It is a "neighbourhood centre" like Nagios.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 476.80]</p>	Disallow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.81	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Opposes the Residential Zoning of 31-33 Nicholson Road.</p> <p>Considers that 3 Dekka Street and 31-33 Nicholson Road should be rezoned as LCZ as these three properties are all owned by FSNI and a resource consent application is currently being considered by Council (Ref. SR 517439) to extend the supermarket activity.</p>	Rezone 31-33 Nicholson Road from Medium Density Residential Zone to Local Centre Zone.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Opposes Local Centre Zoning of 31-33 Nicholson Road.</p>	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.149	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is inappropriate to rezone in anticipation of a resource consent being granted.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Christina Mackay	478.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) with the height limit of 21m will effectively promote the demolition of neighbouring 2 – 3 storey character housing due to unacceptable close over-shadowing. The Medium Density Residential Zone and rules should apply in all areas of expanded inner residential character areas.	Seeks rezoning of High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone in all areas of expanded inner residential character areas. [Inferred decision requested]
Escape Investments Limited	484.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the high density residential zoning walkable catchment for the City Centre should revert back to 15 minutes in line with the NPS-UD objectives. This will bring selected parts of Oriental Bay within the high residential zone, which given its access and proximity to the city, will allow it to grow with a variety of housing types and meet the demands of the changing city. Auckland has adopted a 15 minute walkable catchment. WCC reducing the walkable catchment size creates issues around less potential supply surrounding the CCZ, essential and service industry workers priced out of the city, and is unresponsive of the climate. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend the High Density Residential Zoning around the City Centre to cover the increased 15 minute walkable catchment suggested by this submission.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.18	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.20	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Escape Investments Ltd's submission that seeks to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.20	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.20	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Reasons for opposing extension of walkable catchment beyond 10 mins are set out above in relation to Property Council : Considers that a limit of ten minutes on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington, and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last five minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for Wilkinson Street). People's propensity to walk decreases with distance.	Disallow
Jonathan Markwick	490.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that six storey high density residential buildings should be allowed in all of Kelburn (with a viewshaft protection from the top of the cable car) to help accommodate demand for student and staff housing close to Victoria University's Kelburn Campus. Students and staff have extremely high rents with a restricted housing supply in Kelburn.	Amend the mapping to allow six storey high density residential buildings in all of Kelburn (with a viewshaft protection from the top of the cable car).
Generation Zero	FS54.3	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Support and submit: Enable 6 stories in more of Kelburn. Kelburn is the site of a major regional employment hub and currently has very low development capacity and correspondingly higher rents, house prices and lower rental quality than the rest of the city.	Allow / Seeks the adoption of 6 storey zoning across more of Kelburn.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jonathan Markwick	490.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that six storey high density residential buildings should be allowed in all of Oriental Bay including Hay Street and Grass Street.</p> <p>This suburb is the easiest suburb to walk to from the city centre (from a traffic safety and scenery point of view). Oriental Bay is also the only suburb that is connected to the city centre with a continuous traffic-free cycle path.</p>	Amend the mapping to allow six storey high density residential buildings in all of Oriental Bay including Hay Street and Grass Street.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Greater intensification on Oriental Parade and in Hay and Grass Streets is opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).</p>	Disallow
Denis Foot	FS10.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 490.6]</p>	Disallow
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.</p> <p>Qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.</p>	Disallow
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.7	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place.</p> <p>Qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St. These matters impact the health and safety of Oriental Bay residents.</p>	Disallow
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.</p> <p>Qualifying matters exist under s.79L and s.79 of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.</p> <p>The futher submitter also also refer to and support the media statement of the Insurance Council of New Zealand Inc dated 23 November 2022.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.22	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Hay St. Submitters repeats comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.</p> <p>Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).</p>	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.14	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Jonathon Markwick's submission that seeks to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Jenny Gyles	FS53.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.</p> <p>Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.79L and s.79 of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.</p> <p>Jenny Gyles refers to and support the media statement of the Insurance Council of New Zealand Inc dated 23 November 2022.</p> <p>Considers that the difficulties in obtaining and/or paying for insurance in the future for intensive housing in high hazard zones (especially re earthquake and climate change) and the exposure to hazard of increased infrastructure will be a burden on property owners, taxpayers, ratepayers and residents for many decades to come.</p>	Disallow
Generation Zero	FS54.4	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Support and submit: Enable 6 stories in Grass and Hay St, Oriental Parade as within the walkable catchment of the City Centre.	Allow / Seeks the adoption of 6 storey zoning across Grass Street and Hay Street.
Helen Foot	FS62.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.22	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Wilkinson Street, particularly its steepness, narrowness, and potentially hazardous nature which make high density intensification inappropriate. Also Don MacKay repeat comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.	Disallow
Jonathan Markwick	490.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) should be removed to allow for six storey high density residential buildings where SCHED 3 - Heritage Areas do not apply (such as McFarlane Street).</p> <p>Restrictive rules protecting Character Precincts should not be a priority and is morally wrong when we are experiencing a massive shortage of housing and a housing crisis.</p>	Amend the mapping to allow six storey high density residential buildings in the area currently encompassed by the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct.
Gareth Morgan	18.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	<p>Hay Street is a river gully and building further resilient drainage is difficult.</p> <p>Hay Street has poor vehicle access.</p> <p>Increasing height limits on Hay Street would negatively impact the character of the area and the streetscape.</p>	Retain MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified - with 11m height limit. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.82	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The submitters reasons are not justifiable as the unstable geography is determined by a geotechnical analysis of a s88 RMA Report. This would ensure that any future development would not be adversely impacted by unstable geography. The road navigation and suitability for turning bays are addressed through a Traffic Assessment as part of a s88 RMA Report. An increase in density on Hay Street would not adversely effect road navigation and vehicular access. Lastly, Wellington City Council has determined the Heritage Precincts with regards to Qualifying Matters. As noted in the Proposed District Plan s32 Evaluation report Part 2: Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct at s6, there exists a process for determining character precincts relative to a series of key criteria. Oriental Bay & Hay Street are not recognised as having a Character Area Qualifying Matter apply. MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) is an appropriate precinct for recognising the aspects that have been tested before the courts. Any expansion to this precinct fails to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Disallow
Joanne Morgan	19.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Hay Street is steep and narrow, and has unstable topography with lots of ground water ingress. It is hazardous for emergency vehicles to access. Allowing high rise construction would exacerbate this issue.	Retain MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified - with 11m height limit. [Inferred decision requested].
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.46	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Opposes the original submission to keep hay Street as a MDZ and retain 10-minute walking catchment. The submitters reasonings do not align with data showing that walking/cycling is a favoured commute options. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
Emma Baines	185.3	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the PDP heights for Cockayne Road, Khandallah.	Retain proposed building heights for Cockayne Road as notified.
Peter Nunns	196.4	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the extension of medium density residential zone to Berhampore, including the Chatham Street neighbourhood.	Retain Medium Density Residential Zone mapping in Berhampore as notified.
Peter Nunns	196.5	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the reduction in the area covered by the MRZ-PREC01 in Berhampore. Considers that the remaining special character areas seem much better targeted towards areas that have a contiguous look and feel.	Retain the MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) mapping in Berhampore as notified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.17	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the upzoning of residential land to medium-density, in keeping with the MDRS. Considers that this will allow more housing across current suburbs, providing more choice for young people of where to live in the future and reducing reliance on new greenfield developments.	Retain spatial extent of the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports and requests that the height limits as proposed to apply the properties on the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard, Tawa (which is adjacent to the northern boundary of the Arohata Prison site, as shown in the excerpt below from the PDP zone maps), are retained. These include the following proposed height limits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium Density Residential Zone = 11m (see in yellow in excerpt below) • High Density Residential Zone = 21m (see in orange in excerpt below) Ara Poutama would be opposed to any increase/s in height along that boundary, beyond that currently proposed. It is imperative that proposed height increases do not create the opportunity for a breach in security, for example enabling contraband to be thrown over fences into the Arohata Prison facility. It is also important that the operational facility is not subject to reverse sensitivity issues, such as privacy and amenity of adjacent multi-level residential developments that could see into the prison.	Retain the 11m height limit proposed to apply to the properties on the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard, Tawa.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 240.1 in that it is inconsistent with the Kāinga Ora submission whereby Kāinga Ora have sought for an expansion of the HDRZ along the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.2	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	<p>Supports and requests that the height limits as proposed to apply the properties on the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard, Tawa (which is adjacent to the northern boundary of the Arohata Prison site, as shown in the excerpt below from the PDP zone maps), are retained.</p> <p>These include the following proposed height limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium Density Residential Zone = 11m (see in yellow in excerpt below) • High Density Residential Zone = 21m (see in orange in excerpt below) <p>Ara Poutama would be opposed to any increase/s in height along that boundary, beyond that currently proposed. It is imperative that proposed height increases do not create the opportunity for a breach in security, for example enabling contraband to be thrown over fences into the Arohata Prison facility. It is also important that the operational facility is not subject to reverse sensitivity issues, such as privacy and amenity of adjacent multi-level residential developments that could see into the prison.</p>	Retain the 21m height limit proposed to apply to the properties on the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard, Tawa.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.3	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 240.2 in that it is inconsistent with the Kāinga Ora submission whereby Kāinga Ora have sought for an expansion of the HDRZ along the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 240.3]</p>	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.8	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the Medium Density Residential zoning of the residential part of the site.	Retain Medium Density Residential Zone as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.18	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Forest & Bird is concerned at the level of vegetation clearance to enable development of the land currently proposed MRZ. MRZ would be incompatible with s31(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA and the requirements to maintain indigenous biodiversity. Suggest GRZ is more appropriate for the capacity of the land and its biodiversity values.	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.9	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the Natural Open Space zoning on the balance land to the south-west, subject to an agreement being reached with the submitter on appropriate tenure.	Retain zoning of Natural Open Space zoned land, depending on the tenure of zoning.
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.14	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	<p>Considers that while Kilmarston Development's support of the NOSZ is commendable for the SW area of their land, the zoning should not and cannot be conditional on appropriate tenure arrangements. The NOSZ zoning is entirely in keeping with the land's very high biodiversity values. It has some of the best examples of native forest in Wellington with mature podocarps such as matai, miro and totara interspersed in mature tawa and kohekohe forest. The natural values here are incredibly high and support a widening variety of resident native birds such as kakariki, kaka, kereru and occasionally bellbird (korimako). These values were recognised in the conditions of the environment court consents and the local community are well aware of the special nature of this land. While the community is very appreciative of being able to use the land over the years, it is inappropriate to suggest zoning of this sort is conditional on the land being purchased by WCC. Much of this land is already zoned Open Space B so the proposed District Plan is merely translating this existing status to its new equivalent.</p>	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that suggests tying the NOSZ zoning to the future tenure of the land. The proposed zoning should be retained as unconditional for the area as mapped and currently Open Space B.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jo McKenzie	FS64.14	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Considers that while Kilmарston Development's support of the NOSZ is commendable for the SW area of their land, the zoning should not and cannot be conditional on appropriate tenure arrangements. The NOSZ zoning is entirely in keeping with the land's very high biodiversity values. It has some of the best examples of native forest in Wellington with mature podocarps such as matai, miro and totara interspersed in mature tawa and kohekohe forest. The natural values here are incredibly high and support a widening variety of resident native birds such as kakariki, kaka, kereru and occasionally bellbird (korimako). These values were recognised in the conditions of the environment court consents and the local community are well aware of the special nature of this land. Considers that while the community is very appreciative of being able to use the land over the years, it is inappropriate to suggest zoning of this sort is conditional on the land being purchased by WCC. Much of this land is already zoned Open Space B so the proposed District Plan is merely translating this existing status to its new equivalent.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that suggests tying the NOSZ zoning to the future tenure of the land. The proposed zoning should be retained as unconditional for the area mapped and currently Open Space B.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.19	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	We endorse retention of zoning of Natural Open Space zoned land. Tenure needs to consider biodiversity outcomes, not just enablement of subdivision.	Allow / Supports in part and seeks that the part of the submission supporting the Natural Open Space zoning on the balance land to the south-west be allowed.
Kilmарston Developments Limited and Kilmарston Properties Limited	290.10	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support in part	Considers alternative zoning appropriate to enable the submitter's Kilmарston subdivision. Considers that Large Lot Residential zoning and a small area of Medium Density Residential or equivalent zoning adjoining Silverstream Road would be appropriate.	Seeks, as an alternative, that: a) Large Lot Residential zoning and a small area of Medium Density Residential or: b) equivalent zoning adjoining Silverstream Road.
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.26	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m2) as MDRZ. These proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through route to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m2 is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m) and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values. Development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow
Jo McKenzie	FS64.26	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m2) as MDRZ. Considers that these proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through route to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m2 is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m) and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values. Considers that development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.20	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Forest & Bird strongly opposes alternative zoning of land adjoining Silverstream Road to enable the submitter's Kilmарston subdivision. The land adjoining Silverstream Road is a high-quality SNA (WC060) with some of the best primary forest remnants left within the city limits. Large Lot Residential zoning and a small area of Medium Density Residential or equivalent zoning adjoining Silverstream Road would be contrary to the ECO provisions of the plan and not give effect to policies 23 & 24 of the RPS or s6(c) and s31(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.46	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.10]	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.11	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Seeks that the planning maps retain the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) areas of the subject land.	Retain the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) areas of the site in the mapping, as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.21	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Forest & Bird is concerned at the level of vegetation clearance to enable development of the land currently proposed MRZ. MRZ would be incompatible with s31(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA and the requirements to maintain indigenous biodiversity. Suggest GRZ is more appropriate for the capacity of the land and its biodiversity values.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	346.2	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports the Medium Density Residential Zone classification of Ryman Healthcare Limited's site in Karori.
Z Energy Limited	361.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	The CCZ at Z Taranaki Street Service Station and Z Vivian Street Service Station is supported.	Retain City Centre Zone at 155 Taranaki Street (Z Taranaki Street) and 174 Vivian Street (Z Vivian Street).
Z Energy Limited	361.2	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	The Metropolitan Centre Zones at the Z service stations in Kilbirnie and Johnsonville are supported.	Retain the Metropolitan Centre Zones at 10 Coutts Street (Z Kilbirnie) and 134 Johnsonville Road (Z Johnsonville).
Z Energy Limited	361.3	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	The Mixed Use Zone at the Z service stations in Tawa, Miramar and Kaiwharawhara are supported.	Retain the Mixed Used Zones at 16-18 Main Road (Z Tawa), 27 Miramar Avenue (Z Miramar) and 208 Hutt Road Road (Caltex Old Hutt Road).
Z Energy Limited	361.4	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	The LCZ at Z Constable Street is supported.	Retain Local Centre Zone at 35/41 Constable Street (Z Constable Street).
Z Energy Limited	361.5	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	The Airport Zone at Z Broadway is supported.	Retain Airport Zone at the corner of Calabar Road & Broadway, Strathmore Park (Z Broadway).
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.3	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Considers that the key controls in relation to the use of the Miramar terminal and surrounding properties are appropriately provided for by the zoning of the site (General Industrial) and adjoining sites (General Industrial and Special Purpose Airport).	Retain the General Industrial Zone of the Miramar Terminal and adjoining sites as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.253	General/ Mapping / Retain Zone	Support	WIAL supports the intent of these submissions.	Allow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.4	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Considers that the key controls in relation to the use of the Miramar terminal and surrounding properties are appropriately provided for by the zoning of the site (General Industrial) and adjoining sites (General Industrial and Special Purpose Airport).	Retain the Special Purpose Airport Zone on adjoining sites to the Miramar Terminal as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.254	General/ Mapping / Retain Zone	Support	WIAL supports the intent of these submissions.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.5	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Considers that the General Industrial zoning of the Kaiwharawhara terminal, and adjoining Mixed-Use zoning, is appropriate given the terminal stores low risk fuels (and hence there has been no need for a QRA for the site) and operates in a low impact manner such that limited effects occur in the surrounding environment (notably traffic, noise, odour, and risk to health and safety effects are all relatively benign). Reverse sensitivity effects are therefore not anticipated on the existing or future (plan enabled) land uses of the adjoining Mixed-Use zone.	Retain the General Industrial Zone of the Kaiwharawhara terminal and adjoining Mixed-Use Zones as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.5	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports Southern Cross Hospital Wellington located at 90 Hanson Street and the adjoining land at 82 to 88 Hanson Street being identified in the Special Purpose Hospital zone. This is appropriate to enable the operation and expansion of Southern Cross Hospital Wellington.	Retain Special Purpose Hospital zoning at 90 Hanson Street.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.6	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports Southern Cross Hospital Wellington located at 90 Hanson Street and the adjoining land at 82 to 88 Hanson Street being identified in the Special Purpose Hospital zone. This is appropriate to enable the operation and expansion of Southern Cross Hospital Wellington.	Retain Special Purpose Hospital zoning at 82 Hanson Street.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.7	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports Southern Cross Hospital Wellington located at 90 Hanson Street and the adjoining land at 82 to 88 Hanson Street being identified in the Special Purpose Hospital zone. This is appropriate to enable the operation and expansion of Southern Cross Hospital Wellington.	Retain Special Purpose Hospital zoning at 84 Hanson Street.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.8	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports Southern Cross Hospital Wellington located at 90 Hanson Street and the adjoining land at 82 to 88 Hanson Street being identified in the Special Purpose Hospital zone. This is appropriate to enable the operation and expansion of Southern Cross Hospital Wellington.	Retain Special Purpose Hospital zoning at 86 Hanson Street.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.9	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports Southern Cross Hospital Wellington located at 90 Hanson Street and the adjoining land at 82 to 88 Hanson Street being identified in the Special Purpose Hospital zone. This is appropriate to enable the operation and expansion of Southern Cross Hospital Wellington.	Retain Special Purpose Hospital zoning at 88 Hanson Street.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.4	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	The Waterfront Zone at the former Lambton Harbour Area is supported in concept, but some specific issues temper support.	Retain the Waterfront Zone in the former Lambton Harbour Area.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.5	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support in part	All areas mapped and classified as Waterfront Public Open Space are supported. Enlargement of these zones is sought wherever possible.	Retain all the areas shown as Public Open Space in the Waterfront Zone.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.22	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the proposed Medium Density Residential zone proposed for Right of Refusal properties in Strathmore Park.	Retain zoning for Right of Refusal properties in Strathmore Park, as notified.
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.17	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Support	EMPI supports medium density residential and mixed-use development for Strathmore Park. The review of the Spatial Plan clearly relates to the subsequent Opportunity Area – “Strathmore Park”, this being a medium density residential and mixed-use development making efficient use of existing infrastructure, community facilities and transport links. EMPI supports medium density residential in Strathmore Park. [Inferred reference to submission 389.22]	Allow
CentrePort Limited	402.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports Waterfront zoning. CentrePort owns the triangle of land between Lady Elizabeth Lane and Waterloo and Interislander wharves. Previously this land was included as being part of the Coastal Marine Area. It is an integral part of the future development of both of these wharves which are specifically recognised through Policy 51 (Heritage demolition) and Policy 149 (Lambton Harbour Area) of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. While CentrePort supports this Zoning, this is on the basis that any redevelopment proposal for this area will be assessed for its compatibility with urban form and other matters, rather than an acceptance that the zero height limit indicates that no built structures can or should occur. [Refer to original submission for map extent]	Retain Waterfront zoning at the triangle of land between Lady Elizabeth Lane and Waterloo and Interislander wharves. [Refer to original submission for map extent].
Investore Property Limited	405.16	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the provision of a broad area of six storey High Density Residential zoning in the wider Johnsonville catchment. Submitter considers that this gives effect to the NPS-UD and reflects the status of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre.	Retain High Density Residential Zoning within the wider Johnsonville catchment as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.17	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the Metropolitan Centre Zone in Johnsonville.	Retain the application of Metropolitan Centre Zone for Johnsonville as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.24	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	The mapped extent of the Airport Zone incorporates all of the Airport's precincts. This is appropriate as it reflects the primary use of the land for airport purposes.	Retain the mapped extent of the Airport Zone as notified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.54	General / Mapping / Rezone	Not specified	Considers that WIAL's map in its submission page 103 clearly show the Bridge Street east area as part of a precinct they have called the 'Airsides' Precinct. The Bridge Street East area is not in any of the Main Site Area Designation maps so the inclusion in a designation area should not occur. [Inferred reference to submission 406.24]	Amend / Amend map - Submitter seeks that the plans being proposed by WIAL are amended as they add land into the Main Side Area designation that was never part of their recent Notice of Requirement.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.73	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support	Supports the amendment to the first sentence to more appropriately apply to buildings that contain noise sensitive activities as opposed to new noise sensitive activities. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow / Adopt amendment sought to first sentence
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.15	General / Mapping / Rezone	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Metlifecare Limited	413.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the Medium Density Residential zoning of 29 Messines Road, Karori on the basis that it aligns with the Amendment Act. It also recognises the need to "upzone" appropriate areas to meet the demand for housing.	Retain the Medium Density Residential zoning of 29 Messines Road, Karori.
Fabric Property Limited	425.4	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the application of City Centre zoning to 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay.	Retain the zoning of 22 The Terrace as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.5	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the application of City Centre zoning to 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay.	Retain zoning of 1 Grey Street as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.6	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the application of City Centre zoning to 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay.	Retain zoning of 20 Customhouse Quay as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.7	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the application of City Centre zoning to 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay.	Retain zoning of 215 Lambton Quay as notified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.4	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the area zoned as High Residential and the associated six storey allowance in the wider Johnsonville catchment.	Retain the High Density Residential Zoning (21m) in the wider Johnsonville catchment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	100.1	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	<p>Considers that currently there are no provisions to protect against future development or infrastructure occurring in close proximity to the radar designations (ACNZ3 and ACNZ4) which may impact air traffic control services.</p> <p>ACNZ3 and ACNZ4 are both potential sites to replace the existing infrastructure as part of Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited's process of scoping replacement Radar and Communications systems.</p> <p>It is critical from a safety perspective that the radar designations are protected from any adverse effects from nearby development.</p> <p>As per the ICAO standard, a 'buffer' of 500m is required around radars to protect against the adverse effects from wind turbines and buildings such as, skyscrapers, large excavating works, communication towers.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Add a new 'Air Traffic Control' overlay with a 500m radius around the radar designation ACNZ3 (Radar & Communications site Hawkins Hill - Section 5 SO24952, Hawkins Hill, off Karepa Street, Brooklyn).
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.255	General/ Mapping / Retain Zone	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of overlays that ensure that Airways air traffic control overlays are protected and thus protect the safety of aircraft on approach to and departure from Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.43	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays / General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed 'air traffic control' overlay as insufficient information has been provided to understand the potential impacts on urban development.	Disallow
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	100.2	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	<p>Considers that currently there are no provisions to protect against future development or infrastructure occurring in close proximity to the radar designations (ACNZ3 and ACNZ4) which may impact air traffic control services.</p> <p>ACNZ3 and ACNZ4 are both potential sites to replace the existing infrastructure as part of Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited's process of scoping replacement Radar and Communications systems.</p> <p>It is critical from a safety perspective that the radar designations are protected from any adverse effects from nearby development.</p> <p>As per the ICAO standard, a 'buffer' of 500m is required around radars to protect against the adverse effects from wind turbines and buildings such as, skyscrapers, large excavating works, communication towers.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Add a new 'Air Traffic Control Information Overlay' with a 500m radius around the radar designation ACNZ4 (Radar & Communications site Hawkins Hill - Section 1 & 2 SO31242, Section 4 on SO24952, Hawkins Hill, off Karepa Street, Brooklyn.).
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.256	General/ Mapping / Retain Zone	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of overlays that ensure that Airways air traffic control overlays are protected and thus protect the safety of aircraft on approach to and departure from Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
Thomas Brent Layton	164.2	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the application of the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay to 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road is inconsistent with the policy intention to preserve the visible ridgelines and hilltops being natural. The ridgelines on these properties are not visible or prominent and there are no hilltops.	Amend the mapping to remove the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay from 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.
Thomas Brent Layton	164.3	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the SNA overlay should be removed from the mapping.	Remove the Significant Natural Areas overlay from the mapping.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.3	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers a map layer of wind turbine location should be added.	<p>Include a map layer showing the extent of existing West Wind and Mill Creek wind farm turbines as an overlay on the Plan maps.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission, including map].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Century Group Limited	238.4	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Opposes the identification of the Property (83-87 Waterloo Quay) as being subject to the 'extent of place' for Item 44 (2 Bunny Street) in SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings). Considers that the extent of place is associated with the Railway Station building which is located some 130m to the south-west of the Property, and the Property has no spatial, functional or historical relationship with the Railway Station building or the railway platforms. Century Group seeks that this anomaly be rectified as they consider it is plainly an error.	Delete the extent of place that applies to the property (83-87 Waterloo Quay) relating to item 44 (2 Bunny Street) in SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings).
Karepa Dell Developments	241.3	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Opposes the Significant Natural Area overlay applying to 11 Makomako Road.	Opposes Significant Natural Area overlay applying to 11 Makomako Road.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.9	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that there is a restrictive policy and rule framework that would apply to SNAs (and in particular where the sites are within a Coastal Environment overlay) and wishes to ensure any sites that are identified are in fact warranted as significant areas. Horokiwi does have concerns with particular areas on both its site and on the adjoining land to the west, in terms of whether the biodiversity values merit the specific areas being identified as SNAs. Based on the independent ecological assessment, Horokiwi seeks amendment to the SNA area identified. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the Significant Natural Area overlay be amended as it relates to the Horokiwi quarry site including to remove the SNA from the Horokiwi site which is subject to the existing use certificate reference 1048648. [Refer to original submission, including figure and attachments]
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.10	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	The Coastal Environment ("CE") overlay is identified over part of the Horokiwi site and adjoining properties. [Refer Figure 9 of the original submission]. Opposes parts of the Coastal Overlay as it relates to part of the exiting Horokiwi quarry site. An amended boundary is sought given the nature of the existing quarrying activities undertaken and modified nature of the environment. The site is not within any identified Schedule 11 Outstanding natural feature and landscape or Schedule 13 High or Very High Coastal Natural Character Area. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the coastal environment line as it relates to Horokiwi is amended. [Refer to original submission, including figure and attachments]
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.11	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Opposes that a portion of the Horokiwi site is within a special amenity landscape with a large portion within the coastal environment, and zoned General Rural. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the coastal environment line as it relates to Horokiwi is amended. [Refer to original submission, including figure and attachments]
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.12	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers the removal of Special Amenity Landscape (SAL) overlay from this area appropriate as this will potentially be restrictive of development.	Seeks to remove the proposed Special Amenity Landscape (SAL) overlay from the Medium Density Residential Area zoned part of the submitter's sites.
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.18	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Supports Kilmarston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However opposes the removal for the land in question. However oppose the removal for the land in question. The history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given it high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which are development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to remove the SAL from the Kilmarston Development's land.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.18	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Support Kilmarston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However Jo McKenzie opposes the removal for the land in question. Considers that the history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given it high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which are development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that proposes removing the SAL from the Kilmarston Development's land
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.22	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Oppose	This site comprises a large portion of the Outer Green Belt and Mt Kaukau SALs and provides habitat for indigenous birds. We oppose arbitrary removal of the SAL overlay on the basis that it may potentially be restrictive of development. The land in question meets the criteria of SAL and should remain so. The development should be able to proceed while simultaneously protecting the values of the SAL.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.47	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.12]</p>	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.13	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers the removal of Significant Natural Area (SNA) overlay from this area appropriate as this will potentially be restrictive of development.	Seeks to remove proposed Significant Natural Area (SNA) from the overlay from Huntleigh Park Way (Road).
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.11	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to lift the SNA overlay on the unformed portion of Huntleigh Park Way. This land is owned by WCC for public use. If Kilmarston Development were to resubmit a new landuse/subdivision plan access to that subdivision using Huntleigh Park Way can be considered as part of the process with a better understanding of the value of the vegetation that exists on that site. As permission from WCC would be required to form the road to support subdivision earthworks an additional step of resource consent for vegetation clearance would be of little consequence.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.11	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes the proposal to lift the SNA overlay on the unformed portion of Huntleigh Park Way. This land is owned by WCC for public use. Considers that if Kilmarston Development ever resubmit a new landuse/subdivision plan access to that subdivision using Huntleigh Park Way can be considered as part of the process with a better understanding of the value of the vegetation that exists on that site. Considers that as permission from WCC would be required to form the road to support subdivision earthworks an additional step of resource consent for vegetation clearance would be of little consequence.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.23	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Oppose	As per above. We oppose arbitrary removal of the SNA overlay from the Huntleigh Park Way paper road on the basis that it's inconvenient and may potentially be restrictive of development. Due process needs to be undertaken to ensure compliance with s6(c) and relevant RPS policies.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.48	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.13]</p>	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.14	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	<p>Considers that it is important for Council to provide appropriate open space connections across the city where enabling residential development of the Submitters land will contribute to creating these connections.</p> <p>The open space zone provisions are also considered adequate for managing land identified as SAL as these objectives are closely aligned.</p>	<p>Seeks that the Special Amenity Landscapes overlay is removed from the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone area from Submitter's site.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.19	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Supports Kilmарston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However opposes the removal for the land in question. However oppose the removal for the land in question. The history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given its high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which any development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to remove the SAL from the Kilmарston Development's land.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.19	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Support Kilmарston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However Jo McKenzie opposes the removal for the land in question. Considers that the history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given its high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which any development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that proposes removing the SAL from the Kilmарston Development's land
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.24	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Oppose	This site comprises a large portion of the Outer Green Belt and Mt Kaukau SALs and provides habitat for indigenous birds. We oppose arbitrary removal of the SAL overlay on the basis that it may potentially be restrictive of development. The land in question meets the criteria of SAL and should remain so. The development should be able to proceed while simultaneously protecting the values of the SAL.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.49	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.14]	Disallow
Kilmарston Developments Limited and Kilmарston Properties Limited	290.15	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Support in part	Considers appropriate to retain the SAL overlay over the Natural Open Space Zone, subject to agreement on appropriate tenure.	Retain the Special Amenity Landscapes overlay over the Natural Open Space Zone, subject to agreement on appropriate tenure.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.25	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Oppose	We agree with retention of the Special Amenity Landscapes overlay over the Natural Open Space Zone. However, see our comment on 290.5 regarding the uncertainty of the caveat 'subject to agreement on appropriate tenure.'	Disallow / Seeks that the part of submission point 290.15 supporting retention of the Special Amenity Landscapes overlay over the Natural Open Space Zone be allowed.
Kilmарston Developments Limited and Kilmарston Properties Limited	290.16	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the Council has correctly identified the residential area of the land as an appropriate location to deliver urban intensification which will build on the existing urban form with quality developments.	Seeks that the Special Amenity Landscapes overlay is removed from the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone area from Submitter's site.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.20	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Supports Kilmарston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However opposes the removal for the land in question. However oppose the removal for the land in question. The history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given its high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which any development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to remove the SAL from the Kilmарston Development's land.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.20	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Support Kilmарston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However Jo McKenzie opposes the removal for the land in question. Considers that the history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given its high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which any development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that proposes removing the SAL from the Kilmарston Development's land
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.26	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Oppose	This site comprises a large portion of the Outer Green Belt and Mt Kaukau SALs and provides habitat for indigenous birds. We oppose arbitrary removal of the SAL overlay on the basis that it may potentially be restrictive of development. The land in question meets the criteria of SAL and should remain so. The development should be able to proceed while simultaneously protecting the values of the SAL.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.50	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.16]	Disallow
Kilmарston Developments Limited and Kilmарston Properties Limited	290.17	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that it is important that Council identified SNAs within the City in order to protect and maintain the remaining areas of indigenous biodiversity. However, this should not include areas earmarked for public access and roads. The Submitter accepts the overlay being clipped to the proposed MRZ areas of their land, but not over the paper road and parts of the access.	Remove significant natural area overlay from paper road identified as Huntleigh Park Way.
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.12	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to lift the SNA overlay on the unformed portion of Huntleigh Park Way. This land is owned by WCC for public use. If Kilmарston Development were to resubmit a new landuse/subdivision plan access to that subdivision using Huntleigh Park Way can be considered as part of the process with a better understanding of the value of the vegetation that exists on that site. As permission from WCC would be required to form the road to support subdivision earthworks an additional step of resource consent for vegetation clearance would be of little consequence.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.12	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes the proposal to lift the SNA overlay on the unformed portion of Huntleigh Park Way. This land is owned by WCC for public use. Considers that if Kilmарston Development ever resubmit a new landuse/subdivision plan access to that subdivision using Huntleigh Park Way can be considered as part of the process with a better understanding of the value of the vegetation that exists on that site. Considers that as permission from WCC would be required to form the road to support subdivision earthworks an additional step of resource consent for vegetation clearance would be of little consequence.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.27	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Oppose	As per above. We oppose arbitrary removal of the SNA overlay from the Huntleigh Park Way paper road on the basis that it's inconvenient and may potentially be restrictive of development. Due process needs to be undertaken to ensure compliance with s6(c) and relevant RPS policies.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.51	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.17]	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.18	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Support	Supports that Mount Kaukau and the Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape are Special Amenity Landscapes.	Retain Mount Kaukau as a Special Amenity Landscape in mapping as notified
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.28	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Support	These are appropriate.	Allow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.19	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Support	Supports that Mount Kaukau and the Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape are Special Amenity Landscapes.	Retain Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape as a Special Amenity Landscape in mapping as notified
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.29	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Support	These are appropriate.	Allow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.20	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the MDRZ area of the land should not be included in this SAL mapping. Considers the inclusion MDRZ land within the SAL overlay, it restricts the land from being efficiently utilized for medium density residential development. Furthermore, the zoning layout has principal support from GWRC both in terms of policy direction (i.e. Policy 27) and the consented layout. The landscape identified to be 'distinctive and widely recognised by the community for the contribution to the amenity and quality of the environment' is predominantly located within the balance land which includes Crows Nest and the Skyline Walkway Trailhead.	Seeks that Special Amenity Landscape overlay be removed from submitter's land zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.21	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Supports Kilmarston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However opposes the removal for the land in question. However oppose the removal for the land in question. The history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given its high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which any development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to remove the SAL from the Kilmarston Development's land.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jo McKenzie	FS64.21	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Support Kilmarston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However Jo McKenzie opposes the removal for the land in question. Considers that the history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given its high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which any development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that proposes removing the SAL from the Kilmarston Development's land
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.30	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Oppose	See comment in 290.12. Due process needs to be observed if the SAL overlays are to be modified.	Disallow
Dawid Wojasz	295.2	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue.	Remove application of High, Medium and Low Coastal Hazard overlay within the City Centre.
Dawid Wojasz	295.3	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue.	Seeks that CE-P18 also be amended to include High Density as functional need to locate a building within the high hazard area. [Inferred decision requested]
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.5	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Seeks the extension of the existing map extent for site #76 in the PDP, as it doesn't accurately reflect their existing land holding and aspirations for Marae redevelopment. Following the fire, whilst the existing Marae was burnt down, the Trust have aspirations and value associated with land as indicated in the map below, and would like to extend the site of significance extent to incorporate this land and include the existing area.	Seeks extent of site of significance to Māori be expanded for Site 76 (Tapu te Ranga Marae) in the mapping.
Parkvale Road Limited	298.4	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Opposes the application of the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay within 200 Parkvale. Submitter seeks the removal of the overlay, or associated changes to the ridgelines and hilltops provisions.	Remove the application of the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay within 200 Parkvale Road.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.42	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Oppose removal of the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay within 200 Parkvale Road. This overlay is part of wider landscape protection and is appropriate for the property in question.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.70	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Supports placing the farm within the Special Amenity Landscape (in addition to retaining Ridgeline and Hilltop status) as was instructed by Council when notifying the Plan. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 29.4].	Disallow
Parkvale Road Limited	298.5	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Opposes the application of the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay within 200 Parkvale Road. Considers that the ridgelines and hilltops overlay is not a requirement of the Regional Policy Statement and creates a third tier of landscape protection that would be better included as a Special Amenity Landscape. Seeks the removal of the overlay, or associated changes to the ridgelines and hilltops provisions.	Seeks amendment of the provisions relating to the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay if this overlay is not removed from 200 Parkvale Road.
Andy Foster	FS86.71	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Supports placing the farm within the Special Amenity Landscape (in addition to retaining Ridgeline and Hilltop status) as was instructed by Council when notifying the Plan. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 29.5].	Disallow
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.6	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Not specified	Considers that the SNA, SAL and CE overlays have the potential to impact quarrying activities both inside and outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone, with two general concerns: 1. While quarrying activity within an overlay is not always disallowed/impossible, the provisions within them are very restrictive. 2. It is not certain that in all cases the overlay status is warranted.	Seeks flexibility for quarrying activities in overlay areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.1	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Support	Quarries are an important and necessary activity, and the district plan should adequately recognise such activities.	Allow
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.7	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Environment overlay is a barrier to new or expanding quarries near State Highway 2, which runs along much of the available rocks of the Wellington faultline. In particular the overlay overlaps with the Quarry Zone and the Horokiwi Quarry site and needs to be adjusted to avoid interfering with new and existing workings.	Amend the Coastal Environment Overlay to remove overlaps with the Special Purpose Quarry Zone.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.8	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Environment overlay is a barrier to new or expanding quarries near State Highway 2, which runs along much of the available rocks of the Wellington faultline. The overlay extends too far from the coast and does not provide the right balance between coastal protection and enabling access to aggregate.	Amend the Coastal Environment Overlay to enable access to aggregate further away from the coast.
David Karl	309.2	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that whanau's homes should not be unnecessarily impacted by inaccurate modelling. Further development should also not occur in areas that it should not. There is emotional pain and significant costs linked to Council holding information that is not publicly available and then requiring costly changes to building plans before providing approval.	Seeks that hazard zoning be based on the best information available.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.23	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.	Seeks that SAL mapping be amended to reflect historical and current built development over the Wellington Prison site (Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035).
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.21	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land." Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park. Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.2	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the 90m Height Control Overlay should extend over 141 The Terrace, 294 and 298 Lambton Quay so it is contiguous with the height control applying to 312 Lambton Quay and other sites to the south.	Amend 90m Height Control Overlay to extend over 141 The Terrace, 294 and 298 Lambton Quay. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].
Oyster Management Limited	404.3	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Support	Supports the 75m Height Control Area applying to Lambton Quay.	Retain 75m Height Control Area extent as notified. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.3	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	<p>Considers that WCC's landscape-scale overlays are an affront to Terawhiti Station.</p> <p>Considers that the Council is not cooperative. Right from the very start of the SNA process all the overlays were set down.</p> <p>Cosniders decisions are already determined.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Not specified
Paul M Blaschke	435.3	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the SNA overlay should extend to residentially zoned areas.	Extend the Significant Natural Area overlay to relevant residentially zoned properties.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.8	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the damaging environmental effects of high rise developments in established low rise communities should be considered as a specific overlay. (Option B)	Seeks that negative environmental effects of high rise development be considered as a specific overlay.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.9	Mapping / AllOverlays / National Grid Transmission Lines	Support	Supports the National Grid Transmission Line layer on the planning maps as its assist in plan interpretation. Considers Policy 12 of the NPSET requires territorial authorities to "identify the electricity transmission network on their relevant planning maps whether or not the network is designated". Given the need for provisions that also relate to the National Grid Yard, Transpower supports the mapping as notified. Considers the mapping layer works with the definitions of National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor to define the required setbacks.	Retain the map layer for the National Grid on the planning maps as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.10	Mapping / AllOverlays / National Grid Transmission Lines	Amend	Considers that when using the on-line maps, the Development Area spatial layer over-rides the National Grid Transmission Line layer. Plan users may not realise the area is subject to the National Grid corridor provisions. [see original submission for image supplied]	Seeks to amend the planning map layers so that the National Grid Transmission line remains visible when all map layers are applied.
Poneke Architects	292.1	Mapping / AllOverlays / Coastal Inundation Overlay	Oppose	Considers that these overlays effectively stop development in Wellington and are too broad.	Delete the Coastal Inundation Overlays in their entirety.
David Karl	309.3	Mapping / AllOverlays / Coastal Inundation Overlay	Amend	Considers that according to presentations from WCC staff and technical experts at a community climate adaptation meeting, modelling underpinning the current maps reflects some of the available, appropriate possible modelling, but does not account for wave dynamics. It is understood from these experts comments wave dynamics may have a significant bearing on the island.	Seeks that the coastal inundation overlay be amended to account for wave dynamics that include consideration of Tapu Te Rangi/the island in Island Bay.
VicLabour	414.11	Mapping / AllOverlays / Coastal Inundation Overlay	Support in part	Supports restrictions on development in areas at risk of coastal inundation and tsunami with amendment as detailed below.	Retain coastal inundation and tsunami overlays.
Oliver Sangster	112.6	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes flood hazard - Inundation overlay applying to 22B Glenside road. Considers the mapping inaccurate as it does not reflect the new (higher) ground level as was raised through the subdivision completion and presently includes area that was raised through earthworks and retaining wall construction.	Remove the Flood Hazard - Inundation overlay from 22B Glenside Road.
Singvest Group Limited	129.1	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes 154 Victoria Street being included in the Flood Hazard (Inundation) overlay	Remove 154 Victoria from the Flood Hazard (Inundation) overlay
Michael Thomas	219.1	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Amend	<p>Considers that 18 Campbell Street is significantly higher than the adjoining property 16A Campbell Street and any water would flow there.</p> <p>18 Campbell Street has a retaining wall along it's western fence that would provide a barrier to flooding.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including pictures]</p>	Amend the extent of the flood hazard inundation overlay to exclude 18 Campbell Street.
Kimberley Vermaey	348.1	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Amend	Considers that buildings in the Flood Hazard Overlay with water depths less than 0.5m should not require resource consents, subject to minimum floor levels. For buildings with floodwater depths 0.5m or greater, resource consent should be needed as proposed, with displacement effects considered.	Seeks that buildings with flood water depth of less than 0.5m in the Flood Hazard Overlay not require resource consents.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.10	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 82 Hanson Street. Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 82 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.11	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 82 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 82 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.12	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 84 Hanson Street. Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 84 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.13	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 84 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 84 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.14	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 86 Hanson Street. Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 86 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.15	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 86 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 86 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.16	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 88 Hanson Street. Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 88 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.17	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 88 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 88 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.18	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 90 Hanson Street. Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 90 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.19	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 90 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 90 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.30	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed, despite the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards being generally supported. Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards and will create unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers.	Delete the Natural Hazard Overlay from the District Plan and instead hold this information in non-statutory GIS maps.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.46	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.53	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.39	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Support	Stride supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.39	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Support	Investore supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.25	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Submitter is required to manage and drain surface water ponding to avoid giving rise to adverse effects on aeronautical safety. Accordingly, Submitter manages surface water on site to ensure ponding does not arise. Opposes the mapping of 'inundation areas' mapped within the Airport Zone as ponding, such as that depicted on the District Planning maps, does not occur within its landholdings.	Delete all Flood Hazard Overlays from the Airport Zone.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.184	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that a vast catchment of Strathmore feeds through Wellington Airport and it should be part of the Flood Hazard overlay	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the flood hazard overlay.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.85	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	The flood inundation overlay is based on probability maps by Wellington Water of likely ponding areas in the event of a flood. It does not take into account likely post-event remediation of flooding effects. If geotechnical engineering has been done to mitigate flood inundation risk, the risk may be lessened, but the submission does not provide examples of this.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.74	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Opposes the deletion of policy direction requiring acoustic treatment and mechanical ventilation for noise sensitive activities. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.26	Mapping / All Overlays / Liquefaction Hazard Overlay	Oppose in part	Submitter is required to manage liquefaction risk to ensure the Airport can continue to operate following as seismic event. Opposes the mapping of 'liquefaction hazard overlay' mapped within the Airport Zone. [See paragraph 4.86 for full reason]	Delete all Liquefaction Hazard Overlays from the Airport Zone.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.182	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Liquefaction Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Considers that parts of Wellington airport are made up of 1950s reclaimed land from sea therefore should be part of the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the liquefaction hazard overlay.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.86	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Liquefaction Hazard Overlay	Oppose	The liquefaction hazard overlay in the Proposed District Plan is based on the High and Very High liquefaction susceptibility areas in Griffin et al (2020). These zones are based on cone penetrometer tests, and analysis of geomorphology, hydrology and site conditions, and do not take into account likely post-event remediation of liquefaction effects. The part of the Airport within the liquefaction overlay is an area of anthropogenic fill, which is in all cases highly susceptible to liquefaction. If geotechnical engineering has been done to mitigate liquefaction risk, the risk may be lessened, but the submission does not provide examples of this.	Disallow
Poneke Architects	292.2	Mapping / AllOverlays / Tsunami Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Considers that these overlays effectively stop development in Wellington and are too broad.	Delete the Tsunami Hazard Overlays in their entirety.
David Karl	309.4	Mapping / AllOverlays / Tsunami Hazard Overlay	Amend	Considers that according to presentations from WCC staff and technical experts at a community climate adaptation meeting, modelling underpinning the current maps reflects some of the available, appropriate possible modelling, but does not account for wave dynamics. It is understood from these experts comments wave dynamics may have a significant bearing on the island.	Seeks that the tsunami inundation overlay be amended to account for wave dynamics that include consideration of Tapu Te Ranga (the island in Island Bay).
VicLabour	414.12	Mapping / AllOverlays / Tsunami Hazard Overlay	Support in part	Supports restrictions on development in areas at risk of coastal inundation and tsunamis.	Retain coastal inundation and tsunami overlays.
John Tiley	142.4	Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Introduction General	Amend	Considers that while the description acknowledges the benefits derived from the Town Belt and the Outer Green Belt, no mention is included of ridgelines generally and how these, together with associated open slopes, contribute to visual amenity, a sense of community, and continuity of open space.	Seeks that ridgelines are acknowledged in the Introduction - Description of the District alongside the town belt and outer greenbelt. [Inferred decision requested].
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.73	Part 1 / Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Introduction General	Support	The submissions identify the need for greater clarity and better protection in the Plan for the city's identified ridgelines and hilltops. Wellington Civic Trust supports these points	Allow
Andy Foster	FS86.26	Part 1 / Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Introduction General	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.4].	Allow
Churton Park Community Association	189.4	Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Introduction General	Amend	Considers that while the description acknowledges the benefits derived from the Town Belt and the Outer Green Belt, no mention is included of ridgelines generally and how these, together with associated open slopes, contribute to visual amenity, a sense of community, and continuity of open space.	Seeks that ridgelines are acknowledged in the Introduction - Description of the District alongside the townbelt and outer greenbelt. [Inferred decision requested].
Andy Foster	FS86.37	Part 1 / Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Introduction General	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 189.4].	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.1	Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Introduction General	Support	Generally supports these provisions as drafted.	Retain "Introduction" section as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.48	Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Amend	Considers the population projections should be updated to the most recent population forecasts.	Amend footnote reference as follows: Stats NZ (2018) New Zealand Census <u>Sense Partners population forecasts for 2020 to 2051</u>
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.24	Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Amend	Considers that Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika holds ahi kā and primary mana whenua status across and throughout Wellington City. The Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust (PNBST) is the post-settlement governance entity for Taranaki Whānui, has the role to manage treaty settlement matters and is the iwi authority for resource management purposes.	Seeks that 'Description of the District' is amended to include the following: "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City."

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.6	Part 1 / Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.6	Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.1	Part 1 / Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui submission quotes its 29 March 2017 MOU with WCC that “As significant land owners at Shelly Bay, the parties recognise the importance of working together to ensure a wider strategic vision for the Miramar Peninsula is achieved for all citizens.” Considers that this is misleading. Nine days after the MOU was signed (7 July 2017) Taranaki Whānui sold three of its four Shelly Bay blocks of land to The Wellington Company, with an option for TWC to buy the fourth and final block as well (which happened later).</p> <p>Considers that when Taranaki Whānui wrote Submission 389, it was no longer a “significant land owner at Shelly Bay”. Considers that this is misleading the Proposed District Plan process. And in fact it was presumably already preparing to sell much of the land as it signed the WCC MOU.</p> <p>Considers that this is relevant to the current Proposed District Plan process. Taranaki Whānui staff have repeatedly acted as supporters and proxies for The Wellington Company property developers in WCC and other processes relating to Shelly Bay. Buy Back the Bay notes that The Wellington Company is not participating in the district plan process. Considers that it appears that Taranaki Whānui is once more fronting for the company in at least many of their requests in Submission 389. Considers that if this is the case, Buy Back the Bay question whether Taranaki Whānui’s special relationship with council should be used to assist a property developer.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.4	Part 1 / Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that “Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.” It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.37	Part 1 / Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.</p>	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.2	Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Support in part	<p>Support Description of the District in part. Submitter considers that there is no recognition of the role of the Port, the harbour or Wellingtons function as the North Island terminal for interisland freight and travel.</p>	Support Description of the District with amendments.

How the Plan Works

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.3	Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Amend	Submitter considers that there is no recognition of the role of the Port, the harbour or Wellingtons function as the North Island terminal for interisland freight and travel.	Amend Description of the District as follows: ... <u>Wellington provides the northern link for State Highway 1 and the main trunk railway between the North Island and the South Island. Wellington Harbour (Te Whanganui-a-Tara) is an important New Zealand port, for a range of exports and imports. Wellington Airport is the third biggest passenger airport in New Zealand.</u> [Inferred decision sought] ... [Submitter seeks consistency with the Proposed Natural Resources Plan].
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	WIAL supports recognition within the Description of the District of the significant freight and travel routes to and from the District, including reference to Wellington International Airport.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.1	Part 1 / Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated is not sure that the relevance to 'biggest' is required. It does not provide any information on what 'biggest' actually means e.g. size of land area, volume of aircraft movement, or number of passengers and freight?	Amend provision as follows: Wellington Airport is the third biggest passenger airport in New Zealand.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.11	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / How the Plan Works General	Amend	Supports the provided clarification in the IPI and PDP as to the legal effect of specific provisions. An amendment is sought to highlight to plan users the existence of qualifying matters and that if a development is located in an area where a qualifying matter applies, the MDRS does not have immediate legal effect. While submitter is aware the provision relating to legal effect and qualifying matters will technically not be required once the plan is made operative, considers that in the interim period it has concerns as to the lack of reference to qualifying matters and therefore supports any clarification that can be provided.	Amend the section Legal effect of rules, as follows: In addition, the District Plan gives effect to the 'Medium Density Residential Standards' (MDRS). The MDRS will replace the existing building standards in the residential zones (MRZ and HRZ) and set out the level of development that can occur on a site as a permitted activity. Specifically, MRZ-S1 to MRZ-S9 and HRZ-S1 to HRZ-S9 (excluding MRZ-S2 and HRZ-S2) have immediate legal effect, along with the related objectives, policies and rules, <u>except within a new residential zone or a qualifying matter area</u> . Note that where one or more of the PDP building standards are not met, the proposal is assessed against the equivalent standard in the Operative District Plan and not this Proposed District Plan.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.2	Part 1 / How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / How the Plan Works General	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to provide clarification around the interim legal effect of specific provisions of the plan, particularly where qualifying matters apply.	Allow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.12	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / How the Plan Works General	Support in part	Supports the provided clarification in the IPI and PDP as to the legal effect of specific provisions. An amendment is sought to highlight to plan users the existence of qualifying matters and that if a development is located in an area where a qualifying matter applies, the MDRS does not have immediate legal effect. While submitter is aware the provision relating to legal effect and qualifying matters will technically not be required once the plan is made operative, considers that in the interim period it has concerns as to the lack of reference to qualifying matters and therefore supports any clarification that can be provided.	Amend the section Legal effect of rules, as follows: In addition, the District Plan gives effect to the 'Medium Density Residential Standards' (MDRS). The MDRS will replace the existing building standards in the residential zones (MRZ and HRZ) and set out the level of development that can occur on a site as a permitted activity. Specifically, MRZ-S1 to MRZ-S9 and HRZ-S1 to HRZ-S9 (excluding MRZ-S2 and HRZ-S2) have immediate legal effect, along with the related objectives, policies and rules, <u>except within a new residential zone or a qualifying matter area</u> . Note that where one or more of the PDP building standards are not met, the proposal is assessed against the equivalent standard in the Operative District Plan and not this Proposed District Plan.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.3	Part 1 / How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / How the Plan Works General	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to provide clarification around the interim legal effect of specific provisions of the plan, particularly where qualifying matters apply.	Allow

Interpretation - Definitions

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.2	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / How the Plan Works General	Support	Generally supports these provisions as drafted.	Retain "How the Plan Works" section as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.13	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / General Approach	Support	Supports the references to the standalone nature of the Infrastructure provisions. Such a reference assists in plan interpretation and application.	Retain the introductory text in the "Using the Plan" section as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.3	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / General Approach	Support	Support	Retain Te Anga Whānui - General Approach as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.34	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Cross Boundary Matters	Amend	Considers that there needs to be an emphasis on joint processing of consents would assist with giving effect to the NPS-FM.	Seeks the joint processing of consents be emphasized more.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.35	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Cross Boundary Matters	Amend	Considers the WCC/PCC boundary should be highlighted due to its potential significance for the Porirua Stream. Any use and development, including the provision of infrastructure, affects downstream environments including Te Awarua o Porirua/Porirua Harbour, and the performance of the Porirua Wastewater Treatment Plant.	Seeks for WCC to identify/ highlight the cross-boundary issue that occurs across the Porirua Stream catchment.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.8	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Cross Boundary Matters	Support in part	Supports reference to joint processing of resource consents regarding Porirua harbour and cross boundary issues between Porirua and Wellington City.	#REF!
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.9	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Cross Boundary Matters	Amend	Considers that the chapter should be amended to ensure that any use and development that impacts the downstream environment and Harbour as well as the Porirua Waste Water Treatment Plan performance.	Amend and redraft relevant sections of the Proposed District Plan to highlight and clearly spell out the significant cross boundary issue of pollution from Wellington City upstream to Te Awarua o Porirua.
Avryl Bramley	202.9	How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Relationships Between Spatial Layers	Amend	Considers it is not clear what the relationship between provisions is.	Seeks clarification how the Character precincts and Mount Victoria North Character Precincts provisions relate to one another.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.3	Interpretation Subpart / Interpretation General / Interpretation General	Support in part	Generally supports these provisions as drafted, except for the definitions noted below.	Retain "Interpretation" section as notified, except for the definitions submitted on below.
McDonald's	274.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Support in part	The PDP contains a number of definitions that McDonald's Restaurants will fall under: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service retail • Retail activity • Commercial activity • Drive-through activity • Drive-through restaurant In general McDonald's supports these definitions; however, it is unclear how the definitions relate to each other.	Retain the Definitions, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Amend	Given the discretionary default there needs to be certainty provided in this regards and McDonald's consider that it would be beneficial for the PDP to include a nesting table on the hierarchy of activities. This provides a logical method for organising different land use activities in a broader term.	Seeks amendment to include nesting table for definitions.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.1	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Support	FSNI support creating a nesting table within the definitions. Submission point 274.4 supports FSNI submission point 476.2.	Allow
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Amend	Considers that some definitions have a grey background due to being set by the National Planning Standards. It would be useful to have this noted at the start of the table.	Amend the Introduction to the Definitions chapter to state that 'Definitions set by the National Planning Standards are printed on a grey background'.
Yvonne Weeber	340.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Oppose in part	The current definitions relating to the Airport Zone, Airport Noise and Airport Designation are opposed, as they do not match the ones in the Operative Plan. Definitions relating to the Airport Zone, Airport Noise and Airport Designation need to remain the same as the operative plan to ensure the integrity of the agreed designation conditions on the Airports Main Site Area and East Side Area to allow these provisions to function properly.	Opposes all definitions relevant to the Airport Zone, Airport Noise and Airport Designation as they are not the same as the ones in the Operative Plan.
Yvonne Weeber	340.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Amend	All definitions relevant to the Airport Zone, Airport Noise and Airport Designation needs to remain the same as the operative plan to ensure the integrity of the agreed designation conditions on the Airports Main Site Area and East Side Area to allow these provisions to function properly.	Reinstate the Operative Plan's definitions relevant to the Airport Zone, Airport Noise and Airport Designation.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.4	Part 1/Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Not specified	Considers that the Operative Plan does not define many of the terms used within the Airport Zone. WIAL has filed submission with respect to the Proposed Plan that seeks to ensure the definition of terms such as "Airport Activity" and "Air Noise Boundary" reflect what is anticipated by the Main Site Area and East Side Area designations.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Support	Support	Retain Ngā Tautuhinga – Definitions as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.31	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Support	Submission point 349.4 supports FSNI submission points 476.3 - 476.6 however FSNI submission also seeks inclusion of a nesting table (476.2).	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Amend	The submitter seeks that the definitions relevant to the Airport Zone as the definitions need to remain the same as the operative plan to ensure the integrity of the agreed designation conditions on the Airports Main Site Area and East Side Area to allow these provisions to function properly.	Amend all definitions relevant to the Airport Zone to be the same as the operative plan to ensure the integrity of the agreed designation conditions on the Airports Main Site Area and East Side Area to allow these provisions to function properly.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.5	Part 1/Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Not specified	Considers that the Operative Plan does not define many of the terms used within the Airport Zone. WIAL has filed submission with respect to the Proposed Plan that seeks to ensure the definition of terms such as "Airport Activity" and "Air Noise Boundary" reflect what is anticipated by the Main Site Area and East Side Area designations.	Disallow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	Amend	Considers that it would be beneficial for the PDP to include a nesting table on the hierarchy of activities because would provide a logical method for organising different land use activities in a broader term.	Seeks that the Definitions include a nesting table on the heirarchy of activities.
Rod Halliday	25.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	No definition of 'Gas Transmission Pipeline corridor'. Without a definition, it may capture minor residential supply pipes down to individual stubs to dwellings.	Add new definition for 'Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor'.
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.1	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Firstgas supports this submission which seeks to add a new definition of 'Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor'. The inclusion of this definition is required to help implement rules within the Plan which relate to the gas transmission pipeline corridor. The definition would allow buffer/setback areas to be determined and therefore appropriately managing potential reverse sensitivity effects. This definition would provide clarity to the plan user of the extent of the pipeline corridor.	Allow
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	A new definition should be added for 'Agricultural Aviation Activity' so that it can be used in relevant rules and definitions to clearly describe the use of rural airstrips and landing areas by aircraft for rural production, biosecurity and biodiversity (conservation) activities.	Add a new definition for 'AGRICULTURAL AVIATION ACTIVITY' as follows: <u>Agricultural Aviation Activity: means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production activities, and; conservation activities for biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes; including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed-wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's).</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.6	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Not specified	WIAL remains neutral with respect to this proposed definition, however notes that such activities will fall within the management of the control tower at Wellington International Airport where they occur within the flight paths / operational areas of aircraft approaching / departing Wellington International Airport.	Allow / Seeks that part of the submission be allowed.
Nick Ruane	61.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that the concept of Universal Design requires a definition in the PDP as it is referenced.	Add a definition for 'UNIVERSAL DESIGN' as follows: <u>"Universal Design is the design and composition of an environment so that it can be accessed, understood and used to the greatest extent possible by all people regardless of their age, size, ability or disability. An environment (or any building, product, or service in that environment) should be designed to meet the needs of all people who wish to use it. This is not a special requirement, for the benefit of only a minority of the population. It is a fundamental condition of good design."</u>
Nick Ruane	61.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers a definition of 'ACCESSIBILITY' is required as it is defined under international law.	Add a new definition for 'ACCESSIBILITY' as defined in international law as follows: <u>"Article 9 – Accessibility States Parties shall take appropriate measures to ensure to persons with disabilities access, on an equal basis with others, to the physical environment, to transportation, to information and communications, including information and communications technologies and systems, and to other facilities and services open or provided to the public, both in urban and in rural areas"</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	Considers that the word 'overlay' is used in a number of parts of the PDP, including Infrastructure and Subdivision. A definition would improve the meaning of these clauses for the convenience of plan users. The Porirua PDP includes a definition of overlay which can be adapted for use in the Wellington District Plan.	Opposes the absence of a definition for 'overlay' and seeks that one be added.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.7	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	WIAL supports the inclusion of a definition in principle as this will provide greater certainty for plan users. WIAL submits however, that the proposed definition only refers to schedules, despite the term "overlay" being used in other contexts within the Proposed Plan (such as "Air Noise Overlay").	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that the word 'overlay' is used in a number of parts of the PDP, including Infrastructure and Subdivision. A definition would improve the meaning of these clauses for the convenience of plan users.	Add new definition for 'Overlay' as follows: <u>means the spatially identified sites, items, features, or areas with distinctive values, risks or other factors within the City which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions, as set out in Schedules 1-8 and 10-12.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.8	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	WIAL supports the inclusion of a definition in principle as this will provide greater certainty for plan users. WIAL submits however, that the proposed definition only refers to schedules, despite the term "overlay" being used in other contexts within the Proposed Plan (such as "Air Noise Overlay").	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that it is unclear what the difference is between "repowering" and "upgrading".	Add a definition for 'Repowering' (if it is different to 'Upgrading').
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.1	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Considers that the meaning of 're-powering' is framed by the rules in which the expression is used. Meridian has no opposition to a new definition for 'repowering' but will need to consider the detail of any wording proposed.	Allow / Seeks that definition be circulated prior to hearings and S42a reports.
Go Media Ltd	236.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that "Plain Wall Surface" in SIGN-S5.1 is open to interpretation.	Seeks a new definition of PLAIN WALL SURFACE. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero Inc	254.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that new definition will provide clarity around the walkable catchments that have been used in the PDP. As well as to provide flexibility in amending a walkable catchment in the future, should that be required.	Add definition for 'walkable catchment', as follows: <u>WALKABLE CATCHMENT</u> means the area an average person could walk from a specific point to get to multiple destinations. <u>The City Centre Zone uses a 15-minute walkable catchment. Walkable catchments around Metropolitan Centre zones and existing and planned rapid transit stops are also 15 minutes.</u>
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.40	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet the National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.68	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.15	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	Submitter seeks definition of 'walk catchment' based on an average person. There is no 'average' person. A walk catchment is a planning device in relation to destination points. The MFE definition notes that a very simplistic radial pedestrian-shed analysis would be sufficient to determine a walk catchment, Living Streets Aotearoa do not agree.	Disallow
Wellington City Council	266.49	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that to provide greater clarification in relation to different types of wetlands – in particular to distinguish between “constructed wetland” and “natural wetland” a new definition should be added. A definition of Constructed Wetland provides for clarity regarding types of wetlands, as set out by National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research.	Add new definition for 'constructed Wetland' as follows: <u>CONSTRUCTED WETLAND</u> means an artificial wetland that can be designed for flood control in addition to be used for natural processes involving wetland vegetation, soils, and their associated microbial assemblages to treat domestic wastewater, industrial wastewater, greywater or stormwater runoff, to improve water quality. Consequential amendments throughout the PDP to reference new definition.
Wellington City Council	266.50	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that a new definition should be added for first flush to provide clarity in association with amendments to THW-P1. This definition is consistent with Auckland Council GD01.	Add a new definition for 'First Flush' as follows: <u>FIRST FLUSH</u> means the initial surface runoff from a storm event. Initial runoff from highly impervious areas typically has high concentrations of pollutants compared to the remainder of the storm.
Wellington City Council	266.51	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers there is no definition of "interpretation signs".	Add a new definition for 'Interpretation Signs' as follows: <u>INTERPRETATION SIGNS</u> means signs that provide information to the public on the environmental, historic, cultural or other values of an area, often with photos, drawings or maps. Consequential amendments throughout the PDP to reference new definition.
Wellington City Council	266.52	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers it necessary to provide greater clarification in relation to different types of wetlands – in particular to distinguish between “constructed wetland” and “natural wetland”. This gives greater effect to the NPS-FM and NES-FM, and is consistent with Regional Policy Statements and plans.	Add a new definition for 'Natural Wetland' as follows: <u>NATURAL WETLAND</u> has the same meaning as defined in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 means a wetland (as defined in the Act) that is not: (a) a wetland constructed by artificial means (unless it was constructed to offset impacts on, or restore, an existing or former natural wetland); or (b) a geothermal wetland; or (c) any area of improved pasture that, at the commencement date, is dominated by (that is more than 50% of) exotic pasture species and is subject to temporary rain derived water pooling. Consequential amendments throughout the PDP to reference new definition.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.1	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the types of wetlands need to be distinguished in the Proposed District Plan and support the insertion of the natural wetlands definition from the NPS-FM. This relief would align with the Proposed Natural Resources Plan	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.53	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers clarification is needed around the meaning of 'undeveloped state' as used in the Three Waters chapter.	Seeks to clarify/add a new definition for 'undeveloped site' through collaboration with Greater Wellington Regional Council and Wellington Water.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Greater Wellington agree that a new definition or greater clarity on the term "undeveloped state" would be beneficial.	Allow
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	FS116.1	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	Rather than introduce a definition for "undeveloped state", SSNZ Wellington prefer to delete the term "undeveloped state" from the definition of "hydraulic neutrality" and amend the definition of "hydraulic neutrality"	Disallow
Wellington City Council	266.54	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers front, side and rear yards are not defined.	Add a new definitions as follows: <u>YARD</u> <u>means: any part of a site that must be kept clear and unobstructed by buildings and structures, except as otherwise provided for by this Plan. Yards will be measured in a horizontal plane at right angles to the boundary.</u> <u>- Front yard: where a site has frontage to a road, the area of land between the front boundary of the site and a line parallel to that boundary, extending the full width of the site. Where the site has two frontages to a road, each frontage is considered a front yard.</u> <u>- Rear yard: the area of land between the rear boundary of the site and a line parallel to that boundary, extending across the full width of the site. This will typically be the boundary associated with the rear elevation of a residential unit.</u> <u>- Side yard: the area of land between a side boundary of the site and a line parallel to that boundary, extending the full width of the site, but excluding those areas comprising front or rear yards.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Seeks to add new definition for "temporary emergency services training activity" to provide greater clarity to plan users and to support the relief sought elsewhere in this feedback. In order to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response, firefighter training is an essential activity undertaken by FENZ. Firefighter training may include live fire training and equipment training both on and off site. The Statement of Performance Expectations (SPE) 2021/22 confirms a commitment to the Government that all firefighters achieve a certain level of training.	Add new definition "temporary emergency services training activity": <u>Means a temporary activity undertaken for the training of any component of FENZ New Zealand for any emergency purpose. An emergency purpose are those purposes which enable FENZ New Zealand to achieve its main functions under sections 11 and 12 of the FENZ New Zealand Act 2017.</u>
Firstgas Limited	304.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that a new definition for 'Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor' should be added. The inclusion of additional terms is sought, which are required to implement rules in the Plan related to the Gas Transmission Network. The terms are required to differentiate between the underground, above ground and buffer/setbacks areas in relation to the infrastructure and managing potential reverse sensitivity issues. The definitions provide clarity on terms and how those terms relate to outcomes sought.	Add a new definition for 'Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor' as follows: <u>Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor: The area of land within 10m either side of the centreline of the Gas Transmission Pipeline.</u>
Firstgas Limited	304.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that a new definition for 'Gas Transmission Network' should be added. The inclusion of additional terms is sought, which are required to implement rules in the Plan related to the Gas Transmission Network. The terms are required to differentiate between the underground, above ground and buffer/setbacks areas in relation to the infrastructure and managing potential reverse sensitivity issues. The definitions provide clarity on terms and how those terms relate to outcomes sought.	Add a new definition for 'Gas Transmission Network' as follows: <u>Gas Transmission Network: Pipelines for the transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum at a gauge pressure exceeding 2,000 kilopascals, including any associated above or below-ground fitting, appurtenance, fixture or equipment required for the conveyance of the product or material in the pipeline and/or for its safe, efficient or effective operation.</u>
Firstgas Limited	304.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that a new definition for 'Gas Transmission Pipeline' should be added. The inclusion of additional terms is sought, which are required to implement rules in the Plan related to the Gas Transmission Network. The terms are required to differentiate between the underground, above ground and buffer/setbacks areas in relation to the infrastructure and managing potential reverse sensitivity issues. The definitions provide clarity on terms and how those terms relate to outcomes sought.	Add a new definition for 'Gas Transmission Pipeline' as follows: <u>Gas Transmission Pipeline: means any high pressure gas pipeline to convey natural gas at a gauge pressure exceeding 2,000 kilopascals.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	<p>Considers that as defined by section 771 and 770 of the RMA, the National Grid Corridor framework is considered a qualifying matter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is a matter required to give effect to the NPSET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD); - it is a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure; - provisions that restrict development in relation to the National Grid are included in the Operative District Plan; and - provisions that would protect the National Grid from inappropriate subdivision, use and development that would otherwise be permitted by the MDRS are included in the proposed district plan. <p>Considers given the role and importance of qualifying matters to the implementation of the RMA, the submitter supports the provision of a definition as an effective and practical method to clearly identify the existing qualifying matter provisions and provide clarity to plan users as to the provisions that will continue to apply where the MDRS and NPSUD intensification provisions would otherwise apply unrestricted.</p> <p>[see Appendix D in original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Add a new definition for Qualifying Matter as follows:</p> <p><u>Qualifying matter means a matter referred to in section 771 or 770 of the RMA.</u></p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.9	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	<p>WIAL supports in principle the inclusion of a definition for “qualifying matter” and “qualifying matter area” in the Proposed Plan. WIAL submits that this definition should be complete and further “qualifying matter areas” added. For example, the Wellington Airport Air Noise Boundary and Obstacle Limitation Surface should be included in the definition.</p>	Allow / Seeks that part of the submission be allowed.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.22	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New Definition	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes this request, as it considers that it is not required to aid in interpretation or implementation of the Plan. Kāinga Ora also opposes consequential changes to other provisions and rules referencing this proposed new term.</p>	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	<p>Considers that as defined by section 771 and 770 of the RMA, the National Grid Corridor framework is considered a qualifying matter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is a matter required to give effect to the NPS-ET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD); - it is a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure; - provisions that restrict development in relation to the National Grid are included in the Operative District Plan; and - provisions that would protect the National Grid from inappropriate subdivision, use and development that would otherwise be permitted by the MDRS are included in the proposed district plan. <p>Considers given the role and importance of qualifying matters to the implementation of the RMA, the submitter supports the provision of a definition as an effective and practical method to clearly identify the existing qualifying matter provisions and provide clarity to plan users as to the provisions that will continue to apply where the MDRS and NPSUD intensification provisions would otherwise apply unrestricted.</p> <p>[See Appendix D in submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Add a new definition for Qualifying Matter Area as follows:</p> <p><u>Qualifying matter area means a qualifying matter listed below:</u></p> <p><u>(a) The National Grid Yard / Transmission Line Buffer (32 metres)</u></p> <p><u>(b) The National Grid Subdivision Corridor/ Transmission Line Buffer (32 metres)</u></p> <p><u>(c)</u></p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.10	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	<p>WIAL supports in principle the inclusion of a definition for “qualifying matter” and “qualifying matter area” in the Proposed Plan. WIAL submits that this definition should be complete and further “qualifying matter areas” added. For example, the Wellington Airport Air Noise Boundary and Obstacle Limitation Surface should be included in the definition.</p>	Allow / Seeks that part of the submission be allowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.1	Part 1 / Introduction and General Provisions / Definitions / Qualifying Matter Area	Support	Supports the definition of 'Qualifying matter area' provided the definition includes the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Amend / Amend provision by including the rail corridor as a qualifying matter.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.23	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New Definition	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this request which would constrain urban development. Kāinga Ora also opposes all consequential changes to other provisions and rules referencing this proposed new term.	Disallow
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that Neither 'carpark' nor 'garage' are defined. When counting parking spaces, spaces within garages need to be included. TR - S7 sets out requirements for on-site vehicle parking and refers to Figure 5- TR and Table 10- TR. While these references have not been stated here, it may be worthwhile to expand the suggested definition to include them.	Add a new definition for 'Car Parking Spaces' as follows: <u>means a space adequate for parking an 4.91m x 1.87m vehicle (85th percentile vehicle) and includes a space or spaces within a garage.</u>
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that the current 'ongoing use' definition describes a continuing original use.	Add a new definition for 'Original Use' as follows: <u>means keeping a building or object in the same use it was originally constructed for.</u>
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that there is a definition of rapid transit stop, which references 'rapid transit service' and rapid transit stops are listed, along with railway stations in the definition of public transport activities. To future-proof the plan, it would be useful to define a minimum level for public transport to be considered rapid transit.	Add a new definition for 'Rapid Transit' as follows: <u>Includes public transport segregated from other traffic, including dedicated busways, trackless trams, trams, light rail and 'heavy' rail electrified multiple units</u>
The Sustainability Society	339.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that a definition for "water sensitive design" should be provided. It is important to recognise that water sensitive design is largely based on a set of Principals that cover water quality, water quantity, integrated urban design and co-benefits. A comprehensive definition of what is meant by the term water sensitive design should be included.	Add a definition for "Water Sensitive Design".
Carolyn Stephens	344.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that a comprehensive, holistic definition of character should be added, clarifying character as a qualifying matter under the National Policy Statement-Urban Development.	Add a new definition for "Character" that is comprehensive, holistic and qualifies character as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'residential unit' will be applicable to some units within retirement villages. In some cases, it will be necessary for the Proposed Plan to distinguish between a residential unit and a retirement unit. Seeks that a new definition of 'residential unit' is inserted.	Add new definition for RETIREMENT UNIT as follows: <u>means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.36	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers the term 'hard engineering' is defined in both the RPS and regional plan. Including a definition for hard engineering natural hazard mitigation works would align with the use of a specific definition of soft engineering hazard mitigation works.	Add a new definition for 'Hard Engineering Natural Hazards Mitigation Works' to align with operative RPS and regional plan as follows: <u>Engineering works that use structural materials such as concrete, steel, timber or rock armour to provide a hard, inflexible edge between the land-water interface along rivers, shorelines or lake edges. Typical structures include groynes, seawalls, revetments or bulkheads that are designed to prevent erosion of the land.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.11	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of this definition, as derived from the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and Regional Plan. WIAL would be comfortable for any relief that seeks to address the concerns raised in its primary submission with respect to the seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point to adopt this language.	Allow
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral'. [Refer to original submission]	Seeks a new definition for 'EV Charging Stations'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that a new, or expanded upon, definition should be included within the PDP so as to capture EV Charging Stations being included within common network utility equipment located within the road reserve. EV Charging stations are “appliances” rather than “works” as defined by Energy Safety, so are unlikely to be owned by network utility operators. However, it is important to note that the electricity distribution network will likely support such appliances within the road reserve.	Seeks that new definition for 'EV Charging Stations' is added that clearly identifies and provides for EV charging stations in the PDP.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that a comprehensive, holistic definition of character should be added, clarifying character as a qualifying matter under the National Policy Statement-Urban Development.	Add a new definition for "Character" that is comprehensive, holistic and qualifies character as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD.
Waka Kotahi	370.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	There is currently no definition for active transport, but several references to it in the PDP. For the sake of clarity, Waka Kotahi seeks that a definition be provided, and that the definition include cycling, micromobility and walking (including to and from public transport journeys).	Add a new definition for 'Active Transport'.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that Hazardous Facilities are not defined in the PDP and clarification is sought on this matter.	Add a new Definition for 'Hazardous Facilities'.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.12	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of this definition as it will assist with the application and implementation of provisions contained with the Ngā Matū Mōrearea Hazardous Substances section of the Proposed Plan.	Allow
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that there needs to be a definition for organic composting in order to provide for the composting of household food waste on a city-wide scale.	Add a new definition for 'Organic Composting'.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that 'Urban Areas' is not defined.	Not specified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that a new definition of 'walking catchments' is needed, being the definition provided by Section 5.5 of the MfE guidance in relation to the NPS-UD.	Add a 'walkable catchment' definition to the plan, being the definition provided by Section 5.5 of the MfE guidance in relation to the NPS-UD: <u>A walkable catchment is the area that an average person could walk from a specific point to get to multiple destinations. A walkable catchment of 400 metres is typically associated with a five-minute average walk and 800 metres with a 10-minute average walk. These distances are also affected by factors such as land form (eg, hills take longer to walk up and can be an obstacle to walking), connectivity or severance (eg, the lack of ease and safety of crossing roads, highways and intersections), and the quality of footpaths. Walkable catchments can be determined either using a simple, radial pedshed analysis or a more detailed GIS (geographic information systems) network analysis.</u>
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.17	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	Submitter seeks definition of 'walk catchment' based on an average person. There is no 'average' person. A walk catchment is a planning device in relation to destination points. The MfE definition notes that a very simplistic radial pedestrian-shed analysis would be sufficient to determine a walk catchment, Living Streets Aotearoa do not agree.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that there should be a definition for "net zero emissions" or "zero carbon" to have consistency of language regarding the city's response to climate change. It is laudable to see a commitment to align with the goal of net zero emissions by 2050. However, this section uses inconsistent language and does not fully express the urgency needed to address climate change, nor the critical role that cities can play through their Plans.	Seeks that a single term, such as "net zero emissions" or "zero carbon" be defined.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.13	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Not specified	WIAL supports, in principle, the inclusion of a definition to this effect, however opposes to the extent that further clarity around the drafting and implementation effects of such a term should be included.	Allow / Seeks that part of submission be allowed, but opposes to the extent that further clarity around the drafting and implementation effects of such a term should be included.
Director-General of Conservation	385.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Not specified	Considers that a definition be provided for "temporary infrastructure" within the Proposed District Plan.	Seeks that definition of "Temporary Infrastructure" is included within the Proposed District Plan

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	A definition is considered to be unnecessary as the 12-month time limit and relevant permitted activity standards adequately determine the effects envelope. [Inferred reference to submission 385.9]	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Supports the definition of 'Temporary infrastructure'. KiwiRail utilises temporary infrastructure within the rail corridor as part of the maintenance, repair, development and upgrade of the rail network. KiwiRail sees value in the definition being defined in the plan to provide for temporary rail infrastructure. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Director-General of Conservation	385.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Not specified	Considers appropriate to include an additional definition for a 'restoration or enhancement activity' in relation to the natural environment. Some of the policies and rules under this chapter refer to 'restoration', however the only definition of restoration under the Proposed District Plan relates to heritage values.	Seeks that an additional definition is include for a 'restoration or enhancement activity' in relation to the natural environment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.14	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the proposed definitions of 'restored' and 'restoration' do not adequately support the interpretation of the plan provisions. The terms are also not consistent with the regional plan.	Allow / Seeks definitions that are either consistent with the regional plan or a new definition for 'Restoration or Enhancement Activity'.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.25	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that there is a need to add papakāinga to definitions. Considers that within Taranaki Whānui's future aspirations for their properties could include papakāinga. [see original submission]	Seeks that a definition of 'papakāinga' be added to the Proposed District Plan.
Andy Foster	FS86.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Considers it is important that papakainga are allowed for. Considers that there is a problem with Taranaki Whanui's submission is that it is completely open ended about definition, location, size, design, height – and therefore potential impacts. Considers that it is quite reasonable that papakainga be allowed in areas where that level of development is anticipated. For example in residential areas allowing 11 metre heights, and the appropriate level of site coverage. That does not apply in ridgelines, special amenity areas, or open space. For Watts Peninsula this again means that a papakainga could well be a result of a master planning exercise, but it would come with some certainty about location, scale etc. Supports the request in part as it applies to zones where housing development of equivalent scale, height, site coverage is expected. For clarity that excludes open space and recreation zones and limits scale in rural areas. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.25]	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.36	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	The submitter seeks for a papakāinga chapter to be added to the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this part of the submission because we also seek the inclusion of a papakāinga chapter in the plan, as it will provide pathways for tangata whenua to build housing and gain tino rangatiratanga in regard to housing.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.26	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that it is needed to add definition of ahi kā and how it is expressed by Taranaki Whānui	Seeks that definition of 'ahi kā' is added and how it is expressed by Taranaki Whānui .
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.27	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers a definition for rāhui to be appropriate to add to the Proposed District Plan.	Seeks that a definition of 'rāhui' to be Added and to be discussed with Taranaki Whānui.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.31	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that references to "Natural Hazard Overlays" should be removed and replaced by a newly defined term "Natural Hazard Areas". Natural Hazard Overlays should instead be included as non-statutory, information-only mapping layer that sits outside the Proposed District Plan.	Seeks to add new definitions to identify flood hazards in the Plan, including a definition for "Natural Hazard Areas".
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.14	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	WIAL supports the use of natural hazard overlays as a non-statutory mapping tool, particularly with respect to the coastal hazard overlays that apply within the already built up area around Wellington International Airport.	Allow
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.47	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	MfE discussion paper on National Planning Standards: Zones and Overlays supports the use of the term 'overlay' to mean mapped areas which "introduce more restrictive built form controls than apply to the underlying zone". As this is the purpose of the WCC proposed plan's Natural Hazard Overlays, the term should be retained. Regulatory natural hazard overlays, including for flood, are an important tool to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that there should be an explanation of what is meant by community scale to accompany the definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures'.	Seeks that a definition of 'community scale' is provided.
Oyster Management Limited	404.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Seeks that a new definition for "indoor exercise facilities" be added to clarify that activities such as gyms can be provided for separately from other "recreation activities" [Refer to original submission for full reason] .	Add a new definition as follows: "Indoor exercise facilities" means indoor facilities used for exercise including gyms. Includes ancillary administrative activities such as offices."
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.27	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	The definition of Air Noise Overlay conflates the two functions of the aircraft noise boundaries that relate to Wellington International Airport. That is: 1. the Air Noise Boundary and 60db Ldn noise boundaries are used as a trigger for specific land use management requirements; and, 2. the Air Noise Boundary is used as a compliance boundary for aircraft noise generated at Wellington International Airport. The chapeau of the definition focuses on the latter. The terms 'Air Noise Boundary' and '60dB Ldn noise boundary' are well established and widely used throughout New Zealand with respect to the aircraft noise and land use management obligations surrounding airports. The term 'Air Noise Boundary' is also consistent with NZS6805, the Operative District Plan and WIAL's communications regarding their 'Quieter Homes' programme.	Add new definition: <u>Air Noise Boundary means the boundary shown on the district plan maps, the location of which is based on predicted day/night sound levels of Ldn 65dB from future airport operations at Wellington International Airport.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Not specified	Considers that there is confusion between the plan and the maps and what is being described as the Air Noise Boundaries Overlay (inner air noise overlay on the maps) and the 60db Ldn Noise Boundary (outer air noise ovelay on the maps) in the proposed District Plan.	Not specified / Seeks clarification so everyone knows the relationship of these two zoned areas in the words of the plan and the maps. The definition of Air Noise Overlay therefore needs greater clarification to link with the actual maps and wording on the maps.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.111	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New Definition	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the '60dB Ldn noise boundary' as an unnecessary and confusing addition which duplicates outer noise overlays. The definitions of inner and outer air noise overlay provide greater clarity and relate more clearly to mapped overlays.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Strathmore Park Residents Association Incorporated	FS122.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	Considers that as an organisation representing lay public the use of the term Overlays to specify (and map) Airport Noise Zones seems a positive step forward in giving a better understanding to DP provisions. Considers the boundaries & the means to establish them is a prescriptive, and a standards-based analysis & decision. Considers the rules which apply to the areas enclosed by boundaries (i.e. Overlays) is that defined by the District. Considers that an example is that the Inner Noise "Overlay" is divided into 3 zones for the purpose of residential noise mitigation and these zones have no reference in NZ Standards. [inferred reference to submission 406.27]	Not specified / Seeks that references to Airport Noise Overlays when referring to rules and recommendations with the formal Noise Boundaries are maintained.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.16	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.28	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	The definition of Air Noise Overlay conflates the two functions of the aircraft noise boundaries that relate to Wellington International Airport. That is: 1. the Air Noise Boundary and 60db Ldn noise boundaries are used as a trigger for specific land use management requirements; and, 2. the Air Noise Boundary is used as a compliance boundary for aircraft noise generated at Wellington International Airport. The chapeau of the definition focuses on the latter. The terms 'Air Noise Boundary' and '60dB Ldn noise boundary' are well established and widely used throughout New Zealand with respect to the aircraft noise and land use management obligations surrounding airports. The term 'Air Noise Boundary' is also consistent with NZS6805, the Operative District Plan and Submitter's communications regarding their 'Quieter Homes' programme.	Add new definition: <u>60db Ldn Noise Boundary means the boundary shown the district plan maps, the location of which is based on predicted day/night sound levels of Ldn 60dB from future airport operations at Wellington International Airport.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.3	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Not specified	Considers that there is confusion between the plan and the maps and what is being described as the Air Noise Boundaries Overlay (inner air noise overlay on the maps) and the 60db Ldn Noise Boundary (outer air noise overlay on the maps) in the proposed District Plan.	Not specified / Seeks clarification so everyone knows the relationship of these two zoned areas in the words of the plan and the maps. The definition of Air Noise Overlay therefore needs greater clarification to link with the actual maps and wording on the maps.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.112	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New Definition	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the '60dB Ldn noise boundary' as an unnecessary and confusing addition which duplicates outer noise overlays. The definitions of inner and outer air noise overlay provide greater clarity and relate more clearly to mapped overlays.	Disallow
Strathmore Park Residents Association Incorporated	FS122.3	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	Considers that as an organisation representing lay public the use of the term Overlays to specify (and map) Airport Noise Zones seems a positive step forward in giving a better understanding to DP provisions. Considers the boundaries & the means to establish them is a prescriptive, and a standards-based analysis & decision. Considers the rules which apply to the areas enclosed by boundaries (i.e. Overlays) is that defined by the District. Considers that an example is that the Inner Noise "Overlay" is divided into 3 zones for the purpose of residential noise mitigation and these zones have no reference in NZ Standards. [Inferred reference to submission 406.28]	Not specified / Seeks that references to Airport Noise Overlays when referring to rules and recommendations with the formal Noise Boundaries are maintained.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.17	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Michelle Rush	436.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	<p>Considers that there should be a definition for 'Walking Catchment' based on MfE guidance to the NPS-UD. The definition of a walkable catchment should also be consistent with the definitions used by Porirua City, Hutt City and Auckland City to provide certainty to the community. The decisions made about walkable catchments in relation to both the city centre and metropolitan zones are inconsistent and reduce, rather than increase the ability to intensify in areas that can be intensified for the benefit of providing extra housing and spaces for businesses and other facilities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new Definition for 'Walking Catchment'. The definition should be consistent with the following MfE guidance:</p> <p><i>"A walkable catchment is the area that an average person could walk from a specific point to get to multiple destinations. A walkable catchment of 400 metres is typically associated with a five-minute average walk and 800 metres with a 10-minute average walk. These distances are also affected by factors such as land form (eg, hills take longer to walk up and can be an obstacle to walking), connectivity or severance (eg, the lack of ease and safety of crossing roads, highways and intersections), and the quality of footpaths. Walkable catchments can be determined either using a simple, radial pedshed analysis or a more detailed GIS (geographic information systems) network analysis."</i></p> <p>and other City Councils' definitions, and should have the following criteria:</p> <p>(a) Within 1200 metres / 15 minutes of the edge of the City Centre; (b) Within 800 metres / 10 minutes of the edge of a Metropolitan Centre (e.g. Tawa, Johnsonville); (c) Within 800 metres / 10 minutes of Rapid Transit stops</p>
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.16	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks definition of 'walk catchment' based on an average person. There is no 'average' person. A walk catchment is a planning device in relation to destination points. The definition proposed by M Rush et al refers to factors affecting the ease of walking but all of the factors mentioned are not considered in the walk catchment zones provided. More factors should be included to provide a finer level of detail. The MfE definition notes that a very simplistic radial pedestrian-shed analysis would be sufficient to determine a walk catchment, Living Streets Aotearoa do not agree.</p>	Disallow
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.44	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.27	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.72	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.35	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Michelle Rush	436.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that there should be a definition to provide for a smaller scale of recycling activity. There should be more local provision for recycling and reuse including collection and sorting facilities, in line with Council's signalling of moves to a circular economy. Currently, such activities fall within the definition of heavy industry, and aren't easily provided for at local level. Local recycling facilities should be enabled at neighbourhood or local centre scale as part of supporting a circular economy.	Add a new Definition providing for smaller scale of recycling and reuse activity, including collection and sorting facilities.
John Wilson	453.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that there should be a definition of 'Rapid Transit Service'. Questions whether rapid transit includes all rail services on the Kapiti and Hutt Valley lines in Wellington city? Does it include the Johnsonville line, where the EMU speed limits are lower than for the other lines? Does it include urban bus services supplied by GWRC/Metlink? It presumably includes future light rail links, although speed limits for light rail vehicles on city streets will presumably be lower than for "Heavy Rail" lines on dedicated tracks without pedestrians?	Add definition of "rapid transit service" and clarify what services would be included in this definition. [Inferred decision requested]
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that in MRZ-PREC02-O1 (Purpose), as "townscape values" is not a defined term - only "townscape" is and the definition does not greatly assist with clarifying what values are at stake - much relies on the further planning framework, and the design guide in particular to protect the precinct.	Seeks that a definition of "Townscape values" is provided.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESS	Support	The definition of 'Access' is supported as it includes cycling access, which will avoid this mode being omitted from consideration across the Proposed District Plan.	Retain the definition of 'Access' as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESS	Support	Supports the definition of access.	Retain the definition of 'Access' as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESS ALLOTMENT	Oppose	Redundant as it duplicates definition of access lot and access strip.	Delete the definition of 'Access Allotment' in its entirety.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESS ALLOTMENT	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition "Access allotment".
Waka Kotahi	370.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESS LOT	Support	Supports definition of access lot as it has a more comprehensive explanation.	Retain the definition of 'Access Lot' as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESS LOT	Oppose	Considers this is unnecessary given there is already a definition of "access allotment"	Delete the definition "Access lot".

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESS STRIP	Oppose	Redundant as it duplicates definition of access lot and access strip.	Delete the definition of 'Access Strip' in its entirety.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESS STRIP	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition "Access strip".
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESSORY BUILDING	Support	Supports the definition for 'Accessory Building' as it best defines detached ancillary buildings that excludes any minor residential unit.	Retain the definition of "accessory building" as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE	Support in part	Clear and explicit definitions being applied in the PDP for electricity distribution network and associated facilities are supported, however a neutral stance has been taken in the context of the proposed defined terms within the PDP. It is considered that a safe, secure, affordable and resilient electric supply is critical infrastructure, and furthermore such infrastructure is just as much a priority as Council owned and operated infrastructure in regard to current or future development across the City.	Retain the Definition of 'Additional Infrastructure' as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Waka Kotahi	370.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports the definition of additional infrastructure.	Retain the definition of 'Additional Infrastructure' as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.20	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE	Support in part	Supports the intention of the definition of 'additional infrastructure' including social infrastructure, such as healthcare facilities.	Supports definition of ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE, with amendment
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.21	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	<p>Seeks amendment of the definition of 'additional infrastructure'.</p> <p>Seeks recognition of facilities that provide healthcare services are critical to cities. Seeks that "hospitals" be added to this definition.</p> <p>Appreciates that the definition of "additional infrastructure" in the Proposed Plan is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and generally supports the Proposed Plan being consistent with the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Questions the practicality of the application of the NPS-UD definition directly to the Proposed Plan in this case. States that the Proposed Plan differentiates 'health care activities' and 'hospitals', but the definition refers only to 'healthcare activities' – and hospitals are expressly excluded from the definition of 'healthcare activities'. While the list of social infrastructure at (d) is open-ended (and it may be the case that hospitals are intended to be included), there is concern around clarity and potential litigation.</p> <p>It is appropriate that hospitals also be included as 'additional infrastructure' definition because hospitals are critical social infrastructure (in the same way that healthcare facilities or schools are). Hospitals (including private hospitals) play an essential role in the healthcare system.</p>	Amend the definition of 'additional infrastructure' as follows: means: a. public open space; b. community infrastructure as defined in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002; c. land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities; d. social infrastructure, such as schools, <u>hospitals</u> and healthcare facilities; e. a network operated for the purpose of telecommunications (as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001); f. a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity or gas.
Ministry of Education	400.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports the definition as defined under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development since it includes schools.	Retain the definition of [Additional Infrastructure] as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports the inclusion of land transport, as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003, within this definition. Land transport includes any transport on land and infrastructure facilitating that transport.	Retain definition of ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.29	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIR NOISE OVERLAY	Oppose	The definition of Air Noise Overlay conflates the two functions of the aircraft noise boundaries that relate to Wellington International Airport. That is: 1. the Air Noise Boundary and 60db Ldn noise boundaries are used as a trigger for specific land use management requirements; and, 2. the Air Noise Boundary is used as a compliance boundary for aircraft noise generated at Wellington International Airport.	Delete definition of "AIR NOISE OVERLAY" in its entirety.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.4	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIR NOISE OVERLAY	Not specified	Considers that there is confusion between the plan and the maps and what is being described as the Air Noise Boundaries Overlay (inner air noise overlay on the maps) and the 60db Ldn Noise Boundary (outer air noise ovelay on the maps) in the proposed District Plan.	Not specified / Seeks clarification so everyone knows the relationship of these two zoned areas in the words of the plan and the maps. The definition of Air Noise Overlay therefore needs greater clarification to link with the actual maps and wording on the maps.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.113	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIR NOISE OVERLAY	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes deletion of the air noise overlay definition which relates to clearly mapped overlay areas.	Disallow
Strathmore Park Residents Association Incorporated	FS122.4	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIR NOISE OVERLAY	Oppose	Considers that as an organisation representing lay public the use of the term Overlays to specify (and map) Airport Noise Zones seems a positive step forward in giving a better understanding to DP provisions. Considers the boundaries & the means to establish them is a prescriptive, and a standards-based analysis & decision. Considers the rules which apply to the areas enclosed by boundaries (i.e. Overlays) is that defined by the District. Considers that an example is that the Inner Noise "Overlay" is divided into 3 zones for the purpose of residential noise mitigation and these zones have no reference in NZ Standards. [Inferred reference to submission 406.29]	Not specified / Seeks that references to Airport Noise Overlays when referring to rules and recommendations withing the formal Noise Boundaries are maintained.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.18	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIR NOISE OVERLAY	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT PURPOSES	Support	The definition of 'Airport Purposes' is supported as the purpose statement of the Designation includes fuel storage and fuelling facilities.	Retain the definition of 'Airport Purposes' as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.30	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT PURPOSES	Amend	<p>Considers that further amendments are needed to AIRPORT PURPOSES definition.</p> <p>It is also inappropriate for the definition to reference the designation as any subsequent alterations to the designation may result in the breadth of activities captured by this definition and the associated methods also being updated without going through the appropriate Schedule 1 process.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend definition of Airport Purposes as follows:</p> <p>Airport Purposes-Activities</p> <p>means the transport of people and cargo by aircraft and any ancillary activity or service that provides essential support to that function. Where a designation of the airport requiring authority exists, it additionally means the activities of the requiring authority described in the Purpose Statement or conditions of that designation.</p> <p><u>means any activity, wholly or partly, relating to the landing, departure and movement of aircraft and aircraft passengers, including but not limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>ground-based infrastructure, plant and machinery necessary to assist aircraft operations;</u> - <u>Runways, taxiways, aprons and other aircraft movement areas;</u> - <u>Aircraft rescue training facilities and emergency services;</u> - <u>Establishment, operation and use of runways, taxiways, aprons, and other aircraft movement areas;</u> - <u>Structures to mitigate against the impact of natural hazards;</u> - <u>Vehicle parking and storage, rental vehicle facilities, vehicle valet activities, and public transport facilities;</u> - <u>Terminal buildings, hangars, control towers, rescue and fire facilities, navigation and safety aids, lighting and telecommunication facilities, car parking, maintenance and service facilities, catering facilities, freight facilities, quarantine and incineration facilities, border control and immigration facilities, medical facilities, fuel storage and fuelling facilities, facilities for the handling and storage of hazardous substances;</u> - <u>Associated administration and office activities;</u> - <u>Ancillary activities, buildings and structures related to the above; and</u> - <u>Servicing, testing and maintenance activities related to the above.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.5	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT PURPOSES	Not specified	<p>Considers that while the Airport purpose definition may need expanding WIAL's designations are very different in the activities that occur in them. This needs to be considered in the definition.</p>	Not specified
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.19	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT PURPOSES	Support	<p>Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.31	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT PURPOSES	Amend	<p>Considers that Airports provide services beyond traditional 'runways and terminals', and provide a range of industrial, commercial and logistical land uses.</p> <p>Considers that it is becoming increasingly important for airport operators to retain sufficient flexibility to properly enable forward planning and development necessary to respond to changing demands that arise at a modern airport.</p> <p>Per case law, commercial activities form part of modern airports.</p> <p>The airport zone chapter does not adequately recognise the diverse and evolving nature of an airport and creates an inefficient and ineffective consenting framework that fails to recognise that a broad range of activities are reasonably anticipated within the zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the definition of Airport Purpose is updated to better reflect the activities that can be reasonably anticipated at the Airport.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.6	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT PURPOSES	Not specified	Considers that while the Airport purpose definition may need expanding WIAL's designations are very different in the activities that occur in them. This needs to be considered in the definition.	Not specified
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.20	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT PURPOSES	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.32	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that further amendments are needed to Airport Related Activities.</p> <p>It is also unclear what is meant by "third parties". The Airport Zone should stand alone, independent of the designation. This reference should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes definition of "AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES" and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.7	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Not specified	Considers that while the proposed changes appear valid we would be interested in what the council was proposing with the use of the 'third party' terminology.	Not specified
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.21	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.33	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Amend	<p>Considers that further amendments are needed to Airport Related Activities.</p> <p>It is also unclear what is meant by "third parties". The Airport Zone should stand alone, independent of the designation. This reference should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend definition of "AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES" as follows:</p> <p>Airport Related Activities means third party ancillary activities or services that provide support to the airport, <u>including but not limited to</u>:-</p> <p>a. land transport activities;</p> <p>b. buildings and structures;</p> <p>c. servicing and infrastructure;</p> <p>d. police stations, fire stations, and medical facilities emergency service facilities;</p> <p>e. educational facilities provided they serve an aviation related purpose;</p> <p>f. retail and commercial services and industrial activity associated with the needs of Airport passengers, visitors and employees and/or aircraft movements and Airport businesses;</p> <p>h. administrative offices, provided they are ancillary to an airport or airport related activity; <u>and</u> h. hotel / visitor accommodation, conference facilities and associated services.</p>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.8	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Not specified	Considers that while the proposed changes appear valid we would be interested in what the council was proposing with the use of the 'third party' terminology.	Not specified
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.22	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.34	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Amend	<p>Considers that Airports provide services beyond traditional 'runways and terminals', and provide a range of industrial, commercial and logistical land uses.</p> <p>Considers that it is becoming increasingly important for airport operators to retain sufficient flexibility to properly enable forward planning and development necessary to respond to changing demands that arise at a modern airport.</p> <p>Per case law, commercial activities form part of modern airports.</p> <p>The airport zone chapter does not adequately recognise the diverse and evolving nature of an airport and creates an inefficient and ineffective consenting framework that fails to recognise that a broad range of activities are reasonably anticipated within the zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the definition of Airport Related Activities is updated to better reflect the activities that can be reasonably anticipated at the Airport.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.9	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Not specified	Considers that while the proposed changes appear valid we would be interested in what the council was proposing with the use of the 'third party' terminology.	Not specified
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.23	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ANCILLARY TRANSPORT NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	Support in part	The definition of 'Ancillary Transport Network Infrastructure' is partially supported, given is amended to be more inclusive of cycling infrastructure.	Retain the definition of 'Ancillary Transport Network Infrastructure' with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ANCILLARY TRANSPORT NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers that this definition should be amended to include specific ancillary cycling infrastructure, as not listing this infrastructure may result in cycle infrastructure not being considered or elevated to the same level of importance as other transport. Wellington will require new types of transport infrastructure to support mode shift from private cars, such as on street secure cycle storage facilities.	Amend the definition of 'Ancillary Transport Network Infrastructure' as follows: ... <u>i. electric cycle charging facilities</u> <u>j. cycle stands, parking and storage facilities</u> <u>k. cycle repair stands</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ANCILLARY TRANSPORT NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers the definition appears to be illustrative and not exhaustive.	Amend the definition of 'Ancillary Transport Network Infrastructure' as follows: "...transport network and includes, <u>but is not limited to:</u> ..."
Waka Kotahi	370.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ANCILLARY TRANSPORT NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers the definition appears to be illustrative and not exhaustive.	Seeks to amend definition to include "rapid transit stops and shelters" should be specifically included in this definition."
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ANCILLARY TRANSPORT NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports specific reference to rail infrastructure within this definition, including train stations and rail furniture.	Retain definition of ANCILLARY TRANSPORT NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES	Amend	The definition of archaeological site should not be limited to the pre-1900 definition in the HNZPTA because this is an arbitrary date that does not reflect archaeological or historic heritage value.	[The decision requested is for the definition of 'Archaeological site', not selectable in this spreadsheet] Amend the Definition of Archaeological Site as follows: Has the same meaning as given in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPT Act) (as set out below): means, subject to section 42(3) of the HNZPT Act, a. any place in New Zealand, including any building or structure (or part of a building or structure), that— i. was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900 or is the site of the wreck of any vessel where the wreck occurred before 1900 , and ii. provides or may provide, through investigation by archaeological methods, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand; and b. includes a site for which a declaration is made under section 43(1) of the HNZPT Act.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.1	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES	Oppose	The definition as notified is aligned with the HNZPTA 2014 definition, and for consistency should be retained.	Disallow / Retain as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ASSISTED HOUSING	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Assisted Housing' should also include papakainga (or mixed generation) housing as a qualifying criteria towards city outcomes. There is a shortage of this type of housing for Maori and some Pacifica families, and also other ethnicities whose custom it is to live this way. This could be incorporated by way of the definition of 'assisted housing' if deemed appropriate: if not, the submitter requests this is included as a separate criterion.	Amend the definition of Assisted Housing to add papakainga or multi generational housing.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.32	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ASSISTED HOUSING	Oppose	Opposes defining 'Assisted Housing' and seeks deletion of this definition.	Delete the definition of 'Assisted Housing'.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Support	[no specific reason provided, see full submission]	Retain the definition of Biodiversity Compensation as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Oppose in part	Considers compensation is not an appropriate management tool for significant biodiversity, particularly in the context of an effects management hierarchy that lacks any requirement to avoid particular effects and therefore seeks that this definition be deleted. Notes that if the definition does remain, seeks that it requires no net loss and preferably a net gain. This is more clear than the standard of 'disproportionately positive'.	Delete definition of "biodiversity compensation".
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.3	Part 1 / Introduction and General Provisions / Definitions / Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of the definition of 'Biodiversity compensation' as this definition assists with the interpretations and implementation of ECP-P1. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.96	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Support	Greater Wellington support the amendment of the "Biodiversity compensation" definition to require "no net loss and preferably a net gain" for clarification and to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow / Seeks the definition for 'Biodiversity Compensation' be amended to ensure 'no net loss and preferably a net gain'
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Oppose	Considers that compensation is an appropriate management tool, including for effects on significant biodiversity, within an effects management hierarchy. Meridian considers that the definition should be retained and require no net loss and preferably a net gain.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Oppose in part	Considers compensation is not an appropriate management tool for significant biodiversity, particularly in the context of an effects management hierarchy that lacks any requirement to avoid particular effects and therefore seeks that this definition be deleted. Notes that if the definition does remain, seeks that it requires no net loss and preferably a net gain. This is more clear than the standard of 'disproportionately positive'.	Amend definition of "biodiversity compensation" to require no net loss and preferably a net gain, instead of "Disproportionately positive" "... The goal of biodiversity compensation is to achieve an outcome for indigenous biodiversity values that is disproportionately positive relative to the values lost of no net loss and preferably a net gain."
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.97	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Support	Greater Wellington support the amendment of the "Biodiversity compensation" definition to require "no net loss and preferably a net gain" for clarification and to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow / Seeks the definition for 'Biodiversity Compensation' be amended to ensure 'no net loss and preferably a net gain'
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.3	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Oppose	Considers that compensation is an appropriate management tool, including for effects on significant biodiversity, within an effects management hierarchy. Meridian considers that the definition should be retained and require no net loss and preferably a net gain.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Support	Supports the proposed definition of Biodiversity Compensation.	Retain the definition of 'Biodiversity Compensation' as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY OFFSETTING	Support	Supports the definition in respect of the reference to achieving the goal of no net loss, as opposed to a requirement for a net gain.	Retain the definition of Biodiversity Offsetting as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY OFFSETTING	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of "biodiversity offsetting" as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BIODIVERSITY OFFSETTING	Support	Supports the proposed definition of Biodiversity Offsetting.	Retain the definition of 'Biodiversity Offsetting' as notified.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Building' should be clarified. The definition as it stands captures non-motorised caravans, which are not capable of moving under their own power. The definition also creates several potential implications, which stem from the fact that individuals with non-motorised caravans will, by definition, be using and parking in a 'building'.	Amend the definition of 'Building' as follows: means a temporary or permanent movable or immovable physical construction that is: a) partially or fully roofed; and b) fixed or located on or in land; but excludes: any motorised vehicle, or other mode of transport that could be moved under its own power, <u>or non-motorised caravans other than those used for a residential accommodation/business purpose for a continuous period of more than two (2) months.</u>
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING	Support	The definition is supported. It is noted that part a. of the definition means an unroofed deck is excluded from the definition of building.	Not specified.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING COVERAGE	Support	The definition is supported. It is noted that the definition uses 'net site area' and 'building footprint' both of which are defined terms. An indication of this or a link to them would be useful.	Not specified.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING COVERAGE	Amend	Considers that the definition uses 'net site area' and 'building footprint' both of which are defined terms. An indication of this or a link to them would be useful.	Amend the definition of 'Building Coverage' to indicate or refer to the definitions of 'Net Site Area' and 'Building Footprint'. [Inferred decision requested]
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING FOOTPRINT	Amend	Considers that the definition uses 'buildings', 'any of those buildings' and 'the building' which is less than clear. In many parts of Wellington 'ground level' may vary by several floors between opposite sides of a building and identifying which is the 'ground floor' (as distinct from the 'main' or largest floor) is not obvious. The extent to which decks and eaves are included is not clear. A 'section of a building' does not obviously include eaves and it would be odd if the existence of an eave over part of a deck meant it qualified as partially roofed and therefore become a building. It is noted this definition is on a grey background so is from National Planning Standards. If it cannot be changed as requested, a supplementary definition specific to Wellington conditions is requested instead.	Amend the definition of 'Building Footprint' as follows: means, in relation to building coverage, the total area of buildings at the <u>floor or floors nearest to ground floor-level</u> together with the area of any section of any of those buildings that extends out beyond the <u>ground-floor-level</u> limits of the <u>that</u> building and overhangs the ground. <u>Any eaves up to 600 mm are not to be included in this total.</u> <u>Unroofed decks, even when partially sheltered by eaves, are excluded from the definition of building and do not count towards the building footprint.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	FS116.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING FOOTPRINT	Support	<p>While the definition of "building footprint" is from the National Planning Standards, Wellington City Council's interpretation that where the eave of a building extends partially over an open deck adjacent to a house requires all of the deck area to be counted as part of the "building footprint" is not the intention of the definition.</p> <p>If Central Government intended decks to be buildings or included in the footprint for coverage purposes, the NPS and MDRS would have been specific on this matter.</p> <p>SSNZ Wellington note that the National Planning Standards allow the inclusion of a subcategory term, or additional terms that have a different meaning. Therefore, a supplementary definition of "uncovered deck" is required that is excluded from the definition of "building" and "building footprint".</p>	Allow
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CABINET	Support in part	Supports definition of 'Cabinet' in general, as it explicitly includes casing for the continued use of electrical equipment such as switchgear and transformers. However, an amendment is sought.	Retain the definition of 'cabinet', with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CABINET	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Cabinet' should contain the words 'storage batteries' as this equipment is commonly contained within a "Cabinet".	<p>Amend the definition of 'Cabinet' as follows:</p> <p>means a three-dimensional structure that houses radio and telecommunication equipment, traffic operations and monitoring equipment, gas distribution enclosures and electrical equipment associated with the operation of infrastructure, which includes single transformers, <u>storage batteries</u> and associated switching gear distributing electricity at a voltage up to and including 110KV.</p>
LIVE WELLington	154.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CHARACTER	Oppose	<p>Opposes the definition of character.</p> <p>Considers it to be too loose and would likely encourage 'faux' old houses to replace genuine Edwardian and Victorian houses.</p>	Seeks changes to the District Plan that would prioritise the retention of actual old houses rather than imitation replacements, while allowing for refurbishments and upgrades that bring houses into line with modern standards of energy efficiency and modern living arrangements.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.32	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CHARACTER	Support	<p>Extend character precincts in the mapping. Improve the definition of character.</p> <p>Avoid erosion of character, especially in Thorndon; the city's (& NZ's) oldest suburb lost much when the urban motorway was carved through it. What remains is of significant cultural and other values. Significant and superior residential character on the eastern side of the suburb, though small in area, should be zoned as Character Precincts because they contribute significantly to the appeal, character and liveability of Thorndon.</p> <p>What remains is of significant cultural and other values. Significant and superior residential character on the eastern side of the suburb, though small in area, should be zoned as Character Precincts because they contribute significantly to the appeal, character and liveability of Thorndon.</p> <p>Inadequate infrastructure, and resilience to natural disasters are additional factors to account for. The natural vulnerabilities should restrain intensification within Thorndon. Thorndon is already a relatively intensely subdivided suburb (compared, say, to equivalent inner suburbs in Auckland).</p>	Allow
Ministry of Education	400.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CHILDCARE SERVICE	Support	<p>Supports the definition.</p> <p>The submitter supports the definition for educational facility also as it includes provision for childcare services also. However, the submitter considers that the definition for childcare services accurately reflects the broad range of activities that may be considered a childcare service. The submitter considers that the definition will be beneficial to differentiate between childcare facilities and schools both of which are educational facilities.</p>	Retain the definition of [Childcare Service] as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL ENVIRONMENT	Support	Supports the identification of the Coastal Environment on the basis it assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the plan provisions that relate to the definition.	Retain the definition (and identification) of Coastal Environment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL ENVIRONMENT	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Coastal Environment' as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.15	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL HAZARD OVERLAY	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it conflicts with WIAL's primary submission which seeks to remove the application of the tsunami coastal hazard overlays.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Coastal Hazard Overlays' as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.16	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL HAZARD OVERLAY	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it conflicts with WIAL's primary submission which seeks to remove the application of the tsunami coastal hazard overlays.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.19	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL MARGIN	Amend	Supports the provision of a definition as it assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the plan provisions that relate to the definition. However, considers it is not clear from the definition or the planning maps where the CMA line is (and therefore where the 10m extends from). Considers clarification is needed otherwise the definition potentially adds more confusion. This is particularly the case for more dynamic coastal environments where the CMA is not readily identifiable. Given the policy implications of defining the coastal margin (in that clarity is required as to where the line applies to enable efficient and effective plan implementation.	Seeks to amend the definition of 'Coastal Margin' to clearly define the CMA line, and clearly identify on the planning maps.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.17	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL HAZARD OVERLAY	Support	WIAL supports the provision of a definition as it assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the plan provisions that relate to the definition. WIAL submits that given the policy implications of defining the coastal margin, clarity is required as to where the line applies to enable efficient and effective plan implementation.	Allow
CentrePort Limited	402.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL MARGIN	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Coastal Margin' as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Amend	With the absence of a specific objective, policy and/or rule relating to service stations, yard-based retail, or general retail activities in some chapters of the PDP, the retail sale of fuel (including service stations and truck-stops and the ancillary sale of electricity as fuel) would fall into another activity definition. It is assumed that the definition of commercial activity includes retail activities as they include the trading of, goods equipment or services and seeks this is specifically provided for in the definition. However, for clarity, it is submitted that the definition is amended.	Amend the definition of 'Commercial Activity' as follows: Means any activity trading in goods, equipment or services including any retail activity. It includes any ancillary activity to the commercial activities (for example administrative or head offices).
Oyster Management Limited	404.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Support	Supports definition of "commercial activity".	Retain definition of "commercial activity" as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.32	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Support	Submission point 404.5 supports FSNi submission 476.3.	Allow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the definition of "Commercial activity".	Retain the definition of "Commercial activity" as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMERCIAL PORT	Support in part	Supports 'Commercial Port' definition in part.	Retain the definition of 'Commercial Port' with amendments.
CentrePort Limited	402.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMERCIAL PORT	Amend	Considers that the Commercial Port Area definition makes no mention of the Port Wharves known as Miramar and Burnham. These are operated alongside the main Port site described in the definition as well as Seaview in Hutt City. Each site is also defined as being Operational Port in the Coastal Marine Area in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan.	Amend definition of 'Commercial Port' as follows: means the area of land to the north and east of Waterloo and Aotea Quays, within Wellington Harbour (Port Nicholson) and adjacent land used, intended or designed to be wholly for Operational Port Activities. <u>The Commercial Port also includes wharf structures at Miramar and Burnham wharves.</u>
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ACTIVITY	Support	Considers that the definition is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards. Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain the definition of "community corrections activity" as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY FACILITY	Support in part	Supports the definition insofar as it includes land and buildings used by the community for safety purposes. However, as currently drafted, the definition could potentially be interpreted to include fire stations which FENZ does not consider appropriate. Whilst it is acknowledged that the District Plan has a separate definition for 'Emergency Service Facilities', which is supported, the 'community facilities' definition does not expressly exclude land and buildings used for emergency service facilities.	Supports the definition of "community facility" with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY FACILITY	Amend	Supports the definition insofar as it includes land and buildings used by the community for safety purposes. However, as currently drafted, the definition could potentially be interpreted to include fire stations which FENZ does not consider appropriate. Whilst it is acknowledged that the District Plan has a separate definition for 'Emergency Service Facilities', which is supported, the 'community facilities' definition does not expressly exclude land and buildings used for emergency service facilities.	Amend definition of "community facility": Means the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups. <u>Note: 'Community facility' excludes land and buildings used for emergency service facilities which is covered by the definition 'Emergency Service Facilities'.</u>
Ministry of Education	400.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY FACILITY	Support	Supports the definition as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of [Community Facility] as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY GARDEN	Amend	Submitter questions whether this definition should provide for composting up to a certain threshold in order to align with MRZ-P14.	Amend the definition of 'Community Garden' to clarify whether community gardens should provide for composting up to a certain threshold in order to align with MRZ-P14.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.37	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY SCALE NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION STRUCTURES	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to define hazard mitigation structures within the District Plan, including Greater Wellington facilities such as the Seton Nossiter flood detention area and the Stebbings Valley Flood detention Dam. It is important to include in the definition those entities responsible for construction and maintain these structures, including Greater Wellington.	Retain the Definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY SCALE NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION STRUCTURES	Support in part	Supports 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' definition in part.	Retain the definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY SCALE NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION STRUCTURES	Amend	Considers that some community scale natural hazard mitigation works may be required particularly where there is public access, as CentrePort holds considerable land adjoining the Coastal Marine Area. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	Amend definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' as follows: means natural hazard mitigation works that serve multiple properties and are constructed and administered by the Crown, the Greater Wellington Regional Council, Wellington City Council, <u>CentrePort</u> , or their nominated contractor or agent.
CentrePort Limited	402.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY SCALE NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION STRUCTURES	Amend	Considers that there is uncertainty as to the relationship between matters covered in the definition of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what is covered in the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation.	Clarify the relationship between matters covered in the definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' and 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation', in particular what is meant by community scale and what activities are excluded from this.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY SCALE RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY GENERATION ACTIVITY	Support	Considers the definition gives effect to the NPS-REG.	Retain the definition of 'Community Scale Renewable Electricity Generation' as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.33	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT	Oppose	Opposes defining 'Comprehensive Development' as a separate activity type from standalone houses or any other residential typology for the purposes of the zone rules and standards. Seeks deletion of this definition.	Delete the definition of 'Comprehensive Development'.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.59	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT	Oppose	Considers this is an important term used throughout the plan and needs to be defined to provide clarity about what the planning rules mean.	Disallow
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES	Amend	Supports the definition of 'Conservation Activities', but seeks that this is expanded to include 'biosecurity' and 'agricultural aircraft activities'.	Amend the definition of Conservation Activities as follows: means the use of land for activities undertaken for the purposes of maintaining, protecting and/or enhancing the natural and/or ecological values of a natural resource. It may include activities which assist to enhance the public's appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the resource, including: (a) species protection, <u>biosecurity</u> , and conservation management work, including restoration and revegetation; (b) pest and weed control <u>including the use of aircraft</u> ; and (c) educational activities.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES	Support in part	Considers the definition should be clear that activities to enhance appreciation and recreational enjoyment are only appropriate where they are consistent with the primary purpose. We therefore seek the following amendment:	Amend the definition of "conservation activities": Means the use of land for activities undertaken for the purposes of maintaining, protecting and/or enhancing the natural and/or ecological values of a natural resource. It may include activities which assist to enhance the public's appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the resource, <u>where that is consistent with maintaining, protecting or enhancing the natural and/or ecological values. Activities may include including:</u> a. species protection and conservation management work, including restoration and revegetation; b. pest and weed control; and c. educational activities
Director-General of Conservation	385.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the proposed definition of Conservation Activities.	Retain the definition of 'Conservation Activities' as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CONTAMINATED LAND	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the definition of 'Contaminated Land' as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CUSTODIAL CORRECTIONS FACILITY	Support	Considers that the definition is appropriate in 'capturing' custodial facilities such as Arohata Prison. Custodial facilities are essential social infrastructure. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain the definition of "custodial corrections facility" as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CUSTOMARY ACTIVITY	Support	Support the inclusion of customary activity in the definitions section, and the recognition it provides for Māori customary activities.	Retain the definition for 'customary activity' as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CUT HEIGHT	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'Cut Height' as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CUT HEIGHT	Amend	Considers the definition of "cut height" should refer to the vertical alteration of the ground. Notes that other local authorities in Wellington do not have a definition of "cut height".	Amend the definition of "cut height" to: Means the maximum height of the cut at the completion of earthworks, measured vertically from the highest point at the top of the cut to the bottom of the cut <u>vertical alteration of the ground by excavation measured vertically.</u>
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CYCLE	Support in part	The definition of 'Cycle' is partially supported, if it is inclusive and covers recycles and tricycle, and excludes skateboards, scooters and other modes covered by the definition of micromobility device.	Retain the definition of 'Cycle' with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CYCLE	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Cycle' is too broad and should be amended to be more inclusive. The definition should cover recycles and tricycle, and exclude skateboards, scooters and other modes covered by the definition of micromobility device.	Amend the definition of 'Cycle' as follows: means a transportation device that has at least two wheels and that is designed primarily to be propelled by the muscular energy of the rider <u>to rotate pedals</u> . It includes electric cycles.
Waka Kotahi	370.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CYCLE	Support	Supports the definition of cycle.	Retain the definition of 'Cycle' as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.34	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEMOLITION	Oppose	Opposes defining 'Demolition' and seeks deletion of this definition.	Delete the definition of 'Demolition'.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEMOLITION	Oppose	The definition of demolition provides clarity in administration of the rules related to the character precincts.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities wishes to remove reference of Demolition throughout the PDP. TRA are mindful that the greenest buildings are those timber buildings that are already built. There's an accumulative benefit from not demolishing older native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.60	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEMOLITION	Oppose	Considers this is an important term used throughout the plan and needs to be defined to provide clarity about what the planning rules mean.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DESIGN SPEED	Support	Supports the definition of design speed.	Retain the definition of 'Design Speed' as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY	Support in part	Supports the definition of 'Development Capacity' in principle as it is important to clearly identify the provision of infrastructure as a key element in the terms meaning and coverage. However, an amendment is sought regarding the inclusion of non-Council controlled infrastructure.	Retain the definition of 'Development Capacity', with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Development Capacity' should include the provision of non-Council controlled infrastructure. As it stands, the term 'Development Infrastructure' is taken to only include infrastructure controlled or owned by Council.	Amend the definition of 'Development Capacity' as follows: means the capacity of land to be developed for housing or for business use, based on: a. the zoning, objectives, policies, rules, and overlays that apply in the relevant proposed and operative RMA planning documents; and b. the provision of adequate development infrastructure <u>and additional infrastructure</u> to support the development of land for housing or business use.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	Not specified	Neutral on the definition of 'development infrastructure'. Considers that any prioritising 'Development Infrastructure' over 'Additional Infrastructure' will not achieve the stated development objectives and policies of the PDP. Critical and or key infrastructure provision (such as the electricity distribution network) should be given the same level of recognition and priority as that of Council owned and controlled 'Development Infrastructure'. [Refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'Development Infrastructure' as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Waka Kotahi	370.19	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports the definition of development infrastructure.	Retain the definition of 'Development Infrastructure' as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	Not specified	Considers that the current definition does not include access to waste facilities. For higher densities to occur, waste management has to be carefully planned for.	Not specified.
CentrePort Limited	402.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support in part	Supports 'Development Infrastructure' definition in part.	Retain the definition of 'Development Infrastructure' with amendments.
CentrePort Limited	402.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers that CentrePort should be listed in the definition. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network and land transport infrastructure within these landholdings. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	Amend definition of 'Development Infrastructure' as follows: means the following, to the extent they are controlled by a local authority, or council controlled organisation (as defined in section 6 of the Local Government Act 2002) <u>or CentrePort</u> : ...
Waka Kotahi	370.20	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DIGITAL SIGN	Amend	Considers that an amendment is needed to include and/or between electronic graphics and text using electronic screens to make it clear that the clauses are not necessarily conjunctive.	Amend the definition of 'Digital Sign' as follows: means a sign which displays electronic graphics and/or text using electronic screens. Digital Signs can include both moving and static signage.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.38	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DRAIN	Amend	Considers it is appropriate to define a drain, particularly where it forms part of a drainage network such as that operated by Greater Wellington. It is slightly inconsistent with the regional plan definition.	Seeks to amend the Definition of 'Drain' to align with regional plan definition.
Rod Halliday	25.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EARTHWORKS	Amend	Considers that the Earthworks definition is too restrictive in term of what activities is allows. The current exclusions for just gardening, cultivation and fence posts is far too narrow and restrictive. Exclusions to earthworks should include vegetation/topsoil removal, as this practice is necessary to enable the solid ground level to be accurately surveyed prior to dwelling or civil design work taking place. Without accurate ground levels, it is near impossible to calculate the area and depth of actual earthworks needed to facilitate a development.	Seeks that the Earthworks definition be amended to exclude topsoil removal.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heidi Snelson	FS24.1	Part 1 / Interpretation / Subpart / Definitions / EARTHWORKS	Oppose	Submitter seeks to undertake extensive earthworks without defined limits as specified by PDP in relation to depth or width or extent (across and beyond development).	Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed in part to limit earthworks based on depth, width and extent and form and site of such.
Rod Halliday	25.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EARTHWORKS	Amend	<p>Considers that the Earthworks definition is too restrictive in term of what activities is allows. The current exclusions for just gardening, cultivation and fence posts is far too narrow and restrictive.</p> <p>Exclusions to earthworks should include trenching, as it is a short-term activity and almost all are re-instated within 1-2 days once drainage, water or utilities such as power, fibre and gas are installed. Any longer than this increases the risk of trench material not being able to be used to backfill, the bedding material being washed out and/or damage to services.</p>	Seeks that the Earthworks definition be amended to exclude trenching.
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.2	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Oppose	<p>Submitter states that Rule R5 requiring hydrological neutrality for any new housing development should not apply to the Upper Stebbings Valley or Seton Nossiter catchments because both these catchments are protected by detention dams. Submitter argues that previous developments in these catchments, including Churton Park subdivisions over the last 5+ years, have had no requirement for stormwater neutrality - however climate change is accelerating and what was required in the past must change to reduce future negative flood impacts.</p> <p>Serious flooding has occurred in the past from these catchments including some events after the detention dams were constructed. Stebbings detention dam was completed in 1994 and is designed to hold back water arising from a one on one-hundred-year flood event, a target that is now unlikely to be met due to the accelerating effects of climate change.</p> <p>Furthermore, Glenside West catchment is not in the Stebbings Dam or Seton Nossiter catchment and there is no downstream floodwater protection therefore Council should be taking additional measure to reduce the impact of earthworks and housing development on the Glenside West water catchment.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledgement by Council that the Government's Policy Statement on Urban Development does not apply to areas such as Glenside West. - That any development in Glenside West takes place with a minimum of earthworks and that natural gullies are not filled in. - That the grey unbuilt area in Glenside West is unsuitable land for housing and that the whole area shown in mustard/yellow (Fig 1) is limited to Large Lot Residential. - Roading and housing doesn't extend into gullies, ephemeral streams, intermittent and perennial streams and is kept away from the ridgetop. - Furthermore no housing is built above the current Glenside-Churton park suburb boundary in order that the ridgeline is offered at least some degree of visual protection. - Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) on this site must be preserved and not impacted by development, if any development is to take place
Heidi Snelson	FS24.2	Part 1 / Interpretation / Subpart / Definitions / EARTHWORKS	Oppose	Submitter seeks to undertake extensive earthworks without defined limits as specified by PDP in relation to depth or width or extent (across and beyond development).	Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed in part to limit earthworks based on depth, width and extent and form and site of such.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EARTHWORKS	Support	Supports the definition on the basis it reflects the National Planning Standards. By default, the definition would cover quarrying activities, noting the Earthworks chapter in the PDP does not apply to quarrying activities provided for in the Quarry Zone.	Retain the definition of EARTHWORKS as notified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EARTHWORKS	Support	The definition for Earthworks is supported.	Retain 'Earthworks' definition as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EARTHWORKS	Support	The definition of 'Earthworks' is supported as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards definition for Earthworks.	Retain the definition of 'Earthworks' as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EARTHWORKS	Support	Supports this definition as it reflects the National Planning Standards. Earthworks are an activity which can directly impact on the National Grid and the submitter supports the provision of a nationally consistent definition.	Retain the definition of 'Earthworks' as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EARTHWORKS	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'Earthworks' as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ECO-SOURCED LOCAL INDIGENOUS VEGETATION	Support	Supports the proposed definition of Eco-Sourced Local Indigenous Vegetation.	Retain the definition of 'Eco-Sourced Local Indigenous Vegetation' as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EDUCATION FACILITY	Oppose	One definition is superfluous, but both terms are used in the PDP. It is preferred that the definition of "Educational facility" is the only one used throughout the PDP, so that child-care facilities are also clearly subject to reverse sensitivity (as they will then come under the definition of sensitive activity).	Delete mentions of "Education Facility" through out the plan and replace them with "Educational Facility".
Ministry of Education	400.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EDUCATION FACILITY	Oppose	Considers that the inclusion of the definition in the Proposed District Plan would result in two similar definitions, 'education facility' and 'educational facility'. The submitter considers that this may cause confusion for the District Plan users. The submitter considers that the main difference between the two definitions is 'education facility' excludes childcare facilities in the residential zones. However, this is already been outlined in the rule framework.	Delete the definition of [Education Facility] in its entirety.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.18	Part 1/Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EDUCATION FACILITY	Support	WIAL supports the deletion of this definition as the activity is inherently captured by the definition of "educational facility" (and associated definitions such as "noise sensitive activity").	Allow
Ministry of Education	400.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EDUCATIONAL FACILITY	Support	Supports the definition as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of [Educational Facility] as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EMERGENCY SERVICE FACILITIES	Support	Supports the definition of "emergency service facilities" as it provides an appropriate rule framework to better provide for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Retain the definition of "emergency service facilities" as drafted.
Oyster Management Limited	404.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EMERGENCY SERVICE FACILITIES	Support	Supports the definition of "emergency service facilities". In particular, the inclusion of fire stations and administration related to emergency services.	Retain the definition of "emergency service facilities" as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EXISTING SLOPE ANGLE	Amend	Considers the definition should include a minimum length over which the slope angle should be measured to avoid short changes in gradient that have no bearing on the overall slope of a site.	Amend the definition of "existing slope angle" to: Means the maximum slope segment angle of all slope segments. For a Cut – slope segments are measured (on a horizontal plane); – within the extent of the cut; and – uphill of the cut, the distance to the boundary or 10m whichever is the lesser. For a Fill – slope segments are measured (on a horizontal plane); – within the extent of the fill; and – downhill of the fill, the distance to the boundary or 10m whichever is the lesser. A slope segment is a segment of sloping ground that falls generally at the same angle to the horizontal (slope segment angle) and extends for a horizontal distance of at least 3m.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FILL DEPTH	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'Fill depth' as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FILL DEPTH	Amend	Considers the definition of "fill depth" should refer to the vertical alteration of the ground. Notes that other local authorities in Wellington do not have a definition of "fill depth".	Amend the definition of "fill depth" to: Means the maximum depth of the fill at the completion of the earthworks, measured vertically from the highest point on the top of the fill to the bottom of the fill placement vertical alteration of the ground by filling measured vertically.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	Support	Considers the definition matches the definition in the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of 'Functional Need' as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	Support	Supports the definition on the basis it reflects the National Planning Standards and provides certainty for users.	Retain the definition of FUNCTIONAL NEED as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	Support	Supports the definition of "functional need" as it defines activities that have a need to be located in certain locations where the activity is specifically required. Fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including those with increased risk of natural hazards. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community. Fire stations therefore need to be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and minimise response times so that they can efficiently and effectively respond to emergency call outs in a timely way, thus avoiding or mitigating the potential for adverse effects associated with fire hazard and other emergencies.	Retain the definition of "functional need" as drafted.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.20	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	Support	Considers the definition reflects that provided in the National Planning Standards and is therefore supported.	Retain the definition of 'Functional Need' as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	Amend	Considers that the definition of functional need should not be limited to location-specific needs but could rather require a building or feature to be designed in a particular manner. This term is included within matters of discretion for infringing a number of standards in the CMUZ zones, which is supported. However it is considered that the definitions of this term needs to be amended accordingly.	Amend the definition of 'Functional Need' as follows: The need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment or be designed in a particular way because the activity can only occur in that environment because of functional characteristics or constraints.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.4	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	Oppose	'Functional Need' is an expression that has come into use in resource management practice usually in association with the particular requirements of infrastructure (not general development activity). The definition should be retained as notified to ensure its specialist intent is not compromised by wider application.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.39	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers that an example would assist plan users. Proposed RPS Change 1 includes several examples in the definition for nature-based solutions. One of these examples may be suitable to include	Seeks to amend the Definition of 'Green Infrastructure' to include an example, such as a constructed wetland.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / GROUND LEVEL	Amend	<p>Considers that the definition of 'Ground Level' needs clarification. As records of title do not generally have levels along boundaries recorded, a. will be largely theoretical.</p> <p>For b. if there is a Resource or a Building Consent applied for, existing presumably means existing as of the date of the consent application. For work that is a permitted use and requires no consents, the date the work starts is the relevant one but there may be no record of this.</p> <p>For c. where a wall face is immediately adjacent to, rather than 'intersecting'; the boundary, the relevant surface is the wall face adjacent to the boundary and the relevant level is the level of the ground against that face. This case can be described as a wall 'on' the boundary. If the retaining wall or structure actually 'intersects' the boundary (now at d.), the surface at the boundary is the top surface of that wall or structure. This surface may well be higher than the ground level on the uphill side of the wall, particularly if the top of the wall is extended to provide a barrier against falling. In this 'intersecting' case, the ground level is best determined by using the level of ground at the uphill surface of the wall.</p> <p>It is noted this definition is on a grey background so is from National Planning Standards. If it cannot be changed as requested, a supplementary definition specific to Wellington conditions is requested instead.</p>	<p>Amend the definition of 'Ground Level' as follows:</p> <p>means:</p> <p>a. the actual finished surface level of the ground after the most recent subdivision that created at least one additional allotment was completed (when the record of title is created);</p> <p>b. if the ground level cannot be identified under paragraph (a), the existing surface level of the ground;</p> <p>c. if, in any case under paragraph (a) or (b), a retaining wall or retaining structure is located <u>immediately adjacent to or on</u> the boundary, <u>but does not cross it</u>, the level on the exterior surface of the retaining wall or retaining structure where it intersects <u>facing</u> the boundary.</p> <p><u>d. if, in any case under paragraph (a) or (b), a retaining wall or retaining structure intersects or crosses the boundary, the level on the uphill/ higher exterior surface of the retaining wall.</u></p>
Wellington City Council	266.55	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HABITABLE ROOM	Oppose	Considers the definition of Habitable Room is included twice.	<p>Delete the second occurrence of the 'Habitable Room' definition as follows:</p> <p>HABITABLE ROOM means any room used for the purposes of teaching or used as a living room, dining room, sitting room, bedroom, office or other room specified in the Plan to be a similarly occupied room.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HABITABLE ROOM	Support	Supports the definition of "habitable room" as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards definition	Retain the definition of "habitable room" as drafted.
Waka Kotahi	370.21	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HABITABLE ROOM	Support	Supports the definition of habitable room.	Retain the definition of 'Habitable Room' as notified.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Oppose	Considers that the definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activity' should be clarified to outline the criteria which define why and how an un-named activity may be sensitive. The definition only provide a list of uses or activities. This approach is inconsistent with the effects-based approach required to be taken in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.	Clarify the definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activity' to provide a set of criteria defining why and how an un-named activity may be sensitive.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the definition of hazard sensitive activity should not include 'Visitor accommodation'. A subcategory that excludes campgrounds from sensitive and hazard sensitive activities should be added to the definition.</p> <p>Reason being, camping grounds are transitory in nature and provide for accommodation on a temporary basis. People enjoy camping in areas with natural scenery and landscapes as well as in areas close to the central business centres. The effects can be moderated easily through more specific site management efforts as many of the activities are not permanently attached to the land. People can be moved easily and forewarned in the event of a potential risk or natural hazard.</p> <p>The New Zealand Motor Caravan Association operates over 47 parks across New Zealand, most of which are not categorised as a sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity.</p>	Amend the definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activity' to remove the mention of visitor accommodation.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the inclusion of retirement villages as a hazard sensitive activity.	Retain the definition of HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.40	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Amend	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, to assist users in applying Plan provisions.	Amend the Definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activities' to align with the definition in Proposed RPS Change 1.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support in part	The definition of Hazard Sensitive Activities is supported as it specifically includes Hazardous Facilities and MHF which recognises the risk associated with the manufacture, use, storage, transportation and disposal of hazardous substances and the potential of human and environmental harm from natural hazards. It is however considered that Hazardous Facilities are not defined in the PDP and clarification is sought on this matter.	Retain the Definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the inclusion of educational facilities in the definition of 'hazard sensitive activities' as it aims to protect educational facilities.	Retain the definition of [Hazard Sensitive Activities] as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE	Support	Supports the definition of "hazardous substance" as it is consistent with S2 RMA and HSNO Act 1996	Retain the definition of "hazardous substance" as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEALTH CARE FACILITY	Oppose in part	Considers that retirement villages typically offer a range of physical or mental health or welfare services to their residents; however, these are an ancillary activity to the primary residential purpose / function of the retirement villages. Considers that it is important the Proposed Plan explicitly recognises retirement villages as residential activities. Seeks that retirement villages are excluded from the definition.	Opposes the definition of HEALTH CARE FACILITY and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEALTH CARE FACILITY	Amend	Considers that retirement villages typically offer a range of physical or mental health or welfare services to their residents; however, these are an ancillary activity to the primary residential purpose / function of the retirement villages. Considers that it is important the Proposed Plan explicitly recognises retirement villages as residential activities. Seeks that retirement villages are excluded from the definition.	Amend definition of HEALTH CARE FACILITY as follows: means land and buildings used for providing physical or mental health or welfare services, including medical practitioners, dentists and dental technicians, opticians, physiotherapists, medical social workers and counsellors, midwives, paramedical practitioners, alternative therapists, providers of health and wellbeing services; diagnostic laboratories, and accessory offices, but excluding hospitals <u>and retirement villages.</u>
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.22	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEALTH CARE FACILITY	Support	Supports definition of 'Health care facility' as it recognises a wide range of services.	Retain the definition of HEALTH CARE FACILITY as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEAVY INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY	Amend	Considers that the Definition of 'Heavy Industrial Activity' should be amended, as it is not appropriate to group all waste management activities as heavy industry. Community waste collection and recycling could be key aspects of a more sustainable 'circular' economy. Also, having close-by small scale waste disposal and recycling will be critical to providing for walkable communities - and this definition, as the associated restriction in heavy industrial activities in neighbourhood zones, will limit that.	Amend the definition of 'Heavy Industrial Activity' as follows: means an Industrial Activity that generates: offensive and objectionable noise, dust or odour, significant volumes of heavy vehicle movements, or elevated risks to people's health and safety. Heavy Industrial Activities include quarries, abattoirs, refineries, the storage, transfer, treatment, or disposal of waste materials or significant volumes of hazardous substances, other waste management processes or composting of organic materials.
Waka Kotahi	370.22	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEAVY VEHICLE	Support	Supports the definition of heavy vehicle.	Retain the definition of 'Heavy Vehicle' as notified.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEIGHT IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Height in Relation to Boundary' needs clarification. Height is defined as "the vertical distance between a specified reference point and the highest part of any feature, structure or building above that point". When using the term "height of a structure" a specific vertical reference point needs to be specified, not just a distance from the boundary. I note this definition (as well as the definition for 'height') is on a grey background so is from National Planning Standards. If it cannot be changed as requested, a supplementary definition specific to Wellington conditions is requested instead.	Amend definition of Height in relation to boundary as follows: means the height of a structure, building or feature, relative to its distance from either the boundary of a measured vertically from ground level at: a. the boundary of the site; or b. a notional boundary within the site; or c. another specified reference point outside the site relative to its horizontal distance from that reference point.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HIGH COASTAL HAZARD AREA	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'High Coastal Hazard Area' as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.23	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HOSPITAL ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the definition of 'hospital activities' recognising a wide range of activities and ancillary activities which are relevant to the operation of a hospital. The nature of hospital activities is evolving and it is important that provisions in the Proposed Plan do not unduly or unintentionally narrow the range of activities which might now and in the future form part of hospital care.	Retain the definition of HOSPITAL ACTIVITIES as notified.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HYDRAULIC NEUTRALITY	Amend	<p>Considers that the definition of 'Hydraulic Neutrality' should be amended. The proposed definition's use of 'site in an undeveloped state' does not equate to the 'pre-development' used here except for greenfield sites.</p> <p>The rules relating to Hydraulic Neutrality, THW-R5 for up to 3 residential units and THW-R6 for 4 or more units, reference Wellington Water regional standards. Their Regional Standard for Water Services states in Section 4 Stormwater at 4.2.1 functionality (on page 29). (f) Retention or attenuation/detention facilities are required for all new development connecting to existing infrastructure and shall be designed to limit the design peak discharge from the development (post-construction) to not greater than the existing design peak discharge (pre-development) from the site for all events up to a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event which shall include the predicted impacts of climate change. (i) Wellington Water has the right to nominate an alternative design event and event duration to mitigate specific downstream risks.</p> <p>The proposed definition's use of 'site in an undeveloped state' does not equate to the 'pre-development' used here except for greenfield sites.</p>	<p>Amend the definition of 'Hydraulic Neutrality' as follows:</p> <p>means managing stormwater runoff from subdivision, use and development through either on-site disposal or storage, so that peak stormwater flows and volumes are released from the site at a rate that does not exceed the modelled peak flows from the site <u>in its existing an undeveloped state.</u></p>
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	FS116.3	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HYDRAULIC NEUTRALITY	Support	<p>The use of the term "undeveloped state" would suggest that the stormwater runoff from any existing buildings is to be ignored, and that the site be considered as though it was a vacant greenfield site.</p> <p>This definition is contradictory to the Regional Standard for water Services.</p> <p>The definition should refer to the site in it's current state (at the time of an application for development).</p>	Allow
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HYDRAULIC NEUTRALITY	Amend	Considers that the definition as proposed removes the existing use rights for any building to discharge stormwater from a site, by way of requiring the rate of stormwater discharge to be the same as that of an undeveloped site.	<p>Amend the definition of "hydraulic neutrality" to:</p> <p>Means managing stormwater runoff from subdivision, use and development through either on-site disposal or storage, so that peak stormwater flows and volumes are released from the site at a rate that does not exceed the modelled peak flows and volumes from the site <u>in an undeveloped it's existing state prior to subdivision, use or development.</u></p>
Waka Kotahi	370.23	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ILLUMINATED SIGN	Support	Supports the definition of illuminated sign.	Retain the definition of 'Illuminated Sign' as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INDIGENOUS VEGETATION	Oppose in part	Oppose the exclusion for indigenous vegetation as defined in and regulated by the NESPF. The NESPF allows for plans to be more stringent to protect significant biodiversity and for NZCPS and that would not be possible with this definition in place. We therefore seek that the second sentence of this definition is deleted.	<p>Amend the definition of "indigenous vegetation":</p> <p>Means vegetation or plant species, including trees, which are native to Wellington district. Indigenous Vegetation does not include "indigenous vegetation" as defined in and regulated by the NESPF.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Murray Martin	14.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFORMAL RECREATION ACTIVITIES	Amend	With specific regard to Owhiro Bay Parade, the concern is that if not amended, the current definition of 'informal recreation activities' means that the rule GRUZ - R5.2 prevails and vehicle access to Owhiro Bay Parade road/track becomes a Discretionary Activity. This opens the possibility of Council having exclusive access to this road/track, without public consultation on relevant access matters, which is not satisfactory to the user groups.	Amend "informal recreation" definition as follows: Informal Recreation Activities: means a pastime, leisure, sport or exercise activity that occurs on an ad-hoc basis or irregularly and contributes to a person's enjoyment and/or relaxation. It excludes: a. regular organised sport and recreation; and b. the use of motorised vehicles, <u>except on unformed legal roads.</u>
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFRASTRUCTURE	Not specified	Considers that quarrying activities outside the proposed Quarry Zone have a challenging role in the PDP as despite their location and resource dependence, functional constraints, and that they are essential to enabling growth of the city and enable the construction of key infrastructure (such as providing aggregate for cycleway and road construction, fill material for the repair and maintenance of three waters infrastructure), as well as essential construction material for new dwellings, they are not recognised as 'infrastructure' within the PDP. Horokiwi appreciates the definition of infrastructure within the PDP reflects that in the RMA.	Not specified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.21	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports the proposed definition of 'Infrastructure', that reflects that provided in the RMA.	Retain the definition of 'Infrastructure' as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports the definition of 'Infrastructure' is supported, as the definition provided under the RMA is considered clean and unambiguous for users of the PDP.	Retain the Definition of 'Infrastructure' as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFRASTRUCTURE	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the definition of 'Infrastructure' with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers that the definition for infrastructure under the RMA excludes waste processing and disposal facilities, therefore the continuance and expansion of these facilities (where necessary, but particularly recycling) needs to be included as part of the infrastructure definition. The alternative is to ensure that waste facilities are considered alongside infrastructure as stated below.	Amend the definition of 'Infrastructure' as follows: Infrastructure means - ... <u>(m) waste processing and disposal facilities.</u> [Inferred decision requested]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports that the definition refers to the RMA definition, noting clause (g) includes rail.	Retain definition of INFRASTRUCTURE as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFRASTRUCTURE	Oppose in part	Considers that NZDF is undertaking a nationwide project to ensure strategic defence facilities and infrastructure is appropriately recognised and provided for in district plans. Defence facilities are nationally and regionally significant, playing an important role in both military training and civil and/or national defence operations. They are essential in enabling NZDF to meet its obligations under the Defence Act 1990. NZDF therefore requests that any existing and future defence facilities in Wellington City are recognised and provided for in the District Plan as they are in many district plans throughout the country (including the Proposed Selwyn District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part).	Opposes the definition of Infrastructure and seeks amendment.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers that NZDF is undertaking a nationwide project to ensure strategic defence facilities and infrastructure is appropriately recognised and provided for in district plans. Defence facilities are nationally and regionally significant, playing an important role in both military training and civil and/or national defence operations. They are essential in enabling NZDF to meet its obligations under the Defence Act 1990.	Seeks amendment of the definition of "Infrastructure" to add "Defence Facilities".

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.22	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LAND DISTURBANCE	Support	Considers the definition reflects that provided in the National Planning Standards and is therefore supported. It is noted the term appears to only be used in INF-P7 and INF-S7.5 and therefore has limited application.	Retain the definition of 'Land Disturbance' as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LAND DISTURBANCE	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'Land Disturbance' as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LAND DISTURBANCE	Support	The definition of 'Land Disturbance' is supported as it is taken from the National Planning Standards and applies to activities undertaken in relation to contaminated land and the Chapter of the same, therefore no further comment is made.	Retain the definition of 'Land Disturbance' as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LARGE FORMAT RETAIL	Support	Supports the definition of "Large format retail".	Retain the definition of "Large format retail" as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LARGE SCALE RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY GENERATION ACTIVITY	Support	Considers the definition accurately captures the facilities and activities typically included in or associated with large scale renewable electricity generation activities such as wind farms.	Retain the definition of 'Large Scale Renewable Electricity Generation Activities' as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.41	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LESS HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, to assist users in applying Plan provisions.	Retain the Definition of 'Less Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LESS HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support in part	Considers that the definition of Less Hazard Sensitive Activities includes accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes. It is unclear whether such accessory buildings can be related to a Hazardous Facility, which is not currently defined, or a MHF, and clarification is sought on this matter.	Retain the Definition of 'Less Hazard Sensitive Activities', with amendment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LESS HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Amend	Considers that the definition of Less Hazard Sensitive Activities should be clarified, as it is unclear whether accessory buildings can be related to a Hazardous Facility, which is not currently defined, or a MHF, and clarification is sought on this matter.	Amend the Definition of 'Less Hazard Sensitive Activities' to clarify whether accessory buildings can be related to a Hazardous Facility.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Support in part	Supports the definition but seeks amendment to improve the meaning of Point (f).	Retain the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' with amendment.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Seeks amendment to improve the meaning of the definition.	Amend the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as follows: ... f. The affixing of scaffolding to a <u>heritage building</u> unless the work is reasonably required for health and safety. ...
Historic Places Wellington	182.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Support in part	Supports clarification of rules for repair and maintenance of heritage buildings.	Retain the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as notified. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.56	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers the wording of this definition in relation to the modification, removal or replacement of windows is confusing and needs to be amended for clarity.	Amend the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as follows: (...) h. The modification, removal or replacement of windows (all joinery, including frames, sashes, sills, casements, mullions, glazing bars), except; i. modifications as <u>necessary</u> to replace an existing clear single glazed window pane with a clear double glazed pane a clear single glazed window pane of an existing window with a new window pane.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.23	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Support	Considers that notwithstanding that the NES-ETA regulates maintenance (and by default repair) associated with existing National Grid lines, the definition of maintenance and repair is supported as it recognises activities associated with the ongoing operation of existing network utilities. However, clarification is sought as to how the rule is structured as it is unclear whether the opening clause a. and b. also apply to the INF chapter.	Retain the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as it relates to the Infrastructure (INF) chapter subject to amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.24	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers that notwithstanding that the NES-ETA regulates maintenance (and by default repair) associated with existing National Grid lines, the definition of maintenance and repair is supported as it recognises activities associated with the ongoing operation of existing network utilities. However, clarification is sought as to how the rule is structured as it is unclear whether the opening clause a. and b. also apply to the INF chapter.	Amend the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as it relates to the Infrastructure (INF) chapter subject to clarification that clause a. and b. do not apply in the Infrastructure chapters.
Waka Kotahi	370.24	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Support	Supports the definition of maintenance and repair.	Retain the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Maintenance and Repair' as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Support	Supports the inclusion of any work or activity necessary to keep the operation or functioning of existing infrastructure, within this definition.	Retain definition of MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers that the definition is very different to the one in the current District Plan and must ensure that heritage items are not able to be adversely affected using this definition.	Amend the definition of 'Maintenance and repair' as follows: Means: (For the purposes of the HH-Historic heritage chapter) In addition to the above, maintenance and repair of built heritage must not result in any of the following: <u>a. Demolition of a structural element</u> a. b. Changes to the existing surface treatment of fabric;
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers that the definition should be made clearer e.g. what is meant by surface treatment?	Clarify the definition, particularly the meaning of surface treatment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.19	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	Amend	Considers that double glazing should not be permitted as maintenance and repair and should instead be subject to the considerations of a resource consent process. Identifies the approach of English Heritage.	Seeks that the definition of 'maintenance and repair' is amended as follows: ... (For the purposes of the HH-Historic heritage chapter) In addition to the above, maintenance and repair of built heritage must not result in any of the following: h. The modification, removal or replacement of windows (all joinery, including frames, sashes, sills, casements, mullions, glazing bars) except; i. modifications as necessary to replace an existing clear single glazed window pane with a clear double glazed pane.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MAJOR HAZARD FACILITY	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'Major Hazard Facility' as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MARAE ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the definition of marae activity in the PDP, and deems all activities listed to be an accurate summary.	Retain the definition for 'marae activity' as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.25	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MICROMOBILITY DEVICE	Support	Supports the definition of micromobility device.	Retain the definition of 'Micromobility Device' as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.22	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MICROMOBILITY DEVICE	Amend	Considers that it is unclear if 'micromobility device' includes completely motorised versions such as e-scooters or is intended to support the sustainable modes that involve physical activity.	Clarify if 'micromobility device' includes completely motorised versions such as e-scooters or is intended to support the sustainable modes that involve physical activity.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MULTI-UNIT HOUSING	Oppose in part	Considers that as currently drafted the definition could be interpreted to encompass retirement villages which provide four or more residential units on a site. Retirement villages are provided for as a separate activity throughout the Proposed Plan. Considers that it is important the Proposed Plan provides a bespoke retirement village planning regime. Seeks that retirement villages are excluded from the definition.	Opposes definition of MULTI-UNIT HOUSING and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MULTI-UNIT HOUSING	Amend	Considers that as currently drafted the definition could be interpreted to encompass retirement villages which provide four or more residential units on a site. Retirement villages are provided for as a separate activity throughout the Proposed Plan. Considers that it is important the Proposed Plan provides a bespoke retirement village planning regime. Seeks that retirement villages are excluded from the definition.	Amend the definition of MULTI-UNIT HOUSING as follows: means any development that will result in four or more residential units on a site, excluding <u>retirement villages and</u> residential development within the Oriental Bay Precinct Area.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.35	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MULTI-UNIT HOUSING	Oppose	Opposes defining 'Multi-Unit Housing' as a separate activity type from stand-alone houses or any other residential typology for the purposes of the zone rules and standards. Seeks deletion of this definition. Consequential changes will also be needed throughout the residential, commercial, and mixed-use zone provisions to remove this distinction. It is considered that residential development should be considered on the basis of its effects and merits rather than specifically on typology or the scale/collective number of dwellings.	Delete the definition of 'Multi-Unit Housing'.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.61	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MULTI-UNIT HOUSING	Oppose	Considers this is an important term used throughout the plan and needs to be defined to provide clarity about what the planning rules mean.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.5	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MULTIUNIT HOUSING	Oppose	The removal of the definition of multi unit housing is opposed. This form of housing requires special design consideration.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	FS117.5	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MULTI-UNIT HOUSING	Oppose	The removal of the definition of multi unit housing is opposed. This form of housing requires special design consideration.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.25	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATIONAL GRID	Support	Considers that given 'National Grid' is referenced throughout the PDP, the submitter supports the definition as provided in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008. Considers the provision of a definition provides clarity for plan users as to what is the National Grid and assists with the interpretation and application of the objectives, policies and rules.	Retain the definition of 'National Grid' as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.26	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATIONAL GRID SUBDIVISION CORRIDOR	Support	<p>Given 'National Grid' is referenced throughout the PDP, Transpower supports the definition as provided in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008. Considers the provision of a definition provides clarity for plan users as to what is the National Grid and assists with the interpretation and application of the objectives, policies and rules. Considers the provision of the definition gives effect to the NPS-ET in that they clearly articulate the framework in which to give effect to the NPS-ET.</p> <p>The subdivision 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' width of 39m (maximum) is based on the distance from the centreline between the support structures to a point where the conductor would swing under possible high wind conditions and is the swing of the 95th percentile span across the country, as well as other variables. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p> <p>Considers it is important that the swing of conductors can be taken into account in the subdivision process so that the allotment(s) can be safely developed and used. This is why differing widths are provided for different voltage lines. In essence the Corridor is wider than the Yard and it should be noted that the Corridor and Yard overlap.</p> <p>Seeks amendment to the definition to recognise the two transmission lines within the city that have non-standard features [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Retain the definition of 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor', with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.27	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATIONAL GRID SUBDIVISION CORRIDOR	Amend	<p>Given 'National Grid' is referenced throughout the PDP, Transpower supports the definition as provided in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008. Considers the provision of a definition provides clarity for plan users as to what is the National Grid and assists with the interpretation and application of the objectives, policies and rules. Considers the provision of the definition gives effect to the NPS-ET in that they clearly articulate the framework in which to give effect to the NPS-ET.</p> <p>The subdivision 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' width of 39m (maximum) is based on the distance from the centreline between the support structures to a point where the conductor would swing under possible high wind conditions and is the swing of the 95th percentile span across the country, as well as other variables. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p> <p>Considers it is important that the swing of conductors can be taken into account in the subdivision process so that the allotment(s) can be safely developed and used. This is why differing widths are provided for different voltage lines. In essence the Corridor is wider than the Yard and it should be noted that the Corridor and Yard overlap.</p> <p>Seeks amendment to the definition to recognise the two transmission lines within the city that have non-standard features [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Amend the definition of 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' as follows:</p> <p>NATIONAL GRID SUBDIVISION CORRIDOR National Grid Subdivision Corridor means, as depicted in Diagram 1, the area measured either side of the centre line of any above ground National Grid transmission lines as follows:</p> <p>a. 14m of a 110kV transmission line on single poles <u>or a cable</u>;</p> <p>b. 16m of a 110kV transmission line on pi poles;</p> <p><u>c. 16m of the Te Hikowhenua - Deviation A (THW-DEV-A) transmission line on towers and Pi poles;</u></p> <p><u>d. 18m of the South Makara - Oteranga Bay A (SMK-OTB-A) 11kV transmission line on Single Poles;</u></p> <p><u>ce. 32m of a transmission line up to and including 110kV, on towers;</u></p> <p><u>df. 37m of a 220kV transmission line;</u></p> <p><u>eg. 39m of a 350kV National Grid transmission lines on towers.</u></p> <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.28	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATIONAL GRID YARD	Support	Supports the definition as considers the provision of this gives effect to the NPS-ET in that it clearly articulates the framework in which to give effect to the NPS-ET. [Refer to original submission for full reason] Seeks an amendment to recognise the two transmission lines within the City that have non-standard features. An amendment is also sought to the setback from support structures to apply the 12 metre setback regardless of voltage. Considers this is to ensure the support structure and line is not compromised. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain the definition of 'National Grid Yard', with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.29	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATIONAL GRID YARD	Support	Supports the definition as considers the provision of this gives effect to the NPS-ET in that it clearly articulates the framework in which to give effect to the NPSET. [Refer to original submission for full reason] Seeks an amendment to recognise the two transmission lines within the City that have non-standard features. An amendment is also sought to the setback from support structures to apply the 12 metre setback regardless of voltage. Considers this is to ensure the support structure and line is not compromised. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain the definition of 'National Grid Yard', subject to amendment as follows: NATIONAL GRID YARD means, as depicted in Diagram 1: a. the area located within 120m of either side of the centreline of an above ground 110kV electricity transmission line <u>up to and including 110kv</u> on single poles, or a cable; b. <u>the area located within 10m of either side of the centreline of the Te Hikowhenua - Deviation A (THW-DEV-A) - Single Circuit transmission line on towers and Pi poles;</u> bc the area located within 12m either side of the centreline of an above ground transmission line on pi-poles or towers that is up to 110kV or greater; ed. the area located within 12m in any direction from the outer visible edge of an electricity transmission <u>support structure pole or tower foundation, associated with a line which is up to 110kV or greater.</u> ...
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD	Support	Supports the definition of "natural hazard" as it is consistent with S2 RMA	Retain the definition of "natural hazard" as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.42	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION WORKS	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, to assist users in applying Plan provisions.	Retain the Definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION WORKS	Support in part	Supports 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' in part. Considers that there is uncertainty as to the relationship between matters covered in the definition of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what is covered in the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation.	Retain the definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' with amendments.
CentrePort Limited	402.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION WORKS	Amend	Considers that there is uncertainty as to the relationship between matters covered in the definition of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what is covered in the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation.	Clarify the relationship between matters covered in the definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' and 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation', in particular what is meant by community scale and what activities are excluded from this.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.43	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, identifying the areas of the particular hazard, including flooding, to assist users in applying the relevant Plan provisions.	Retain the Definition of 'Natural Hazard Overlays' as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.36	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Oppose in part	The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed, despite the overall support for the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards.	Opposes the definition of 'Natural Hazard Overlays' as it stands and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.19	Part 1/Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAY	Oppose	WIAL supports the further refinement of the natural hazard overlay and mapping in the Proposed Plan. WIAL however opposes the submission to the extent that this definition only deals with a selection of hazards, not coastal hazards such as tsunami risk. This creates ambiguity in the subsequent application of the natural hazard provisions of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.54	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.37	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Natural Hazards Overlays' should be amended.	Amend the definition of 'Natural Hazard Overlays' as follows: NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS AREA means the combined mapped extent within the District Plan of the following natural hazards: a. Flood Hazards b a. Liquefaction Hazards c b. Fault Hazards <u>And the Council's publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.20	Part 1/Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAY	Oppose	WIAL supports the further refinement of the natural hazard overlay and mapping in the Proposed Plan. WIAL however opposes the submission to the extent that this definition only deals with a selection of hazards, not coastal hazards such as tsunami risk. This creates ambiguity in the subsequent application of the natural hazard provisions of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.48	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Oppose	MfE discussion paper on National Planning Standards: Zones and Overlays supports the use of the term 'overlay' to mean mapped areas which "introduce more restrictive built form controls than apply to the underlying zone". As this is the purpose of the WCC proposed plan's Natural Hazard Overlays, the term should be retained. Regulatory natural hazard overlays, including for flood, are an important tool to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.55	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Support	Supports proposed definition which reflects that provided in the RMA.	Retain the definition of Network Utility Operator as notified.
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.4	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Support	Firstgas supports this submission which seeks for the definition of 'Network utility Operator' to retain as notified. The definition reflects that provided in the RMA and provides for Firstgas.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Amend	The submitter is concerned that this definition of network utility operator (though set by the national planning standard) may exclude operators of the state highway, as roads are often defined as the network managed by the territorial authority [the submitter was neutral on this provision	Delete mentions of "Network Utility Operator" throughout the plan and replace them with "Network Utility Operator and State Highway Network Operator".
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Support	Supports use of the RMA definition of Network Utility Operator, which includes railway activities in clause (f).	Retain definition of NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Oppose in part	Considers that the defined term 'retirement village' should be used for clarity [Note, the submitter incorrectly references THW-02].	Opposes the definition of NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY and seeks amendment as follows: means any lawfully established: a. residential activity, including activity in visitor accommodation or retirement accommodation- villages ; b. educational activity; c. health care activity; d. congregation within any place of worship; and activity at a marae.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	The definition of Noise Sensitive Activity is supported. Service stations frequently generate noise effects, not uncommonly on a 24/7 basis, and are required to comply with permitted noise limits of the district plan or limits otherwise included as conditions in an approved land use consent. These service stations are also frequently located at the edge of centre or commercial zones or in close proximity to residential activities which may be more sensitive to noise generating activities.	Retain the Definition of 'Noise Sensitive Activity' as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the inclusion of educational facilities in the definition of 'noise sensitive activities' as it aims to protect educational facilities.	Retain the definition of [Noise Sensitive] as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.35	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Oppose in part	Considers that the definition of noise sensitive activity does not adequately capture the range of activities typically considered to be sensitive to aircraft noise.	Opposes the definition of "NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY" and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.10	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the addition of noise sensitive activities of hospitals.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.24	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.36	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Amend	Considers that the definition of noise sensitive activity does not adequately capture the range of activities typically considered to be sensitive to aircraft noise.	Amend definition of "NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY" as follows: Noise Sensitive Activity means any lawfully established: a. residential activity, including activity in visitor accommodation or retirement accommodation; b. educational activity; c. health care <u>and hospital activities activity</u> ; ...
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.11	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the addition of noise sensitive activities of hospitals.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.25	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Amend	Supports the activities listed within this definition subject to amendments to clarify certain activities.	Amend definition of NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY as follows: means any lawfully established: a. residential activity, including activity in visitor accommodation or retirement accommodation, <u>including boarding houses, residential visitor accommodation and papakāinga</u> ; b. educational activity; c. health care activity, <u>including hospitals</u> ; d. congregation within any place of worship; and e. activity at a marae. Or any such alternative relief to ensure that all appropriate noise sensitive activities are covered by this definition.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.37	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NON-AIRPORT ACTIVITY	Amend	The definition requires updating to reflect Submitters' proposed replacement of the term "Airport Purposes" with "Airport Activity".	Retain definition of Non-Airport Activity with amendments.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.12	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NON-AIRPORT ACTIVITY	Not specified	Considers that if this adds wording clarity to the plan it would be useful.	Not specified
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.26	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NON-AIRPORT ACTIVITY	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.38	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NON-AIRPORT ACTIVITY	Support in part	The definition requires updating to reflect Submitters' proposed replacement of the term "Airport Purposes" with "Airport Activity".	Amend definition of "NON -AIRPORT ACTIVITY" as follows: Non-Airport Activity means an activity within the Airport Zone which is not for "Airport <u>Activity Purpose</u> " or an "Airport Related Activity".
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.13	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NON-AIRPORT ACTIVITY	Not specified	Considers that if this adds wording clarity to the plan it would be useful.	Not specified
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.27	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NON-AIRPORT ACTIVITY	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NON-CUSTODIAL REHABILITATION ACTIVITY	Support	Considers the definition is appropriate in 'capturing' non-custodial rehabilitative and reintegration activities and programmes. Non-custodial rehabilitative and reintegration activities and programmes are an important component of the rehabilitative process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain the definition of "non-custodial rehabilitation activity" as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.39	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE	Oppose	Submitter is not clear where this term is used within the Proposed Plan other than in the text of the Designation. Submitter is concerned that seeking to define this term in this manner oversimplifies the obstacle limitation surfaces described in Designation WIAL1.	Delete definition of "OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE" in its entirety. (Option A)

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.14	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE	Not specified	Considers that having words in the Proposed plan that need further connection to the designation and simply obstacle limitations either need further clarification or removal.	Not specified
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.114	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks the retention of a definition of “obstacle limitation surface” to provide clarity to Plan users.	Disallow / Seeks the retention of a definition of “obstacle limitation surface” to provide clarity to Plan users.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.28	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.40	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE	Oppose	Submitter is not clear where this term is used within the Proposed Plan other than in the text of the Designation. Submitter is concerned that seeking to define this term in this manner oversimplifies the obstacle limitation surfaces described in Designation WIAL1.	Amend definition of "OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE" to include reference to the relevant detailed provisions of Designation WIAL1. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.15	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE	Not specified	Considers that having words in the Proposed plan that need further connection to the designation and simply obstacle limitations either need further clarification or removal.	Not specified
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.115	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks the retention of a definition of “obstacle limitation surface” to provide clarity to Plan users.	Disallow / Seeks the retention of a definition of “obstacle limitation surface” to provide clarity to Plan users.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.29	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OBSTACLE LIMITATION SURFACE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OFFICIAL SIGN	Support	Supports the definition of "official sign" as it aligns with HSNO, HSW Act 2015.	Retain the definition of "official sign" as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.26	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OFFICIAL SIGN	Support in part	Supports the definition as it aligns with the NPS-UD.	Retain the definition of 'Official Sign', subject to amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.27	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OFFICIAL SIGN	Amend	Considers that there are two definitions for official sign, and only one aligns with the national planning standard definitions.	Retain the definition of 'Official Sign' which aligns with the NPS-UD and delete the additional definition for 'Official Sign' as follows: means all signs required or provided for under any statute or regulation or are otherwise related to aspects of public safety. Official signs include: traffic / pedestrian / cycling signs; railway signs; airport signs; port signs; and signs for the purpose of health and safety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OFFICIAL SIGN	Support	Supports the retention of one definition for 'Official sign' that aligns with the NPS-UD. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ONGOING USE	Amend	Considers that there is no definition for 'original use' 'existing use' or 'current use', and 'Original Use' is a more accurate description of this definition ('the same use it was originally constructed for'). Building uses change over time, and a current lawful use may be long established but not have been the use for which the building or object was originally constructed.	Amend the definition of 'Ongoing Use' as follows: means keeping a building or object in the same use it had at the time of the last approved legal use or change of was originally constructed for use.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ONSITE SIGNS	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'On-site Signs' as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.28	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATING SPEED	Support	Supports the definition of operating speed.	Retain the definition of 'Operating Speed' as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	Support	Considers that the definition matches the definition in the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of 'Operational Need' as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	Support	Supports the definition of "operational need" as it defines activities that have a need to operate in certain locations where the activity is specifically required. Fire stations that have a need to be located in certain areas may including areas with increased risk of natural hazards.	Retain the definition of "operational need" as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.30	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	Support	Considers the definition reflects that provided in the National Planning Standards and has high relevance to the National Grid within the PDP given the operational needs of the National Grid.	Retain the definition of Operational Need as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	Amend	Considers that the definition of operational need should not be limited to location-specific needs but could rather require a building or feature to be designed in a particular manner. This term is included within matters of discretion for infringing a number of standards in the CMUZ zones, which is supported. However it is considered that the definitions of this term needs to be amended accordingly.	Amend the definition of 'Operational Need' as follows: The need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment or be designed in a particular way because of technical, logistical or operational characteristics or constraints.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.5	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	Oppose	Considers that 'Operational Need' is an expression that has come into use in resource management practice usually in association with the particular requirements of infrastructure (not general development activity). The definition should be retained as notified to ensure its specialist intent is not compromised by wider application.	Disallow
Ministry of Education	400.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	Support	Supports the definition as at times the submitter has an operational need to establish educational facilities in areas prone to natural hazards. The submitter acknowledges the Proposed District Plan provisions which relate to buildings and infrastructure which have an operational need to be established in natural hazard areas.	Retain the definition of [Operational Need] as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.19	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL PORT ACTIVITIES	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Operational Port Activities' as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL PORT ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the inclusion of both ferry activities within this definition, as well as associated rail activities. KiwiRail has one ferry that is rail-enabled, and two further rail-enabled ferries will be arriving in 2025. It is important to include rail activities within this definition to accurately capture all port activities in Wellington.	Retain definition of OPERATIONAL PORT ACTIVITIES as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.31	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OUTSTANDING NATURAL FEATURES AND LANDSCAPES	Support	Supports the identification of such areas on the basis it assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the plan provisions that relate to the definition	Retain the definition of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.20	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PASSENGER PORT FACILITIES	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Passenger Port Facilities' as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PASSENGER PORT FACILITIES	Support	Supports this definition that provides for the transfer of freight and passengers to and from ferry services in an integrated manner.	Retain definition of PASSENGER PORT FACILITIES as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.23	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PEDESTRIAN	Amend	Considers that the definition of Pedestrian is more comprehensively defined in transport legislation and this should be used instead of the PDP definition.	Amend the definition of PEDESTRIAN as follows (use the transport legislation definition): means a person walking rather than travelling in a vehicle, including a person with impaired mobility who relies on mobility assistance including a wheelchair. <u>a) means a person on foot on a road; and</u> <u>b) includes a person in or on a contrivance equipped with wheels or revolving runners that is not a vehicle.</u> <u>Note: a pedestrian is a person and not a mode of travel. The mode of travel is 'on-foot', walking, running etc.</u> <u>[Inferred decision requested]</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PEST	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of "pest" as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.21	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PORT	Support in part	Supports definition of 'Port' in principle, with amendment.	Retain definition of 'Port' with amendments.
CentrePort Limited	402.22	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PORT	Amend	Considers that there should be recognition that Burnham and Miramar Wharves are located in the Coastal Marine Area and Burnham Wharf is used for Operational Port Activities. It is included in the Regional Policy Statement definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as being one of the three locations in Wellington Harbour for Commercial Port Activities. The land immediately adjoining Burnham Wharf is zoned General Industry there is an interrelationship with Port Activities. An alternative is to cross reference this matter in introductions of the Special Purpose Port Zone and Miramar/Burnham Precincts in the General Industrial Area.	Amend definition of 'Port' to include Miramar and Burnham Wharves.
CentrePort Limited	402.23	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PORT NOISE OVERLAY	Support in part	Support 'Port Noise Overlay' in part. Port Noise at Miramar and Burnham Wharves is subject to the Port Noise Management Plan required under the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. This definition does not include reference to Port Noise controls adjoining this facility. Without it the PNRP noise rule (requiring compliance with respect to the noise control line) cannot work. The location of the Port Noise Control Line at Burnham, if reinstated, should be determined on the basis of updated noise modelling which CentrePort currently has underway.	Retain definition of 'Port Noise Overlay', with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.24	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PORT NOISE OVERLAY	Amend	Port Noise at Miramar and Burnham Wharves is subject to the Port Noise Management Plan required under the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. This definition does not include reference to Port Noise controls adjoining this facility. Without it the PNRP noise rule (requiring compliance with respect to the noise control line) cannot work. The location of the Port Noise Control Line at Burnham, if reinstated, should be determined on the basis of updated noise modelling which CentrePort currently has underway.	Seeks that the 'Port Noise Overlay' definition is amended to: - Include Port Noise Control Line at Miramar/Burnham Wharf. - Provide note that Port Noise matters for land adjoining Miramar and Burnham Wharves is subject to the provisions in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.44	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / POTENTIALLY HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, to assist users in applying Plan provisions.	Retain the Definition of 'Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / POTENTIALLY HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	The definition of Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities is supported, as it includes commercial activities and retail activities (which includes Yard-Based Retail Activities and, therefore, service stations).	Retain the Definition of 'Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / POTENTIALLY HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities including offices and retail activities. This is appropriate and consistent with the other potentially hazard sensitive activities, which are activities which include employees but are not particularly sensitive (in comparison to, for example, childcare activities)	Retain the definition of "Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities" as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.98	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / POTENTIALLY HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the definition of "potentially hazard sensitive activities". Considers this is appropriate and consistent with the other potentially hazard sensitive activities, which are activities which include employees but are not particularly sensitive (compared to sensitive activities such as childcare activities).	Retain the definition of 'potentially sensitive activity' as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Potentially hazard sensitive activities	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities including offices and retail activities. This is appropriate and consistent with the other potentially hazard sensitive activities, which are activities which include employees but are not particularly sensitive (in comparison to, for example, childcare activities).	Retain definition of 'Potentially hazard sensitive activities' as notified.
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Amend	Supports the definition of 'Primary Production' and recognition of agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, and forestry activities.	Retain the definition of 'Primary Production' as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.29	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PUBLIC ACCESSWAY	Support	Supports the definition of public accessway.	Retain the definition of 'Public Accessway' as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.30	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the definition of public transport activity.	Retain the definition of 'Public Transport Activity' as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.25	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Public Transport Activity' as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the inclusion of services relating to train stations, ferry terminals and ancillary ticketing and passenger facilities, within this definition.	Retain definition of PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACTIVITY as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / QUARRY	Support	Supports the definition on the basis it reflects the National Planning Standards and provides certainty for users.	Retain the definition of QUARRY as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / QUARRY	Support	The definition for Quarry is supported.	Retain 'Quarry' definition as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / QUARRYING ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the definition on the basis it reflects the National Planning Standards and provides certainty for users.	Retain the definition of QUARRYING ACTIVITIES as notified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / QUARRYING ACTIVITIES	Support	The definition for Quarrying activities is supported.	Retain 'Quarrying Activities' definition as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAIL ACTIVITIES	Amend	Supports the inclusion of rail buildings, signaling, tracks and facilities within this definition. However, the definition needs to recognise that rail activities are more than operation of the railway, also encompassing development, upgrading and maintenance of the railway network.	Amend the definition of RAIL ACTIVITIES as follows: The use of land and buildings for the <u>development, upgrading, operation and maintenance</u> of a rail network, including railway signalling, railway tracks and facilities.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAILYARD AREA	Support	Support definition and acknowledge use of the term 'Railyard Area' in the Port Zone Chapter.	Retain definition of RAILYARD AREA as notified.
Generation Zero Inc	254.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	Amend	<p>Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line meets the definition and criteria of rapid transit in the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Considers that the NPS-UD is intended to align new higher density development along places with existing infrastructure. The Johnsonville Rail Line is underused and has spare capacity.</p> <p>Considers that the Greater Wellington Regional Council identification of the Johnsonville line as rapid transit in the RLTP 2021 as the best available source of information for the matter.</p> <p>Considers that failure to identify Johnsonville Rail Line as rapid transit will make the Proposed District Plan inconsistent with the requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Considers that identifying the Johnsonville rail line as a rapid transit service and intensifying around it will support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Considers that MfE guidance references Wellington's commuter rail services as an example of existing rapid transit stops as supporting Johnsonville Rail Line to be designated a rapid transit service.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend definition of 'rapid transit stop' as follows:</p> <p>RAPID TRANSIT STOP means a place where people can enter or exit a rapid transit service, whether existing or planned.</p> <p><u>The following stations on the Kapiti Line are rapid transit stops:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellington Station • Takapu Road Station • Redwood Station • Tawa Station • Linden Station • Kenepuru Station <p><u>The following stations on the Johnsonville Line are rapid transit stops:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crofton Downs Station • Ngaio Station • Awarua Street Station • Simla Crescent Station • Box Hill Station • Khandallah Station • Raroa Station • Johnsonville Station <p><u>The following station on the Hutt/Melling Line is a rapid transit stop:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngauranga Station
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.41	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	Oppose	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet the National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.4	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.69	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.70	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that train stations do not need to be identified in the definition.	Disallow
Stephen Minto	FS100.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	Oppose	<p>Submtter 254 proposes the encouragement of ‘Pop-up public realm’'s for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. ‘Closing time drink up ya tea’. That just doesn’t match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It’s simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it’s just bad luck.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 254.9]</p>	Disallow
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.7	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Waka Kotahi	370.31	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	Support	Supports the definition of rapid transit stop.	Retain the definition of 'Rapid Transit Stop' as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.5	Part 1 / Introduction and General Provisions / Definitions / Rapid Transit Stop	Support	Supports the definition of 'Rapid transit stop' which aligns with the NPS&UD definition. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Michelle Rush	436.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	Amend	Considers that the rapid transit stops interpretation should be amended to clarify which stations are rapid transit stops and include stops missing from the Johnsonville Line and Kapiti Line. The Kaiwharawhara station should be included in the Kapiti Line, as whilst currently unused, the NPS-UD references future transport routes as well as current. This station, which could be easily reinstated, is in an area increasingly important for both commercial and industrial activities, and housing.	Amend the definition of 'Rapid Transit Stop' as follows: means a place where people can enter or exit a rapid transit service, whether existing or planned. <u>The following stations on the Kapiti Line are rapid transit stops:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellington Station • Kaiwharawhara Station* currently in abeyance • Takapu Road Station • Redwood Station • Tawa Station • Linden Station • Kenepuru Station <u>The following stations on the Johnsonville Line are rapid transit stops:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crofton Downs Station • Ngaio Station • Awarua Street Station • Simla Crescent Station • Box Hill Station • Khandallah Station • Raroa Station • Johnsonville Station <u>The following station on the Hutt/Melling Line is a rapid transit stop:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngauranga Station.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.45	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RECLAMATION	Amend	Considers that the definition is inconsistent with the regional plan definition.	Seeks to amend the Definition of 'Reclamation' to align with regional plan definition.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.20	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RECONSTRUCTION	Support	Supports the use of the ICOMOS NZ charter definition.	Retain the definition of 'Reconstruction' as notified.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RECREATION ACTIVITY	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Recreation Activity' should include campgrounds as a recreational activity as this could achieve their desired outcome of campgrounds being a permitted activity in the zones.	Amend the definition of 'Recreation Activity' to include campgrounds.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports (b) of the definition, which is consistent with the proposed amended definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure in regard to telecommunication and radio communications networks in Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.	Retain clause (b) of the Definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Powerco Limited	127.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Oppose in part	Considers that Clause (a) of the definition of "Regionally Significant Infrastructure" relates to pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum. Powerco prefers the wording in the first bullet point of the proposed amended definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure in Proposed Change 1 to the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement that also recognises pipelines may include ancillary equipment to enable them to function.	Amend clause (a) of the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as follows: a. Pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum_ <u>including any associated fittings, appurtenances, fixtures or equipment.</u>
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Firstgas supports the intent of the submission which is seeking an amendment to the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure'. The submission seeks to amend the definition so that where it refers to pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum it specifically includes 'any associated fittings, appurtenances, fixtures or equipment.' This submission aligns with the intent of Firstgas' original submission seeking to amend this definition to specifically refer to 'The Gas Transmission Network'. This is to ensure that clarity is provided that any associated above or below-ground fitting, appurtenance, fixture or equipment required for the conveyance of the product or material in the pipeline is captured within the definition. Firstgas supports the submission in addition to seeking that the Gas Transmission Network is also specifically added to the definition.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Considers the definition matches the definition in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan (following settlement of appeals) and the proposed RPS change #1 and is supported by the regional community.	Retain the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports the definition of "regionally significant infrastructure", particularly the inclusion of the water supply network in the definition.	Retain the definition of "regionally significant infrastructure" as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' should be amended so that it incorporates the wider gas transmission network rather than the pipelines only. The network (which includes the ancillary above and below ground infrastructure), as opposed to solely the pipelines, delivers gas to consumers, thereby providing for their well-being and their health and safety. As such, it is the network, not only the pipelines that should be defined as Regionally Significant Infrastructure. (Option A)	Amend the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as follows: Regionally Significant Infrastructure: means regionally significant infrastructure including: a. Pipelines for the distribution of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum b. <u>The Gas Transmission Network</u> c. Facilities and structures necessary for the operation of telecommunications and radiocommunications networks operated by network utility operators; d. the National Grid
Firstgas Limited	304.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers that wider gas transmission network be included within the Regionally Significant Infrastructure, rather than the pipelines only. Relief to achieve this submission could be that any associated above or below-ground fitting, appurtenance, fixture or equipment required for the conveyance of the product or material in the pipeline and/or for its safe, efficient or effective operation is included in the definition. (Option B)	Amend the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' to include any associated above or below-ground fitting, appurtenance, fixture or equipment required for the conveyance of the product or material in the pipeline and/or for its safe, efficient or effective operation.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.32	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Considers the provision of a definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure and its use throughout the plan reflects the approach used within the Wellington Regional Policy Statement. While references, policies and methods specific to the National Grid (both within the policy and any rule framework) are supported, the inclusion of the National Grid within the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure is supported.	Retain the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Oppose in part	Seeks that the definition is confined (not including) to the listed matters. As such, we seek the deletion of the word 'including', and the insertion of the word 'means'. Considers paragraph a. needs to be more clearly defined to ensure it doesn't apply to things that are less than regionally significant, for example, piped gas for a subdivision. Considers paragraph j. should refer specifically to the port areas intended to be covered. Further, the following clause should be deleted: 'adjacent land used in association with the movement of cargo and passengers and including bulk fuel supply infrastructure, and storage tanks for bulk liquids, and associated wharf lines'. Either these areas are part of the Port, or they should not be included as RSI (just as the Wgtn Airport is defined).	Amend the definition of "regionally significant infrastructure": Means regionally significant infrastructure including: a. regionally significant pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum; b. facilities and structures necessary for the operation of telecommunications and radiocommunications networks operated by network utility operators; c. the National Grid; d. facilities for the generation and/or transmission of electricity where it is supplied to the National Grid and/or the local distribution network; e. the local authority water supply network and water treatment plants; f. the local authority wastewater and stormwater networks, systems and wastewater treatment plants; g. the Strategic Transport Network, as identified in the operative Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan; h. Wellington City bus terminal and Wellington Railway Station terminus; i. Wellington International Airport; and j. Commercial Port Areas within Wellington Harbour (refine areas) and adjacent land used in association with the movement of cargo and passengers and including bulk fuel supply infrastructure, and storage tanks for bulk liquids, and associated wharf lines.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.16	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Support the wording changes and removal of redundant words and areas of land.	Allow
Powerco Limited	FS61.1	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Oppose	The proposed change to the definition in regard to gas networks does not align with different changes being sought by Powerco and is unhelpful by referring to regionally significant pipelines (including gas) within the definition whereas the definition is intended to define what is regionally significant infrastructure.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.6	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Oppose	Rejects amendments that result in a departure to the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement definition of 'Regionally significant infrastructure'. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.3	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Oppose	Firstgas opposes this submission in part which seeks to amend the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' so that it more clearly defined.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.6	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Oppose	Considers that the definition matches the definition in the GWRC Natural Resources Plan which was settled following mediation of appeals. It is widely accepted and does not need the refinement requested.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS104.1	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Oppose	Defence facilities are critical for New Zealand's security and for the safety and well-being of the community. Although NZDF does not currently have major facilities in Wellington City, this does not preclude the need for future defence infrastructure in Wellington City and it is appropriate they are included in the definition as requested in NZDF's original submission. Use of the term 'including' in the definition is critical to ensuring regionally significant infrastructure that is not yet captured under this definition is not excluded, should they not be explicitly listed in the definition.	Disallow / Reject submitter's relief and retain definition of infrastructure as notified but with the addition of "defence facilities" as requested in NZDF's original submission.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support in part	Supports the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' in part and seeks amendment to ensure the WCC definition is consistent with other recent plan reviews in the Wellington Region. In particular, considers that the definition should align with the GWRC Natural Resource Plan, which has been confirmed through a negotiated court order.	Retain the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure', with amendment.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Removal of "...facilities for the generation (of electricity)..." fits with the definition's intention enable conveyancing: i.e. transmission, flow and movement of electricity, water and people. Generation facilities themselves appear to be an anomalous inclusion. Disallow those submissions that support the definition as notified.	Allow
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' should be amended to align with the definition in the GWRC Natural Resources Plan. Consider the definition should appropriately differentiate the two distinct elements of the distribution network. Wellington Electricity Lines Limited's distribution network consists of lower voltage electricity supply within the local distribution network. The distribution network also contains higher-voltage transmission lines that takes electricity supply from the National Grid (from Grid Exit Points – GXP) which is then supplied to the lower voltage to service the local distribution network. It is considered important for the 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' definition in the PDP to be consistent with other recent plan review processes in the Wellington Region– and therefore adopt the same definition as in the GWRC Natural Resource Plan, as well as the decisions version of the Proposed Porirua City District Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Amend the Definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as follows: means regionally significant infrastructure including: ... d. facilities for the generation and/or transmission of electricity where it is supplied to the National Grid and/or the local distribution network; <u>d. facilities for the electricity distribution network, where it is 11kV and above. This excludes private connections to the local distribution network.</u> ...
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.40	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Transpower accepts the relief sought on the basis specific reference is retained in the definition to the National Grid.	Allow / Seeks that part of the submission be allowed in so far as consistent with the relief sought in the Transpower submission.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Removal of "...facilities for the generation (of electricity)..." fits with the definition's intention enable conveyancing: i.e. transmission, flow and movement of electricity, water and people. Generation facilities themselves appear to be an anomalous inclusion. Disallow those submissions that support the definition as notified.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.32	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports the definition of regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.26	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Supports definition, noting that this is the Regional Policy Statement definition (Subject to the definition of Port being amended).	Retain the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.41	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Insofar as it relates to Wellington International Airport, the definition is consistent with the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement definition of regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain definition of "REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE" as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.30	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Supports the inclusion of the Strategic Transport Network within this definition. All railway corridors are included in the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 definition of Strategic Transport Network. KiwiRail seeks an addition to clarify that the Interislander ferry terminal is expressly included in this definition. The description of the Strategic Transport Network in Appendix B of the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 refers to railway corridors. While the railway corridor extends to the Interislander ferry terminal it is not expressly referenced in the description. KiwiRail seeks to avoid any ambiguity that the ferry terminal is not part of the Strategic Transport Network.	Amend definition of REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE as follows: ... g. the Strategic Transport Network, as identified in the operative Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan; h. <u>Interislander Ferry Terminal</u> , Wellington City bus terminal and Wellington Railway Station terminus; i. Wellington International Airport; and ...
New Zealand Defence Force	423.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Supports 'defence facilities' being added to the definition of regionally significant infrastructure. Considers that the wording of this definition is amended, as currently the wording is circular, i.e. 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure means Regionally Significant Infrastructure, including..'	Amend the definition of "Regionally Significant Infrastructure" as follows: Regionally Significant Infrastructure means regionally significant infrastructure including <u>includes</u> : ... k. <u>Defence Facilities</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.7	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	Oppose	Considers that the definition matches the definition in the GWRC Natural Resources Plan which was settled following mediation of appeals. It is widely accepted and does not need the refinement requested.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY GENERATION ACTIVITY	Support	Considers the definition accurately captures the facilities and activities typically included in or associated with renewable electricity generation activities.	Retain the definition of 'Renewable Electricity Generation' as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY GENERATION INVESTIGATION ACTIVITY	Support	Considers the definition accurately captures the facilities and activities typically included in or associated with renewable electricity generation investigation activities.	Retain the definition of 'Renewable Electricity Generation Investigation Activity' as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oranga Tamariki	83.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Support	Oranga Tamariki support the inclusion of the definition which is consistent with the National Planning Standard. Oranga Tamariki considers that it encompasses a range of Oranga Tamariki homes including those with custodial and/or supervised living accommodation where the residents may be detained on site.	Retain definition of Residential Activity as notified.
Oranga Tamariki	83.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Amend	Oranga Tamariki request that the 'Supported Residential Care Activity' be nested within the residential activity definition. The inclusion of 'Supported Residential Care Activity' and its definition further refines a specific subset of residential activity. Oranga Tamariki considers that it could encompass Oranga Tamariki homes and should be nested within the residential activity definition to enable the residential policy framework to apply to this activity.	Seeks that the definition of "Supported Residential Care Activity" be nested within the definition of "Residential Activities".
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Support	Considers that the definition is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards. This definition applies to supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama. Providing reintegration and rehabilitation support is an important component of the reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. It enables people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety	Retain the definition of "residential activity" as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the definition of "residential activity" as it includes the use of land and buildings that are primarily purposed for living accommodation.	Retain the definition of "residential activity" as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the definition of residential activity.	Retain the definition for 'residential activity' as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL UNIT	Support	Supports the definition of "residential unit" as it includes the use of a building or part of a building as forming part of a residential unit, one or more residential units, used or intended to be used for a residential activity.	Retain the definition of "residential unit" as notified.
Airbnb	126.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL VISITOR ACCOMMODATION	Amend	Considers that the distinction visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation should be clarified as the former appears to encompass the latter.	Clarify the distinction between visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESTORATION	Oppose in part	Considers the definition does not apply easily to ecological restoration and therefore seeks that this definition is amended	Amend definition of "restoration": Means an alteration to return a place to a known earlier form, by reassembly and reinstatement, and/or by removal of elements that detract from its heritage value, <u>or the rehabilitation of sites, habitats or ecosystems to support indigenous flora and fauna, ecosystem functions and natural processes that would naturally occur in the ecosystem and locality.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.46	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESTORATION	Amend	Considers that the definition is inconsistent with the regional plan definition. It is also unclear why restoration and restored have been separated out, such that 'restoration' relates only to cultural heritage.	Seeks to amend the Definition of 'Reconstruction' to align with regional plan definition.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.21	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESTORATION	Support	Supports the use of the ICOMOS NZ charter definition.	Retain the definition of 'Restoration' as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESTORED	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of "restored" as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.47	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESTORED	Amend	Considers the definition aligns with regional plan definition of 'restoration' relating to natural heritage but is inconsistently named	Seeks to amend the Definition of 'Restored' to align with regional plan definition.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RETAIL ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the definition of "Retail activity".	Retain the definition of "Retail activity" as notified.
Metlifecare Limited	413.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RETIREMENT VILLAGE	Support in part	Supports a broad definition of retirement village.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Metlifecare Limited	413.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RETIREMENT VILLAGE	Amend	Considers it should be recognised that given the economic conditions and changing nature of society, there are some limited circumstances where residents wish to or are required to work and are therefore not "retired". A minor amendment is proposed to reflect this.	Seeks to amend the definition of "retirement village" as follows: "residential accommodation for people who are <u>predominately</u> retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities."
Meridian Energy Limited	228.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Support	Considers the definition accurately describes the concept of reverse sensitivity and will be helpful to users of the plan.	Retain the definition of 'Reverse Sensitivity' as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.33	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Support	Supports the provision of a definition as the concept recognises the relationship between existing activities and incompatible new or altered activities. The term is used within the INF chapter within INF-O3 and INF-P7 and is of specific relevance to the National Grid.	Retain the definition of Reverse Sensitivity as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.33	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Support	Support the definition of reverse sensitivity as it provides for the operation of an existing lawfully established activity (state highway network) to be compromised, constrained or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential or perceived environmental effects generated by the existing activity.	Retain the definition of 'Reverse Sensitivity' as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.27	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Support	Supports the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Reverse Sensitivity' as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.42	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Support	The definition provides a consistent interpretation and application of the concept of reverse sensitivity.	Retain definition of "REVERSE SENSITIVITY" as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.31	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Amend	Supports the definition proposed in relation to reverse sensitivity effects. It is important to recognise the vulnerability of existing, lawfully established activities, such as the rail network, to noise sensitive activities being located nearby. However, the definition needs to recognise that rail activities are more than operation of the railway, also encompassing development, upgrading and maintenance of the railway network.	Amend definition of REVERSE SENSITIVITY as follows: means the potential for the <u>development, upgrading, operation and maintenance</u> of an existing lawfully established activity to be compromised, constrained or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential or perceived environmental effects generated by the existing activity.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.17	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Oppose	Considers that the proposed additions of 'development' 'upgrading' and 'maintenance' are too broad to be part of the reverse sensitivity definition.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.8	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to protect minor upgrading and maintenance of existing activities from reverse sensitivity effects.	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RIPARIAN MARGIN	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of "riparian margin" as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jeremy Partridge	102.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ROOT PROTECTION AREA	Amend	<p>Considers that the proposed definition of a Root Protection Area, with the canopy spread/dripline method proposed by Council to determine a critical area of roots, will fail to protect an adequate area and volume of roots required to maintain the tree's health, functions and physiology.</p> <p>The 'dripline half height' method proposed in the PDP derives from a British Standard method which was withdrawn in 2005 and replaced with the '12 times stem diameter' method.</p> <p>The NZ Arboricultural Association supports a different method which is the '12 times stem diameter multiplier method' to determine the area of roots a tree requires to function and survive and this method is also used in the Australian, American and British Trees and Construction National Standards.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the definition of 'Root Protection Area' to use the 12 times stem diameter method recommended by the NZ Arboricultural Association and not be based on the dripline or half tree height method taken from BS5837 1991.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ROOT PROTECTION AREA	Oppose	Notes the definition of root protection area in the Proposed Plan uses the British Standard which has been proven not to be accurate. It is sought that this be updated with the methodology most commonly used by arborists in New Zealand (from the Australian Standard).	<p>Delete the current the definition of "root protection area".</p> <p>Replace with the following definition:</p> <p><u>Means the area to be protected from root disturbance. It is calculated by using the following formula (from the Australian Standard)</u></p> <p><u>Root Protection Area = DBH x 12</u> <u>DBH is diameter of the trunk at breast height = trunk diameter measured at 1.4m above ground level.</u> <u>Radius is measured from the centre of the stem at ground level.</u> <u>For multi-stemmed trees, the following formula is used.</u> <u>Total DBH = Square root ((DBH1)2 + (DBH2)2 + (DBH3)2)</u> <u>The assessment of the root protection area also needs to take into account:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>existing root morphology and site conditions such as the presence of roads, structures, and underground services,</u> • <u>topography and drainage,</u> • <u>the soil type and structure,</u> • <u>the likely tolerance of the tree to root disturbance or damage based on species, age, condition, and past management.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	228.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Considers the definition accurately identifies land use activities that are sensitive to adverse amenity effects including noise.	Retain the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' as notified.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Oppose	Considers that the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' should be clarified to outline the criteria which define why and how an un-named activity may be sensitive. The definition only provide a list of uses or activities. This approach is inconsistent with the effects-based approach required to be taken in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.	Clarify the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' to provide a set of criteria defining why and how an un-named activity may be sensitive.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.9	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Oppose	Considers that camping grounds and all forms of temporary accommodation are potentially sensitive in relation to noise effects and should not be excluded from the definition. In the absence of any specific wording proposal, Meridian does not support the inclusion of criteria.	<p>Disallow / Seeks the requested exclusion of camping grounds or temporary accommodation is disallowed.</p> <p>Seeks the request to include criteria is disallowed.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the definition of sensitive activity should not include 'visitor accommodation'. A subcategory that excludes campgrounds from sensitive and hazard sensitive activities should be added to the definition.</p> <p>Reason being, camping grounds are transitory in nature and provide for accommodation on a temporary basis. People enjoy camping in areas with natural scenery and landscapes as well as in areas close to the central business centres. The effects can be moderated easily through more specific site management efforts as many of the activities are not permanently attached to the land. People can be moved easily and forewarned in the event of a potential risk or natural hazard.</p> <p>The New Zealand Motor Caravan Association operates over 47 parks across New Zealand, most of which are not categorised as a sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity.</p>	Amend the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' to remove the mention of visitor accommodation.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.10	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Oppose	Considers that camping grounds and all forms of temporary accommodation are potentially sensitive in relation to noise effects and should not be excluded from the definition. In the absence of any specific wording proposal, Meridian does not support the inclusion of criteria.	<p>Disallow / Seeks the requested exclusion of camping grounds or temporary accommodation is disallowed.</p> <p>Seeks the request to include criteria is disallowed.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.34	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the definition of Sensitive Activity as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.34	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the definition of sensitive activity.	Retain the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.19	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'Sensitive Activity' as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the inclusion of educational facilities in the definition as it aims to protect educational facilities.	Retain the definition of [Sensitive Activity] as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Supports activities listed within this definition.	Retain definition of SENSITIVE ACTIVITY as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SERVICE STATION	Support	The definition of Service station is supported, as the submitter assumes the definition includes truck stops	Retain the Definition of 'Service Station' as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.35	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SIGN	Support	Supports the definition of sign.	Retain the definition of 'Sign' as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.20	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SIGN	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'Signs' as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.35	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Support	Supports the identification of such areas on the basis it assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the plan provisions that relate to the definition.	Retain the definition of Significant Natural Area as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Support in part	Considers the definition should also include areas of significant biodiversity values that meet Policy 23 RPS criteria, but that are not yet on Schedule 8, for example where they are discovered as part of a consenting process. It also needs to include reference to the deleted SCHED9 – Urban Environment Allotments. Notes that the plan refers to SNAs in varying ways in different chapters. Some chapters simply use the term 'Significant Natural Area', while others refer to SCHED 8. We seek that the defined term is used throughout the plan.	Amend definition of "significant natural area": Means an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna <u>that meets any of the criteria in Policy 23 of the Wellington Regional Policy Statement, whether identified in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED9- Urban Environment Allotments, or as part of a consenting process.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.11	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Oppose	Meridian understands the desire to ensure all 'significant natural areas' are captured but the request erodes the certainty provided by the definition. Considers that plan users and resource users need the certainty of knowing, in any given situation, what and where significant natural areas are located.	Disallow
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SITE OR AREA OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	Support	Supports the definition of a site or area of significance to Māori.	Retain the definition for 'site or area of significance to Māori' as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SMALL SCALE RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY GENERATION ACTIVITY	Support	Considers the definition gives effect to the NPS-REG.	Retain the definition of 'Small Scale Renewable Electricity Generation Activity' as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.48	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SOFT ENGINEERING NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION WORKS	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term as it improves ease of use of the Plan and guides the Plan user and the examples included are useful.	Retain the Definition of 'Soft Engineering Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.36	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SPECIAL AMENITY LANDSCAPES	Support	Supports the identification of such areas on the basis it assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the plan provisions that relate to the definition.	Retain the definition of Special Amenity Landscapes as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.36	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / STREETScape	Support	Supports the definition of streetscape.	Retain the definition of 'Streetscape' as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / STRUCTURE	Support	Supports the definition of "structure" as it best defines buildings that are fixed/located on land.	Retain the definition of "structure" as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPERMARKET	Support	Supports the definition of "Supermarket".	Retain the definition of "Supermarket" as notified.
Oranga Tamariki	83.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	Amend	It is further considered that the definition should be completed by including "is provided" as it currently reads incomplete.	Amend definition of "Supported Residential Care Activity" as follows: means land and buildings in which residential accommodation, supervision, assistance, care and/or support by another person or agency for residents- <u>is provided</u>
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	Oppose	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama. That is, supported and transitional accommodation activities use "land and building(s) for people's living accommodation" (as per the definition of "residential activity"). As such, there is no need for a separate and standalone definition of "supported residential care activity" and the associated provisions applying to such throughout the PDP.	Remove the definition of "supported residential care activity" and the associated provisions applying to it throughout the plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.4	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the definition of “residential activity” entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama. That is, supported and transitional accommodation activities use “land and building(s) for people’s living accommodation” (as per the definition of “residential activity”). As such, there is no need for a separate and standalone definition of “supported residential care activity” and the associated provisions applying to such throughout the PDP.	Disallow
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	Support in part	Considers that there is no need for a separate and standalone definition of “supported residential care activity” and the associated provisions applying to such throughout the PDP. However, if this is retained, the wording is acceptable.	If the definition of ‘supported residential care activity’ remained in the Proposed District Plan, retain the wording as notified.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.5	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of the ‘Supported Residential Care’ definition as it is uncertain how the deletion of the definition would affect existing activities that fall within this definition.	Disallow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	Oppose in part	Notes that the definition of ‘retirement village’ includes the provision of ‘supported residential care’ within the village. However, retirement villages are regulated separately from ‘supported residential care’ and therefore retirement villages should be excluded from the definition. Notes that the definition for ‘supported residential care’ as currently drafted appears to be incomplete.	Opposes the definition of SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	Amend	Notes that the definition of ‘retirement village’ includes the provision of ‘supported residential care’ within the village. However, retirement villages are regulated separately from ‘supported residential care’ and therefore retirement villages should be excluded from the definition. Notes that the definition for ‘supported residential care’ as currently drafted appears to be incomplete.	Amend the definition of SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY as follows: means land and buildings in which residential accommodation, supervision, assistance, care and/or support <u>is provided</u> by another person or agency for residents <u>excluding retirement villages</u> .
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TECHNICIAN ARBORIST	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of “technician arborist” as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TECHNICIAN ARBORIST	Support in part	Considers the definition of technician arborist is restrictive by requiring the arborist to have a Level 6 diploma. An arborist could have the necessary expertise to be a technician arborist without having this qualification.	Amend the definition of “Technician Arborist” as follows: means a person who: ... c. has demonstrated competency to Level 6 New Zealand Diploma in Arboriculture standard (or to an equivalent arboricultural standard) <u>or has equivalent experience and is competent in the assessment of working around trees and their root zones on development sites</u> .
Massey University	253.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the definition for Temporary Activities as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Support in part	Supports the definition of “temporary activities” as it provides for temporary/ short-term event and activities. However, as below, FENZ requests a new definition for ‘temporary emergency services training activity’ to provide greater clarity to plan users and to support the relief sought elsewhere in this feedback. Subject to acceptance of the new definition for ‘Temporary emergency services training activity’ FENZ considers that ‘Temporary emergency services training activities’ should be excluded from this definition to provide further clarity to plan users.	Supports the definition of “temporary activities” with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.19	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Amend	Supports the definition of "temporary activities" as it provides for temporary/ short-term event and activities. However, as below, FENZ requests a new definition for 'temporary emergency services training activity' to provide greater clarity to plan users and to support the relief sought elsewhere in this feedback. Subject to acceptance of the new definition for 'Temporary emergency services training activity' FENZ considers that 'Temporary emergency services training activities' should be excluded from this definition to provide further clarity to plan users.	Amend definition of "temporary activities": Means any short term activities that are primarily held outdoors, on public or private land and that are intended to have a limited duration and incidence. This includes non-permanent ancillary buildings and structures associated with temporary activities. Temporary activities include: 1. Festivals, and exhibitions; 2. Fairs, carnivals and temporary markets; 3. Parades and ceremonies; 4. Council organised public firework displays; 5. Any short-term filming; 6. Public meetings; 7. Sporting and recreation events and associated temporary parking; and 8. Site offices for construction projects. <u>It excludes:</u> <u>1. temporary military training activity;</u> <u>2. temporary emergency services training activity.</u>
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Support	Support amending the definition to explicitly exclude Temporary Military Training Activities (TMTA) and Temporary Emergency Services Training Activities for further clarity	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.43	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Oppose	The definition does not currently define the time parameters of a "temporary" activity. Considers that an appropriate timeframe should be put on temporary activities. Considers that crange and building wraps should be included in the definition of "temporary activity".	Retain definition of "TEMPORARY ACTIVITY" and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.18	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Support	Considers that the addition of a timeframe and crange and building wraps are supported in the definition of temporary activity.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.32	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.44	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Amend	The definition does not currently define the time parameters of a "temporary" activity. Considers that an appropriate timeframe should be put on temporary activities. Considers that crange and building wraps should be included in the definition of "temporary activity".	Amend the definition of "TEMPORARY ACTIVITY" to include: 1. A timeframe that provides clarity around a "short term" activity; and, 2. Crange and building wrap as a specific listed matter.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.19	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Support	Considers that the addition of a timeframe and crange and building wraps are supported in the definition of temporary activity.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.33	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	423.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TEMPORARY MILITARY TRAINING ACTIVITY	Support	Considers that the proposed definition is consistent with the definition in the National Planning Standards (2019). NZDF supports the inclusion of this definition.	Retain definition of Temporary Military Training Activity as notified.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TERTIARY EDUCATION FACILITY	Support in part	<p>Considers that the definition should include 'education and research partners' to provide for activities such as the existing Malaghan Institute of Medical Research, as well as ensuring research partners who seek to collocate with the University on the Kelburn campus are provided for in the future.</p> <p>This is consistent with the wider definition/catch all 'educational services' under the Wellington Operative District Plan, which includes: ... research activities of the institution and encompassing all such activities consistent with the function of a modern university.</p> <p>The definition should also include 'ancillary food, beverage and retail' to cover activities such as the existing University bookshop, food and beverage shops (e.g. campus cafes like Wishbone and Subway), as well as ensuring that such activities are provided for in the future.</p> <p>This is consistent with the wider definition/catch all 'educational services' under the Wellington Operative District Plan, which includes: ...business and social services related to the education and research activities of the institution and encompassing all such activities consistent with the function of a modern university.</p>	<p>Amend the definition of 'Tertiary Education Facility' as follows:</p> <p>Tertiary Education Facility means land or buildings used for tertiary education and research activities.</p> <p>Includes:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><u>i. education and research partners;</u></p> <p><u>ii. any ancillary activity necessary for the effective operation of the University sites which includes:</u></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><u>xiii. food and beverage; and</u></p> <p><u>xiv. retail.</u></p>
Massey University	253.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TERTIARY EDUCATION FACILITY	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the definition for Tertiary Education Facility as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.28	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / THREE WATER INFRASTRUCTURE	Support in part	Supports definition of 'Three Water Infrastructure' in part. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network infrastructure within these landholdings. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being an agency responsible for three waters infrastructure.	Retain definition of 'Three Waters Infrastructure', with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.29	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / THREE WATER INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network infrastructure within these landholdings. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being an agency responsible for three waters infrastructure.	Amend definition of 'Three Waters Infrastructure' as follows: means network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, or stormwater, to the extent that it is controlled by Wellington City Council or Wellington Water Ltd.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TRANSPORT NETWORK	Support in part	The definition of 'Transport Network' is partially supported, but should be amended.	Retain the definition of 'Transport Network' with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TRANSPORT NETWORK	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Transport Network' should be amended to list active mode facilities. A list that specifically includes heavy vehicle public transport network infrastructure and does not list active mode facilities risks these being seen as less important or not considered.	Amend the definition of 'Transport Network' as follows: ... It includes: a. Train stations; b. Bus stops; c. Bus shelters; and d. Park and Ride areas; <u>and</u> e. <u>Cycle stands, parking, storage and charging areas</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.37	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TRANSPORT NETWORK	Amend	Considers that although rapid transit stops, and shelters has it's own definition it should be specifically included in this definition also.	Seeks to add rapid transit stops and shelters to this definition.
CentrePort Limited	402.30	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TRANSPORT NETWORK	Support in part	Supports the definition of 'Transport Network' in part. Considers that the definition would be improved by including public ferries to the list and a reference to sea freight reflecting the role these have in the Regions Transport Network.	Retain definition of 'Transport Network', with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.31	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TRANSPORT NETWORK	Amend	Considers that the definition would be improved by including public ferries to the list and a reference to sea freight reflecting the role these have in the Regions Transport Network.	Amend definition of Transport Network as follows: means all public rail, public roads, <u>sea freight, passenger ferries</u> , public pedestrian, cycle and micromobility facilities, public transport, commercial freight and associated infrastructure. It includes: a. Train stations; b. Bus stops; c. Bus shelters; d. Park and Ride areas; e. <u>Ferry Terminals</u> f. <u>Freight Terminals</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TRANSPORT NETWORK	Support	Supports the inclusion of sea freight and public ferries within this definition which would include the ferries associated with the Interislander service. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TRANSPORT NETWORK	Amend	Supports the inclusion of rail and associated infrastructure within this definition. However, this definition should be amended to recognise both freight and passenger/public movements on the rail network. KiwiRail request 'public' be removed to accurately reflect the purpose of the railway and its role in the wider transport network.	Amend definition of TRANSPORT NETWORK as follows: means all public rail, public roads, public pedestrian, cycle and micromobility facilities, public transport and associated infrastructure. It includes: a. Train stations; b. Bus stops; c. Bus shelters; and d. Park and Ride areas.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.16	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TREE	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of "tree" as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / TRIMMING AND PRUNING	Support	Considers the definition of trimming and pruning is appropriate.	Retain the definition of "trimming and pruning" as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Support	Considers the definition accurately describes the scope of upgrading activities anticipated for infrastructure (including of renewable electricity generation activities) but would be improved by referring also to upgraded 'output' (e.g. from the replacement of turbines with those having greater efficiency or power output).	Retain the definition of 'Upgrading' with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Amend	Considers the definition accurately describes the scope of upgrading activities anticipated for infrastructure (including of renewable electricity generation activities) but would be improved by referring also to upgraded 'output' (e.g. from the replacement of turbines with those having greater efficiency or power output).	Amend the definition of 'Upgrading' as follows: As it applies to infrastructure, means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity <u>or output</u> , operational efficiency, security or safety of existing infrastructure, but excludes maintenance, repair and renewal.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.37	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the definition of Upgrading as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Amend	Considers the term 'upgrading' is too broad a term in relationship to increasing carrying capacity when relating to special purpose zones (e.g. the Airport), namely in INF-CE-P21.	Amend the definition of 'Upgrading' as follows: as it applies to infrastructure, means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity , operational efficiency, security or safety of existing infrastructure, but excludes maintenance, repair and renewal.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.8	Part 1 / Introduction and General Provisions / Definitions / Upgrading	Oppose	Considers that upgrading of infrastructure should include increasing the carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security or safety of existing infrastructure. Without this, infrastructure upgrades would be significantly constrained. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.38	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Support	Supports the definition of upgrading.	Retain the definition of 'Upgrading' as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.32	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Upgrading' as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.45	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Oppose	The definition requires broadening to encapsulate the range of activities that are involved with the upgrade of infrastructure.	Retain definition of "UPGRADING" and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.20	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Support	Considers that the proposed plan definition is too broad especially with increased carrying capacity. The WIAL definition reduces the activity to the 'same or similar in character, intensity and scale as the existing structure and activity'.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.46	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Amend	The definition requires broadening to encapsulate the range of activities that are involved with the upgrade of infrastructure.	Amend the definition of "UPGRADING" as follows: As it applies to infrastructure, means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security or safety of existing infrastructure, but excludes maintenance, repair and renewal. means the use and development to bring existing structures or facilities up to current standards or to improve the functional characteristics of structures or facilities, provided that the effects of the activity are the same or similar in character, intensity and scale as the existing structure and activity.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.21	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Support	Considers that the proposed plan definition is to broad especially with increased carrying capacity. The WIAL definition reduces the activity to the 'same or similar in character, intensity and scale as the existing structure and activity'.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.12	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Oppose	Meridian supports the publicly notified definition of 'Upgrading' but accepts that the suggested refinement may improve the clarity of the definition. Meridian opposes deletion of the text describing increased carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security and safety.	Amend provision to retain the following text: "means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security or safety of existing infrastructure".
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.3	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Support	Supports definition of upgrading which applies to infrastructure but excludes maintenance, repair and renewal.	Retain definition of UPGRADING as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Amend	Considers the term upgrading is too broad a term in relationship to increasing carrying capacity when relating to special purpose zones.	Amend definition of 'upgrading' as follows: as it applies to infrastructure, means the improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security or safety of existing infrastructure, but excludes maintenance, repair and renewal.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.13	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / UPGRADING	Oppose	Considers that inclusion of increased carrying capacity in the definition is essential to allow for improvements in efficiency and new technology that can enhance energy generation output (for example) without introducing new or additional adverse effects	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.39	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / VEHICLE	Support	Supports the definition of vehicle.	Retain the definition of 'Vehicle' as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.24	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / VEHICLE	Amend	Considers that the definition of "vehicle" (as used in TR-P1) excludes bicycles and micromobility so is not consistent with transport legislation.	Amend the definition of "VEHICLE to include bicycles and micromobility.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / VEHICLE CROSSING	Amend	Considers that none of the following standards and rules INF- S16 Connections to roads - Driveways , TR - R3 Site access (or the tables that TR-R3 refers to) contain any reference to culverts or bridges. The suggested change in wording makes it clear these culverts & bridges are within the road reserve. References to the standards covering such works in the road reserve would also be helpful.	Amend the definition of 'Vehicle Crossing' as follows: means a facility for vehicle access between a road carriageway and a site boundary. It includes any culvert, bridge or kerbing <u>within the road reserve.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.40	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / VEHICLE CROSSING	Support	Supports the definition of vehicle crossing.	Retain the definition of 'Vehicle Crossing' as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.41	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / VEHICLE MOVEMENT	Support	Supports the definition of vehicle movement.	Retain the definition of 'Vehicle Movement' as notified.
Airbnb	126.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / VISITOR ACCOMMODATION	Amend	Considers that the distinction visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation should be clarified as the former appears to encompass the latter.	Clarify the distinction between visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.9	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / VISITOR ACCOMMODATION	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Visitor accommodation' should include campgrounds as this could achieve their desired outcome of campgrounds being a permitted activity in the zones.	Amend the definition of 'Visitor Accommodation' to include campgrounds.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.49	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WATER SENSITIVE URBAN DESIGN	Support	Considers it aligns with the regional plan definition.	Retain the Definition of 'Water Sensitive Urban Design' as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WATERBODY	Not specified	Considers that it appears unclear whether Tyers Stream would be a 'waterbody' for the purpose of those provisions.	Seeks that Tyers Stream from the junction of Delhi and Karachi Crescents is a 'waterbody' under the RMA definition.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WELL-FUNCTIONING URBAN ENVIRONMENT	Oppose	Opposes the definition of 'well functioning urban environment'. Considers that while it is recognised that Policy 1 of the NPS-UD provides a description of what constitutes a well-functioning urban environment, it is inappropriate to include it as a definition when it is intended to be a Policy and drafted as such. Considers it will lead to interpretation issues and uncertainty when the Plan is applied.	Delete definition WELL-FUNCTIONING URBAN ENVIRONMENT in its entirety as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.25	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WELL-FUNCTIONING URBAN ENVIRONMENT	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the definition of WELL-FUNCTIONING URBAN ENVIRONMENTS to include mixed uses that support daily requirements, such as fresh food shops, and other services within a 15 minute walking catchment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.47	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WELLINGTON AIR NOISE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (WANMC)	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary or appropriate to duplicate the aircraft noise management obligations imposed on WIAL as the requiring authority for WIAL4 in the Operative and Proposed Plan. Furthermore, "NMP" nor "WANMC" are terms used in the designation, therefore it is not clear when this committee would be required. [See original submission for full reason]	Delete definition of WELLINGTON AIR NOISE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (WANMC) in its entirety.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.22	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WELLINGTON AIR NOISE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (WANMC)	Not specified	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated is neutral in the Delete definition of WELLINGTON AIR NOISE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (WANMC) but they do note that other community committees in other designations do not appear to be listed in the definitions of the plan.	Not specified
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.116	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WELLINGTON AIR NOISE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (WANMC)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks the retention of the definition to provide clarity to Plan users.	Disallow / Seeks the retention of the definition.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.34	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WELLINGTON AIR NOISE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (WANMC)	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WIND FARM	Support in part	Considers the definition includes most of the activities typically within or associated with a wind farm but would be improved by clarifying that it also includes lines required to convey the electricity to the distribution network or National Grid'.	Retain the definition of 'Wind Farm' with amendment.

Interpretation - Glossary

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.6	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WIND FARM	Support	Whilst there is support for this submission point in principle, WELL suggest removing the word "transmission" from the definition so that it appropriately captures distribution lines. Both the Meridian Mill Creek wind farm and the Meridian Brooklyn turbine are connected to WELL's distribution lines.	Amend / Seeks that the submission point is accepted with the minor correction to distribution lines as opposed to transmission lines.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WIND FARM	Amend	Considers the definition includes most of the activities typically within or associated with a wind farm but would be improved by clarifying that it also includes lines required to convey the electricity to the distribution network or National Grid'.	Amend the definition of 'Wind Farm' as follows: means wind turbines (and support pylons or towers) used to generate electricity from the wind which is then conveyed to the distribution network or National Grid. It includes ancillary access roads and tracks, buildings and structures (including substations, <u>transmission lines and poles/supporting structures</u>), communications equipment, electricity storage technologies, and the system of electricity conveyance required to convey the electricity to an associated substation.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WIND FARM	Oppose	The requested additional wording is sufficiently covered by '... the system of electricity conveyance required to convey the electricity to an existing substation'.	Disallow
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WIND FARM	Support in part	Supports the definition of 'Wind Farm', however considers it is misleading to state that the wind generated electricity is conveyed 'to' the distribution network, when it is in fact conveyed 'by' the distribution network.	Retain the Definition of 'Wind Farm' with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WIND FARM	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Wind Farm' should be amended to note that electricity generated from windfarms is conveyed by and not to the distribution network. As it stands, wording in the definition is misleading, as it states that the wind generated electricity is conveyed to the distribution network, when in fact it is conveyed by the distribution network.	Amend the Definition of 'Wind Farm' as follows: means wind turbines (and support pylons or towers) used to generate electricity from the wind which is then conveyed to <u>by</u> the distribution network or National Grid. It includes ancillary access roads and tracks, buildings and structures (including substations), communications equipment, electricity storage technologies, and the system of electricity conveyance required to convey the electricity to an associated substation.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WORKS ARBORIST	Support	Supports the definition.	Retain the definition of "works arborist" as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WORKS ARBORIST	Support	Supports the definition of works arborist.	Retain the definition of "Works Arborist" as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.8	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / YARD BASED RETAIL	Support	The definition of Yard base sale is supported, as the submitter assumes the definition includes service stations.	Retain the Definition of 'Yard Based Retail' as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.21	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / YARD BASED RETAIL	Support	The definition of 'Yard-based Retail' is supported as activities include all the Fuel Companies' service stations (and truck stops) subject to provisional relief.	Retain the definition of 'Yard-based Retail' as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.7	Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi tapu	Oppose in part	Considers that it may be better and consistent with other regulations and usage to adopt the meaning of wāhi tapu from the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (section 6).	Opposes the glossary term of 'wāhi tapu' as notified and seeks amendment.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.3	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi tapu	Oppose	The submitter opposes the notified glossary term of 'wāhi tapu' and seeks amendment to be consistent with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (section 6). Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission because the notified definition for wāhi tapu in the district plan is appropriate.	Disallow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.8	Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi tapu	Amend	Considers that it may be better and consistent with other regulations and usage to adopt the meaning of wāhi tapu from the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (section 6).	Amend the glossary entry for 'wāhi tapu' to be consistent with the HNZPT Act as follows: means sacred or spiritual places e.g., battle sites, urupa, burial sites, caves, ritual sites including burial of pito / whenua (placenta) means a place sacred to Māori in the traditional, spiritual, <u>religious, ritual, or mythological sense.</u>

Tangata Whenua

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.4	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi tapu	Oppose	The submitter opposes the notified glossary term of 'wāhi tapu' and seeks amendment to be consistent with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (section 6). Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission because the notified definition for wāhi tapu in the district plan is appropriate.	Disallow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.9	Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi Tipuna	Oppose in part	Considers that using the definition of Wāhi Tipuna from the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 would be appropriate and more consistent.	Opposes the glossary term of 'wāhi tipuna' as notified and seeks amendment.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.5	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi Tipuna	Oppose	The submitter opposes the notified glossary term of 'wāhi tipuna' and seeks amendment to be consistent with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (section 6). Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission because the notified definition for wāhi tipuna in the district plan is appropriate.	Disallow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.10	Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi Tipuna	Amend	Considers that using the definition of Wāhi Tipuna from the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 would be appropriate and more consistent.	Amend the glossary entry for 'Wāhi Tipuna' to be consistent with the HNZPT Act as follows: means places with special cultural, scenic or amenity values e.g., mountains, rivers and other waterways, including the sea and coastal areas, important landmarks, boundary markers. <u>means a place important to Māori for its ancestral significance and associated cultural and traditional values.</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.6	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi Tipuna	Oppose	The submitter opposes the notified glossary term of 'wāhi tipuna' and seeks amendment to be consistent with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (section 6). Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission because the notified definition for wāhi tipuna in the district plan is appropriate.	Disallow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.11	Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi Tipuna	Amend	Considers that Wāhi Tipuna/Tipuna has the same meaning as Wāhi Tupuna/Tūpuna in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 and this should be reflected in the PDP.	Amend the glossary entry for 'Wāhi Tipuna' to include a statement that the term also refers to 'Wāhi Tūpuna'.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.7	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi Tipuna	Oppose	The submitter opposes the notified glossary term of 'wāhi tipuna' and seeks amendment to be consistent with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (section 6). Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission because the notified definition for wāhi tipuna in the district plan is appropriate.	Disallow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.12	Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi Tūpuna	Oppose	Considers that Wāhi Tipuna/Tipuna has the same meaning as Wāhi Tupuna/Tūpuna in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 and this should be reflected in the PDP.	Delete the glossary entry for 'Wāhi Tūpuna'.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.8	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Glossary / Wāhi Tipuna	Oppose	The submitter opposes the notified glossary term of 'wāhi tipuna' and seeks amendment to be consistent with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (section 6). Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission because the notified definition for wāhi tipuna in the district plan is appropriate.	Disallow
Melissa Harward	65.1	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Support in part	Supports wording of Tangata Whenua chapter as it stands.	Retain Tangata Whenua chapter as notified.
Melissa Harward	65.2	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Amend	Considers that WCC should enable local Iwi to participate in all resource management decisions affecting land in Wellington.	Seeks that the scope of the Tangata Whenua chapter is expanded beyond the minimum required by Treaty Settlement legislation.
Roland Sapsford	305.25	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Support	Supports provisions which seek to enhance the mana of kaitiaki and to give effect at a local level to the solemn commitment to rangatiratanga contained in Te Tiriti o Waitangi	Retain Tangata Whenua chapter as notified [Inferred decision requested]
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.18	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Support	Generally supports these provisions as drafted.	Retain "Tangata Whenua" section as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.1	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Not specified	Considers that the iwi were not consulted under Clause 3(1)(d), 1st Schedule of the RMA 1991 in the preparation of the proposed plan.	Not specified.
Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.2	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... Mana Whenua and Resource Management ... Tangata Whenua interests <u>with Treaty settlements</u> within the Council jurisdiction are represented by: - Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust who represent Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika a Maui; and and - Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Incorporated who represent Ngāti Toa Rangatira. <u>Whātonga-descent peoples including Muaūpoko and Rangitane also have ancestral associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</u> ...
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.28	Part 1 / Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow
Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.3	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... RECOGNITION OF IWI AND HAPU History of the Hapū and Iwi Within the Rohe <u>Whātonga-descent peoples</u> <u>Whātonga, rangatira of the Kurahaupo waka, explored the harbour and named it Te Whanganui-a-Tara after his son. Fortifications were built including Te Whetu-kairangi pa, on the then island of Miramar. Cultivations were established in the Seatoun Island Bay and Te Aro areas as well as at the harbour entrance. The harbour was thereafter settled by the descendants of Whātonga including Ngai Tara, Muaūpoko, Rangitane and Ngāti Apa.</u> Taranaki Whānui ...
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.29	Part 1 / Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.4	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... The Relationship of Hapū and Iwi with their Rohe / The Relationship of Hapū and Iwi with Ancestral Lands, Water, Sites, W āhi Tapu, and other Taonga, and interests in Resource Management <u>Whātonga descent groups</u> <u>Ancestral connections with te Whanganui a Tara are important to these iwi.</u> Te Whanganui a Tara Te Whanganui a Tara (the Wellington Harbour) has always been of great importance to Māori since the arrival of Kupe many centuries ago when he named the Harbour islands Matiu and Makaro (after his daughters) and Mokopuna. Early Whātonga and his descendants Māori settled on the land around the Harbour, initially on Matiu and then Motu Kairangi (Watts Peninsula and Miramar). The Harbour has always provided a trade route, not only across Te Moana o Raukawa (the Cook Strait) but also up Te Awa Kairangi (The Hutt River), and its fish and shellfish species long supported iwi who used it as their food basket. ...
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.30	Part 1 / Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow
Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.5	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... ENVIRONMENTAL OUTCOMES <u>Whātonga descent peoples</u> <u>Reclaimed connections and protection of sites associated with past occupation are critical to maintain relationships with ancestral lands.</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.31	Part 1 / Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.6	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... Description of Resources Significant to Tāngata Whenua / Mana Whenua <u>Whātonga descent peoples</u> <u>Many sites in the harbour are associated with descendants of Whātonga. These ancestral relationships need to be recognised. The layer of history of these descendants needs to be protected in developments.</u> Taranaki Whānui ...
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.32	Part 1 / Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow
Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.7	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... Relevant Iwi Authorities <u>with Treaty settlements</u> Taranaki Whānui
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.33	Part 1 / Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow
Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.8	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... TANGATA WHENUA / MANA WHENUA – LOCAL AUTHORITY RELATIONSHIPS <u>Whātonga descent groups</u> <u>While there are at this time no formal Treaty settlements with Whātonga descent iwi covering Te Whanganui a Tara, the Council acknowledges the importance of reaching out to these groups where they may be affected by developments.</u> Taranaki Whānui ...

National Direction Instruments

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.34	Part 1 / Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.26	Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Support	Supports the inclusion of a Tangata Whenua section setting out clearly the iwi that are man whenua and the settlement obligations.	Retain Tangata Whenua chapter as notified.
Simon Ross	37.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Amend	Considers that the definition of walkable catchments and low walking speeds are restrictive and inappropriate around the city centre, train, and other mass transit stations.	Seeks that walkable catchments are extended to be 1200m or 15 minutes walking distance (whichever is greater) in locations around the city centre, train, and other mass transit stations.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.49	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.77	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.41	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Simon Ross	37.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that NPS-UD provisions along the probable Lets Get Wellington Moving mass transit routes are applied.
Stephen Pause	64.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Amend	<p>Supports the designation of the Johnsonville Line (JVL) as rapid transit for the following reasons:</p> <p>The JVL is capable of providing high-capacity, reliable, and quick service directly to the CBD from four major suburbs. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p> <p>The argument that a rapid transit service is not provided due to the current lack of development along the JVL is circular because higher density development and greater commercial activity is not currently encouraged/allowed.</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as rapid transit as per the NPS-UD Policy 3.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stephen Pause	64.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Amend	<p>Considers that the removal of the JVL as rapid transit removes the requirements for walking catchments along the JVL (except Johnsonville station) and the possibilities for six-storey development (except at Johnsonville station).</p> <p>Not designating the JVL as rapid transit does not appear to meet National Policy Statement - Urban Development (NPS-UD) Policy 3.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as rapid transit as per the NPS-UD Policy 3.
Generation Zero Inc	254.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Amend	Considers that a 10-minute walkable catchment is inconsistent with the policy direction of the NPS-UD and the approach of other Tier 1 local authorities and not supported by a robust section 32 assessment, rather decisions by Councillors which the submitter does not agree with.	Seeks that the area of the walkable catchment around the edge of the Metropolitan centre zone where 6 storey development must be enabled be increased to 15 minutes.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.20	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.22	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.35	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.71	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.69	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group.</p> <p>10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero Inc	254.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Amend	Considers that a 10-minute walkable catchment is inconsistent with the policy direction of the NPS-UD and the approach of other Tier 1 local authorities and not supported by a robust section 32 assessment, rather decisions by Councillors which the submitter does not agree with.	Seeks that the area of the walkable catchment around existing and planned rapid transit stop where 6 storey development must be enabled be increased to 15 minutes.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.21	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.23	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.36	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.72	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.70	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero Inc	254.12	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Amend	<p>Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line meets the definition and criteria of rapid transit in the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Considers that the NPS-UD is intended to align new higher density development along places with existing infrastructure. The Johnsonville Rail Line is underused and has spare capacity.</p> <p>Considers that the Greater Wellington Regional Council identification of the Johnsonville line as rapid transit in the RLTP 2021 as the best available source of information for the matter.</p> <p>Considers that failure to identify Johnsonville Rail Line as rapid transit will make the Proposed District Plan inconsistent with the requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Considers that identifying the Johnsonville rail line as a rapid transit service and intensifying around it will support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Considers that MfE guidance references Wellington's commuter rail services as an example of existing rapid transit stops as supporting Johnsonville Rail Line to be designated a rapid transit service.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Johnsonville Rail Line is designated a rapid transit service in the Proposed District Plan and the stops along it as rapid transit stops.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.42	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet the National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.73	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.8	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Generation Zero Inc	254.13	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Amend	<p>Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line meets the definition and criteria of rapid transit in the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Considers that the NPS-UD is intended to align new higher density development along places with existing infrastructure. The Johnsonville Rail Line is underused and has spare capacity.</p> <p>Considers that the Greater Wellington Regional Council identification of the Johnsonville line as rapid transit in the RLTP 2021 as the best available source of information for the matter.</p> <p>Considers that failure to identify Johnsonville Rail Line as rapid transit will make the Proposed District Plan inconsistent with the requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Considers that identifying the Johnsonville rail line as a rapid transit service and intensifying around it will support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Considers that MfE guidance references Wellington’s commuter rail services as an example of existing rapid transit stops as supporting Johnsonville Rail Line to be designated a rapid transit service.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that High Density Residential Zone is applied to all residential sites within a 15-minute walkable catchment of the rapid transit stops on the Johnsonville Rail line except where a justifiable qualifying matter applies.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.43	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet the National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.74	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.9	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.19	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	Generally supports these provisions as drafted.	Retain "National Direction Instruments" section as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.19	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Amend	Considers that given the increased building height and reduced height to boundary controls enabled under the MDRS which increase the risk of potential interference with the rail corridor from maintenance and other activities being undertaken on sites adjoining the rail corridor, KiwiRail considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks	Seeks that the rail corridor be identified as a qualifying matter to incorporate provisions which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor. Specifically, this qualifying matter needs to be applied in the Proposed Plan to require a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures in all relevant zones adjacent to the railway.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.45	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	Supports the rail corridor being identified as a qualifying matter to incorporate provisions which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor. Considers that, specifically, this qualifying matter needs to be applied in the Proposed Plan to require a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures in all relevant zones adjacent to the railway.	Allow / Seeks to incorporate changes as outlined by the submitter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.26	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. Kāinga Ora also opposes all consequential changes to other provisions and rules relating to the rail corridor as a qualifying matter (in particular 408.116 & 408.120).	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.18	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	Stride is opposed to identifying a setback area within 5m of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. This is not necessary for the safe or efficient operation of the railway line, which is already provided for through KiwiRail's designation. Imposing an additional setback as proposed would inappropriately constrain development outside of the rail designation, and inappropriately externalises the costs of the infrastructure on to private landowners. We note that KiwiRail is a Requiring Authority so has the ability to designate private land in order to acquire the interests required for their operations if the existing designation is insufficient.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.18	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	Investore is opposed to identifying a setback area within 5m of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. This is not necessary for the safe or efficient operation of the railway line, which is already provided for through KiwiRail's designation. Imposing an additional setback as proposed would inappropriately constrain development outside of the rail designation, and inappropriately externalises the costs of the infrastructure on to private landowners. We note that KiwiRail is a Requiring Authority so has the ability to designate private land in order to acquire the interests required for their operations if the existing designation is insufficient.	Disallow
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Not specified	Considers that the RMA Schedule 3B requirements for maximising development are incompatible with some of the strategic objectives of the PDP as expressed in the section on Urban Form and Development RMA Schedule 3A Clause 6. [See original submission for full reasons]	Not specified.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.57	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.15	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD is divorced from actual need because it requires councils to deliver a great deal of new development capacity all at once above the amount required at the time. This includes raising height limits irrespective of need. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Council applying an integrated set of qualifying matters that act together to hold height limits at a level the community seeks in the inner suburbs and review as additional capacity is shown to be required.
Jack Chu	4.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Rapid transit routes are fully capable of supporting growth.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jack Chu	4.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Rapid transit routes are fully capable of supporting growth.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line. [Inferred from submission]
Jack Chu	4.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Town centre areas e.g. Johnsonville are perfectly suited to allow for high density allocation.	Amend walkable catchment areas to 15 minutes.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.28	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.30	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Gareth Morgan	18.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Extending Walkable catchments further than 10 minutes may lead to more densification, forcing more people to walk in rough Wellington conditions.</p> <p>Lack of private transport in the city makes it less liveable. If further densification leads to more public transport and less private, it will lead to a less liveable city.</p> <p>10 minute walkable catchment is less damaging than a 15 minute definition because the process to define walkable catchment was poor.</p> <p>10 minutes limits densification to areas better suited for it.</p>	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.10	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to amore equitable 10 minutes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.15	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.42	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The submitters request to keep the walkable catchment at 10 minutes is opposed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is unreasonable for the original submitter to assume that a walking catchment of 15 minutes would exclude elderly residents from utilising other transport options. - The submitter opposes that a greater walking catchment does not take into account the effects of terrain on walking time - the effects of slope and walking speed were used in the creation of walking catchments. - The submitter opposes that the greater walking catchment does not reflect the willingness to walk based on weather conditions. - The Spatial Plan adopted on 21 June 2021 used a 15-min walking catchment which was seen as a step in the right direction by housing advocates. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
Rod Bray	FS137.32	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Joanne Morgan	19.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Wellington can be challenging to navigate by foot or bike due to its incremental weather. Except for good days, private vehicle transport is a must. The wind (specifically around the corner of Hay St and Oriental Parade) can make walking dangerous especially for older people.</p>	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.18	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.45	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
Rod Bray	FS137.44	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Simon Ross	37.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such apply full NPS-UD provisions.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line be classified as a mass rapid transit line.
Simon Ross	37.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the current zoning disregards the NPS-UD direction. The Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such it should apply full NPS-UD zoning (six-storey).	Rezone the Johnsonville line from MRZ to HRZ. [Inferred decision requested]
Lilias Bell	50.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the Johnsonville Line not being classified as rapid transit under the NPS-UD.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.5	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Noelle Pause	55.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Opposes that the classification of the Johnsonville Line (JVL) is not rapid transit for the following reasons:</p> <p>The JVL is capable of providing high-capacity, reliable, and quick service directly to the CBD from four major suburbs. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p> <p>The removal of JVL as rapid transit will limit future development of much-needed higher-density housing and commercial services that could be frequented by the four suburbs combined 27,000+ residents (2018 census).</p> <p>The argument that a rapid transit service is not provided due to the current lack of development along the JVL is circular because higher density development and greater commercial activity is not currently encouraged/allowed.</p> <p>Not encouraging multi-family development will only drive up house prices while the quality of aging homes declines.</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line as per the NPS-UD Policy 3.
Noelle Pause	55.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that the removal of the JVL as rapid transit removes the requirements for walking catchments along the JVL (except Johnsonville station) and the possibilities for six-storey development (except at Johnsonville station).</p> <p>Not designating the JVL as rapid transit does not appear to meet National Policy Statement - Urban Development (NPS-UD) Policy 3.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line as per the NPS-UD Policy 3.
Noelle Pause	55.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Considers that single-family homes should not be expected or promoted within a 5-minute walking catchment of a frequent and reliable rail service that brings residents directly to the country's capital within 10-25 minutes.	Not specified.
Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Considers that zoning the site at 9 Comber Place as MRZ aligns with the NPS-UD as it provides for residential use and enables additional housing supply.	Rezone 9 Comber Place from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone .
Conor Hill	76.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Objective 2 as there is not enough land rezoned to create a competitive land market.	Seeks that there is far more greenfield development as part of the District Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Conor Hill	76.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, Policy 1(a)(i) because the plan will not bring housing prices down to \$300k.	[Not specified]
Conor Hill	76.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, Policy 1(b) because the PDP does not provide enough commercial zoning in most suburbs.	Seeks that at least one quarter of Wellington evenly spread should have ground floor zoned commercially.
Conor Hill	76.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, Policy 2 as not enough land is zoned to provide for sufficient development capacity for housing and business.	[Not specified]
Conor Hill	76.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, Policy 3a as the provisions for the City Centre Zones will not achieve the requirement to provide as much development potential as necessary.	Seeks that height limits are removed in the City Centre Zone.
Conor Hill	76.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Policy 3(c)(i) by not zoning 6 stories around the Johnsonville Line.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is included as a Mass Transit Line
Conor Hill	76.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Policy 3(c)(i) by not planning to zone 6 stories along the two planned rapid transit lines East and South.	Seeks that planned East and South Mass Transit Lines are added.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Conor Hill	76.12	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Policy 3(c)(i) as the walkable catchments around the Kapiti Line are inconsistent.	Amend walkable catchment areas around planned rapid transit stops to the East and South to 20 minutes.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.8	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.28	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.62	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Conor Hill	76.13	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(ii) because the PDP has walkable catchments wrong. Considers that most Wellingtonians who walk to work walk further than 20 minutes. Notes that their daughter's school is zoned more than 20 minutes away.	Seeks that walkable catchment from the edge of the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is extended to 20 minutes and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ann Mallinson	FS3.9	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.29	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.63	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.3	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.34	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.14	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.62	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.19	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Conor Hill	76.14	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(iii) (Metropolitan Centre Zone walkable catchments) and the walkable catchment here should be 20 minutes.</p>	Seeks that walkable catchment extended to 20 minutes from the edge of Kilbirnie and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.10	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Helen Foot	FS62.12	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.30	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.64	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Conor Hill	76.15	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(iii) (Metropolitan Centre Zone walkable catchments) and the walkable catchment here should be 20 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchment extended to 20 minutes from the edge of Johnsonville and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.11	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.13	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.31	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.65	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Conor Hill	76.16	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(iii) (Metropolitan Centre Zone walkable catchments) and the walkable catchment here should be 20 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchment extended to 20 minutes from the edge of Tawa and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.12	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.14	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.32	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	FS96.66	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Conor Hill	76.17	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(iii) (Metropolitan Centre Zone walkable catchments) and the walkable catchment here should be 20 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchment extended to 20 minutes from the edge of Newtown and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.13	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.15	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.33	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.67	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Conor Hill	76.18	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that the PDP has walkable catchments wrong. Considers that most Wellingtonians who walk to work walk further than 20 minutes. Notes that their daughter's school is zoned more than 20 minutes away.	Seeks that all walkable catchments are extended to 20 minutes.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.14	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.16	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.34	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.68	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.4	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Conor Hill	76.19	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(d) has been ignored.	Seeks that walkable catchments extended to 10 minutes from local and town centres.
Conor Hill	76.20	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(d) has been ignored.	Seeks that local and town centres should be allowed development of 6 storeys, or if not, then the proposed District Plan should allow an unlimited number of homes per section in those places.
Conor Hill	76.21	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Wadestown as an example has reasonable infrastructure to be zoned with more mixed use to meet the requirements of policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.	Seeks that Wadestown should be zoned for development of 6 storeys and have more provisions that enable more mixed use activities.
Conor Hill	76.22	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Part 3.2(1)(a), as there has been very little new land zoned as required.	[Not specified].
Ann Mallinson	81.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Considers that Wellington weather conditions limit walkability and 10 minutes is appropriate.	Retain Walkable Catchments around the City Centre Zone (CCZ) as notified (at 10 minutes).
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.33	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.61	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
Rod Bray	FS137.18	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
David Stephen	82.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as a Mass Rapid Transit line.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.10	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
David Stephen	82.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure is a qualifying matter under NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.	Seeks that 3-waters infrastructure is interpreted as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.
Hugh Good	90.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line.
Ian Law	101.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as rapid transit.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ian Law	101.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure is a qualifying matter under NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.	Seeks that 3-waters infrastructure is interpreted as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.
Julie Patricia Ward	103.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as rapid transit. Considers that is not a quick, frequent, reliable and high-capacity public transport service to which the NPS-UD applies.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit (as notified).
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.11	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
292 Main Road Limited	105.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the WCC definition of walking speed at 4.86km/hr is slow and determined by a small sample size. Waka Kotahi has a much larger amount of data and their walking speeds should be respected.	Seeks that the PDP interpretation of Policy 3 of the UPS-UD (Walkable Catchments) assumes a 4.8km/hr to 5km/hr as recommended by Waka Kotahi.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oliver Sangster	112.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville trainline is a good commuter route into the city and this will give young people an opportunity to purchase new, smaller homes within rail commute distance from the city	Amend the plan to enable higher density development around train stations along the Johnsonville Rail Line regardless of whether or not the rail line technically/legally meets the NPS-UD definition of "rapid transit service".
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.23	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations. [inferred reference to submission 112.7]	Disallow
Pam Wilson	120.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the Johnsonville Line no longer being classified as a Rapid Transit System.	Retain the Johnsonville Line classification as notified (not Rapid Transit).
Pam Wilson	120.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure should be qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.	Seeks that 3-waters infrastructure is interpreted as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD. [Inferred decision requested].
Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	121.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that the PDP does not adequately provide for housing supply as required by the NPS-UD, specifically due to the constraints imposed by 1. The character precinct provisions 2. The reduction in the size of the walkable catchment from the CCZ, from 15 minutes in the Draft District Plan to 10 minutes in the PDP 3. The absence of the identification of the Johnsonville train line as a mass rapid transit line.	Not specified.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.37	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks to disallow in so far as the submission point relates to the classification of the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	121.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that failing to identify the Johnsonville train line as a mass rapid transit in the PDP is contrary to other planning documents and would have significant negative impacts with respect to provision of housing.	Seeks to identify the Johnsonville train line as rapid transit and adjust the zoning around the relevant stops accordingly.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.38	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks to disallow in so far as the submission point relates to the classification of the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.125	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Greater Wellington consider Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified a rapid transit service to align with the RLTP which support the 'up-zoning' of walkable catchments. Johnsonville Rail Line is recognised as a key part of the region's transport network.	Allow / Seeks review of walkable catchments and reclassification of Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.12	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oriental Bay Residents Association Inc	128.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the adoption of 10 minutes (800) for the CBD "walkable catchment" under NPS-UD Policy 3. Considers that it would be unreasonable to expect Oriental Bay residents, many of whom are elderly, to walk more than 10 minutes to services. Exposure to extreme winds and sea conditions along the only practicable route (Oriental Parade), without shelter, means walking is frequently not practicable for many residents, nor is cycling or use of e-scooters.	Retain 10 minute walkable catchment as notified. Or, reduce it to 5 minutes (400m).
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.24	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.52	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons: - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.4	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Anne Lian	132.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested]
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.7	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.26	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.34	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.33	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Anne Lian	132.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Anne Lian	132.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ingo Schommer	133.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested]
Ann Mallinson	FS3.26	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.28	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.6	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
Ingo Schommer	133.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ann Mallinson	FS3.27	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.29	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Ingo Schommer	133.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Olivier Reuland	134.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested]
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.17	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.16	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.44	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Olivier Reuland	134.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Olivier Reuland	134.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Ella Patterson	138.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are made larger and increased to 15 minutes.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Ella Patterson	138.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around Centres zones.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around Centres zones are made larger and increased to 15 minutes.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.31	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.15	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.59	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.17	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Janice Young	140.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the Johnsonville train line not being a rapid transit line.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.
Grant Buchan	143.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that all inconsistencies between the NPS-UD and MDRS should be removed (in favour of NPS-UD directions).	Seeks that 15 minute walking catchments are applied to all mass transit stops.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Grant Buchan	143.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that all inconsistencies between the NPS-UD and MDRS should be removed (in favour of NPS-UD directions).	Seeks that a 15 minute walking catchment is applied to the City Centre Zone.
Grant Buchan	143.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports the Johnsonville Line being classified as rapid transit. Considers that the line has the capacity that clearly supports any reasonable definition of mass transit. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend Johnsonville Line to be classified as rapid transit (as per NPS-UD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development)).
Grant Buchan	143.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD dictates that qualifying matters should be applied on a site-by-site basis, not by broad areas.	Seeks that qualifying matters are applied on a site-by-site basis, not by broad areas. [Inferred decision requested].
Braydon White	146.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.28	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rachel Leilani	FS132.1	Support	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	<p>Considers that a 15 minute catchment around the central city should be reinstated, particularly parts of Newtown which were included in the original 15 minute catchment are no longer included in the 10 minute catchment.</p> <p>As the Wellington Regional Hospital is located in Newtown, including Newtown in the walkable catchment for high density residential zoning is needed to provide affordable housing options for Wellington Hospital staff. Currently, the lack of housing, affordable housing and rentals are pushing Wellington Hospital workers out of Wellington City. If we want to retain our essential workers we must provide affordable housing within a walkable distance to their places of work. Without housing close to the city, people will not be willing to work in the city and will leave Wellington for other opportunities. A 10 minute catchment will not provide enough housing to ensure that our city has enough supply at an affordable level. These changes will impact future generations and it is important to make the correct decision now. Without affordable housing close to the city, we will lose the essential workers, creative artists, and young families who contribute to the quintessential Wellington City culture. Reinstating a 15 minute catchment will allow for enough supply to provide for affordable housing. A 15 minute catchment will let us essential workers keep hope for housing options close to work and will keep our city liveable and attainable.</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.25	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.56	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.31	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Braydon White	146.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Braydon White	146.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jennifer Mary Gyles	147.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the adoption of 10 minutes (800) for the CBD "walkable catchment" under NPS-UD Policy 3. Considers that it would be unreasonable to expect Oriental Bay residents, many of whom are elderly, to walk more than 10 minutes to services. Exposure to extreme winds and sea conditions along the only practicable route (Oriental Parade), without shelter, means walking is frequently not practicable for many residents, nor is cycling or use of e-scooters.	Retain 10 minute walkable catchment as notified. Or, reduce it to 5 minutes (400m).
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.11	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to amore equitable 10 minutes.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.19	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.47	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons: - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. - The submitter stated that walking is not practical due to wind and sea conditions, also stating that it is unreasonable to expect elderly residents to walk more than 10 minutes to services. - the data does not support this which shows many people walk/cycle to the city centre. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Matthew Gibbons	148.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers there should be increased densification along the Johnsonville Railway Line.</p> <p>Considers, as an economist, that improved infrastructure (better railway lines and more frequent bus services) will follow intensification.</p> <p>Currently most of my students are paying almost all their income in rent, and this is not good for their health or education. Increased density will make Wellington a more attractive place to live and will be good for the economy.</p>	Seeks that there is densification along the Johnsonville Railway Line.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.22	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow
David Stevens	151.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports Johnsonville Line (JVL) not being classified as rapid transit (RTS).</p> <p>Considers that the JVL cannot achieve better than four trains per hour, which does not meet the GWRC criteria for RTS of ten trains per hour. Together with limited bus service, this lack of frequency means that the Broadmeadows to Crofton Downs corridor is unsuitable for any substantial residential development without increasing carbon emissions.</p> <p>There is no planned major investment from GWRC or Kiwirail to double track this route.</p>	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.</p> <p>The fact that some people are not willing to walk 15-20 minutes does not mean that others who are willing to should not receive the benefits of intensification.</p>	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased, in general, to 15-20 minutes.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Helen Foot	FS62.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.25	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.59	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.1	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.32	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.7	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.60	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.</p> <p>The fact that some people are not willing to walk 15-20 minutes does not mean that others who are willing to should not receive the benefits of intensification.</p>	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased, in general, to 15-20 minutes.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Helen Foot	FS62.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.26	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.60	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group.</p> <p>10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.2	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.7	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.27	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.61	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as Rapid Transit.	Amend the Johnsonville Line to be classified as Rapid Transit and up zoned in accordance with the NPS-UD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development).
James and Karen Fairhall	160.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.
Jill Ford	163.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Jill Ford	163.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around Centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around Centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.22	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.6	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement`	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.50	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.12	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Tore Hayward	170.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports the adoption of 10 minutes (800) for the CBD "walkable catchment" under NPS-UD Policy 3.</p> <p>Wind conditions have an important bearing on people's willingness to walk, and for how long/far. Wellington averages 198 days per year with gale force winds, and 52 with storm force winds (based on a table from a NIWA publication). This reality supports a shorter walking time for Wellington than may be appropriate for some other cities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons, including table].</p>	Retain 10 minute walkable catchment as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.50	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.78	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. - There is evidence that people will walk/cycle in any weather, provided by the submitter. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
Rod Bray	FS137.42	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Scott Galloway & Carolyn McLean	171.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the adoption of 10 minutes (800) for the CBD "walkable catchment" under NPS-UD Policy 3. Considers that it would be unreasonable to expect Oriental Bay residents, many of whom are elderly, to walk more than 10 minutes to services. Exposure to extreme winds and sea conditions along the only practicable route (Oriental Parade), without shelter, means walking is frequently not practicable for many residents, nor is cycling or use of e-scooters.	Retain 10 minute walkable catchment as notified. Or, reduce it to 5 minutes (400m).
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.14	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to amore equitable 10 minutes.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.29	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.57	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons: - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.37	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason] [Inferred reference to 171.11]</p>	Disallow
Amos Mann	172.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.14	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.41	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.38	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Amos Mann	172.12	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Amos Mann	172.13	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Patrick Wilkes	173.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Patrick Wilkes	173.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Patrick Wilkes	173.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers the declassification of the Johnsonville train line and change of decisions from the spatial plan as disappointing.	Seeks that the Johnsonville train line be classified as a 'rapid transit service' under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. [Inferred decision requested].
Patrick Wilkes	173.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.20	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.57	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen — seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.
Pete Gent	179.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.21	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.18	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.49	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.21	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Pete Gent	179.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Pete Gent	179.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington	182.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that a Qualifying Matter exists that should exempt areas within Policy 3 of the NPS-UD from upzoning. [See original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that areas subject to National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPSUD) Policy 3 "upzoning" a qualifying matter of "the aggregation of pre-1930s buildings embodies the historical and cultural values of historic, physical, social, rarity and representativeness and should have special procedural care before they are demolished." apply to exempt them from mandatory 6-storey plus intensification otherwise required.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.102	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	All inner Residential suburbs should be MDZ Exemption from upzoning Importance of character areas Character Precincts, rules & design regime Extended Character Precincts in line with Boffa Miskell Demolition be a restricted activity for pre-1930 buildings New viewshaft for views of St Paul's	Allow
Athena Papadopoulos	183.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.
Lara Bland	184.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.
Emma Baines	185.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the Johnsonville train line not being classified as rapid transit under the NPS-UD. Considers that the total travel time, due to often arriving late or being delayed on track, highlights that it cannot be considered rapid transit.	Retain Johnsonville train line as notified (not classified as rapid transit).
Geoff Palmer	188.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Peter Nunns	196.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.45	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.28	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.73	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.36	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Peter Nunns	196.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Peter Nunns	196.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andrew Flanagan	198.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.13	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.21	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.40	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.24	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Andrew Flanagan	198.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Andrew Flanagan	198.13	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports the Johnsonville Rail Line no longer being classified as rapid transit.</p> <p>The train line is vulnerable to incremental weather and climate change. It is not frequent or reliable enough for people to rely on. It only works for people who work in walking distance of the railway station.</p>	Retain the Johnsonville Rail Line as notified (not being classified as rapid transit).
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers that increased densification along the Johnsonville Rail Line will not necessarily automatically result in increased usage of public transport and less car usage.</p> <p>All the increased densification will result in increased traffic density as people will opt for the more convenient form of personal transport. Considers that densification will likely result in a large number of family vehicles parked on the street, making them difficult to navigate.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Seeks that densification is not concentrated in suburbs along the Johnsonville Rail Line.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Angus Hodgson	200.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the National Policy Statement on Urban Development as a coherent tool supporting city councils in planning for denser urban forms across New Zealand.	Not specified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.18	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that housing 10-20 minutes from the central city is still a relatively desirable distance from the city where many people commute to for work.</p> <p>Considers that transport options are very important, and these distances are highly conducive towards active or public transport which can shelter residents from the cost of lengthy commutes.</p> <p>Considers that character precincts would still be exempt from these provisions so it is important that the higher-density provisions go far enough.</p> <p>Considers that it inconsistent to now have 10 minute walking catchments from the CBD and mass rapid transit hubs given the additional time required to travel on mass rapid transit compared to when walking is the only aspect of the transport journey.</p>	Amend walkable catchment areas around the city centre zone where high density residential development is enabled to 20 minutes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.19	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p> <p>[Inferred submission point].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.63	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.22	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason] [Inferred reference to submission 201.18]</p>	Allow
Wellington City Youth Council	201.19	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that housing 10-20 minutes from the central city is still a relatively desirable distance from the city where many people commute to for work.</p> <p>Considers that transport options are very important, and these distances are highly conducive towards active or public transport which can shelter residents from the cost of lengthy commutes.</p> <p>Considers that character precincts would still be exempt from these provisions so it is important that the higher-density provisions go far enough.</p> <p>Considers that it inconsistent to now have 10 minute walking catchments from the CBD and mass rapid transit hubs given the additional time required to travel on mass rapid transit compared to when walking is the only aspect of the transport journey.</p>	<p>Amend walkable catchment areas around rapid transit stops where high density residential development is enabled to 20 minutes.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Wellington City Youth Council	201.20	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Opposes Reversing the removal of high-density walking catchments along the Johnsonville train line.</p> <p>Opposes carving out suburbs to exclude from development without compelling justification.</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as rapid transit.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.16	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.13	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Wellington City Youth Council	201.21	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that existing public transport corridors should be improved and utilised to promote climate-friendly housing development.
Dougal and Libby List	207.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.	Not specified.
Craig Forrester	210.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Anna Jackson	222.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit. The use of trains should be encouraged.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line.
Nick Humphries	223.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the PDP should do the minimum required by legislation with regards to housing intensification.
Ruapapa Limited	225.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Considers that it would be unreasonable to expect local residents, many of whom are elderly, to walk more than 10 minutes (800m) to services. Weather conditions also make a larger walking catchment impractical.	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) from the edge of the city centre zone as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.13	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to amore equitable 10 minutes.
Ruapapa Limited	225.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers steep side streets and lack of access for emergency vehicles among other matters mean that residential side streets should be a qualifying matter [refer to original submission for further reason]	Seeks that 'Residential Side Streets' are recognised as a qualifying matter.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to use a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter under the National Policy Statement-Urban Development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard W Keller	232.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that walkable catchments to rapid transit are increased to 15 minutes.
Richard W Keller	232.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that walkable catchments should be extended around centres.	Seeks that walkable catchments are extended around centres and mass transit hubs.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.25	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.9	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.53	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Richard W Keller	232.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that walkable catchments should be extended around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walkable catchments are extended around mass transit hubs.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as a Mass Rapid Transit line.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Line does not meet the NPS-UD's definition of rapid transit.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.14	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	233.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Considers that 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable distance in the context of Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Retain Walkable Catchments around the City Centre Zone at 10 minutes as notified.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.89	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>10min walkable catchment</p> <p>Specific heritage identification and assessment</p> <p>Views contributing to sense of place and identity</p> <p>Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell</p> <p>Boffa Miskell streetscapes</p> <p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>CCZ encroachment on residential zones</p> <p>Old St Pauls height controls</p> <p>Preserve viewshalfs</p>	Allow
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	233.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres .	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Victoria Stace	235.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports a 10 minute walkable catchment. Due to Wellingtons weather and topography, walking for more than 10 minutes to a commercial area is not practicable. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.46	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.74	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons: - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. - People will walk/cycle to the city despite weather conditions, evidence provided by submitter. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.39	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports a 10 minute walkable catchment.</p> <p>Due to Wellingtons weather and topography, walking for more than 10 minutes to a commercial area is not practicable.</p> <p>Considers that there are already many areas within the 10 minute catchment for development so increasing is unnecessary.</p> <p>Due to the town belt and propensity to walk lowering over distance, extending walking catchment has diminishing returns. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.12	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to amore equitable 10 minutes.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.23	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.51	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. - The original submitter believes that extending the area for intensification will not generate additional walking activity due to their propensity to walk and the environmental conditions. The further submitter notes that people will walk/active commute in any conditions. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
Rod Bray	FS137.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Pukepue Pari Residents Incorporated	237.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	<p>Considers that there are qualifying matters that apply to Hay Street and limit its development potential.</p>	<p>Seeks that development in Hay Street is restricted due to qualifying matters.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.295	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.85	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Oppose points 237.2, 237.3, & 237.5 to restrict development due to 'qualifying matters' and retain Hay Street as MRZ. Qualifying Matters are set out in s771 of the RMA Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act 2021. Hay Street itself does not have any qualifying matters. Site specific limitations are addressed in a s88 RMA report Assessment of Environmental Effects. While Oriental Bay's special character has been addressed in the special Precinct Height Control's (PREC-03) overlay, it is not a Qualifying Matter. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
Regan Dooley	239.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Opposes the decision from Pūroro Āmua Planning & Environment Committee meeting on 23 June 2022 the council voted to reduce walking catchments from 15 minutes' walking distance of areas around the central city and metropolitan areas to just 10 minutes.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.
Regan Dooley	239.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Opposes the decision from Pūroro Āmua Planning & Environment Committee meeting on 23 June 2022 the council voted to reduce walking catchments from 15 minutes' walking distance of areas around the central city and metropolitan areas to just 10 minutes.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.20	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.3	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.48	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Regan Dooley	239.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Opposes the decision from Pūroro Āmua Planning & Environment Committee meeting on 23 June 2022 the council voted to excluded the Johnsonville line from the definition of rapid transit.	Seeks an amendment to make the Johnsonville Line considered Rapid Transit for the purposes of the NPS-UD.
Richard Martin	244.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports a 10 minute walking catchment as 15 minutes is not workable in Oriental Bay due to topography and existing settlement styles.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain walkable catchments as notified (at 10 minutes).
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports a 10 minute walkable catchment.</p> <p>Due to Wellingtons weather, geography and demographics, walking for more than 10 minutes to a commercial area is not practicable.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.88	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>We oppose point 245.1 to retain the 10-minute walkable catchment. The original submitter has cited that larger walkable catchments spread development inappropriately given Wellington's geography, weather, and demographics. The 2018 census found that 19.3% of Wellingtonians either walk or jog to work, a figure which is almost four times that of the national average. This shows that many Wellingtonians choose to walk despite the geography and weather.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero Inc	254.14	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that a 10-minute walkable catchment is inconsistent with the policy direction of the NPS-UD and the approach of other Tier 1 local authorities and not supported by a robust section 32 assessment, rather decisions by Councillors which the submitter does not agree with.	Seeks that the area of the walkable catchment around the edge of the City Centre Zone where 6 storey development must be enabled be increased to 15 minutes.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.75	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.36	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
Rachel Leilani	FS132.4	Support	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Considers that a 15 minute catchment around the central city should be reinstated, particularly parts of Newtown which were included in the original 15 minute catchment are no longer included in the 10 minute catchment. As the Wellington Regional Hospital is located in Newtown, including Newtown in the walkable catchment for high density residential zoning is needed to provide affordable housing options for Wellington Hospital staff. Currently, the lack of housing, affordable housing and rentals are pushing Wellington Hospital workers out of Wellington City. If we want to retain our essential workers we must provide affordable housing within a walkable distance to their places of work. Without housing close to the city, people will not be willing to work in the city and will leave Wellington for other opportunities. A 10 minute catchment will not provide enough housing to ensure that our city has enough supply at an affordable level. These changes will impact future generations and it is important to make the correct decision now. Without affordable housing close to the city, we will lose the essential workers, creative artists, and young families who contribute to the quintessential Wellington City culture. Reinstating a 15 minute catchment will allow for enough supply to provide for affordable housing. A 15 minute catchment will let us essential workers keep hope for housing options close to work and will keep our city liveable and attainable.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.4	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.64	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the fact that character precincts (MRZ-PREC-01 and MRZ-PREC-02) serves as a qualifying matter, and thus also potentially limits the pressure on Three Waters (THW) Infrastructure .	Retain National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement chapter as notified ((With regards to Character Precincts being Qualifying Matters).
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that this allows a suburb specific response to assessing the ability of the THW Infrastructure to accommodate impacts on wastewater, water supply and storm water can be taken.	Seeks that the current state of Three Waters Infrastructure in Newtown be regarded as a qualifying matter.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports using NPS-UD Policy 3 (d) along the Johnsonville Railway Line.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington City Council defined Johnsonville Line as rapid transit without defining explicit criteria and relied on definitions used for other purposes that exclude the required characteristics of the NPSD-UD.</p> <p>The "Review of the designation of the Johnsonville Railway Line as a Rapid Transit System "paper showed that Johnsonville Line is not rapid transit, and if it was classified as so, would not provide sufficient capacity, increase in carbon emissions and congestion, and degrade the wellbeing along the catchment.</p> <p>The GWRC paper "WELLINGTON RAIL PROGRAMME BUSINESS CASE" excludes the Johnsonville Line and defines criteria for Rapid Transit Stops that the Johnsonville Line cannot meet.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain the Johnsonville Line classification as notified (not Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.49	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers that The Johnsonville Line meets the definition of “mass rapid transit” (MRT) in the NPS-UD. The elements of the definition should be viewed wholistically and not each as a bar to cross. The NPS-UD is not a transport document but a land-use document. The MRT definition is for enabling more housing where good infrastructure exists or is planned, and new housing is easily absorbed. While external transport planning documents are relevant, they are not determinative. The MRT definition should be future looking – to the frequencies likely when new residents are present, and when other changes are made (eg. Wellington Station crossover improvements, integrated ticketing, golden mile improvements). The existence of bus routes that are may be faster to the Central City at certain times of day actually supports the Johnsonville line being MRT. It indicates a transit-rich area that is a well-functioning urban environment capable of supporting more housing.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the Johnsonville Train Line is designated as mass rapid transit (and its associated train stations)
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.15	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes any attempt to reinstate NPS-UD Policy 3 (c) (i) along the Johnsonville Railway Line.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington City Council defined Johnsonville Line as rapid transit without defining explicit criteria and relied on definitions used for other purposes that exclude the required characteristics of the NPSD-UD.</p> <p>The "Review of the designation of the Johnsonville Railway Line as a Rapid Transit System "paper showed that Johnsonville Line is not rapid transit, and if it was classified as so, would not provide sufficient capacity, increase in carbon emissions and congestion, and degrade the wellbeing along the catchment.</p> <p>The GWRC paper "WELLINGTON RAIL PROGRAMME BUSINESS CASE" excludes the Johnsonville Line and defines criteria for Rapid Transit Stops that the Johnsonville Line cannot meet.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain the Johnsonville Line classification as notified (not Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.50	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers that The Johnsonville Line meets the definition of “mass rapid transit” (MRT) in the NPS-UD. The elements of the definition should be viewed wholistically and not each as a bar to cross. The NPS-UD is not a transport document but a land-use document. The MRT definition is for enabling more housing where good infrastructure exists or is planned, and new housing is easily absorbed. While external transport planning documents are relevant, they are not determinative.</p> <p>The MRT definition should be future looking – to the frequencies likely when new residents are present, and when other changes are made (eg. Wellington Station crossover improvements, integrated ticketing, golden mile improvements).</p> <p>The existence of bus routes that are may be faster to the Central City at certain times of day actually supports the Johnsonville line being MRT. It indicates a transit-rich area that is a well-functioning urban environment capable of supporting more housing.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the Johnsonville Train Line is designated as mass rapid transit (and its associated train stations)
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.16	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Support	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Steve Dunn	288.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers the provisions of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) is a blunt instrument when considering inner city housing for Newtown.	Not specified
Priscilla Williams	293.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks that the houses that display character in the area spanning Wesley Road, Aurora Terrace and Bolton Street are considered a qualifying matter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dawid Wojasz	295.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Johnsonville Rail line should be considered as rapid transit for the purposes of its impact of Zoning and walkable catchments. It is a significant rail corridor and high density housing should be encouraged along its route to allow efficient access to public transport.	Seeks that a 15 minute walkable catchment be applied around stations along the Johnsonville rail line to enable high density residential zone. [Inferred decision requested].
Ann Mallinson	FS3.15	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.17	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled. Considers that walkable catchments around the City Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centres Zones should be defined as those within a distance which appropriately reflects the provision and frequency of public transport, the draw of the services and amenity within the city centre, the connectivity of the city centre and the Wellington topography, being 15 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchments around the City Centre Zone are increased to 15 minutes.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.40	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.74	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.42	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.1	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.20	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.70	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.23	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.</p> <p>Considers that walkable catchments around the City Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centres Zones should be defined as those within a distance which appropriately reflects the provision and frequency of public transport, the draw of the services and amenity within the city centre, the connectivity of the city centre and the Wellington topography, being 15 minutes.</p>	Seeks that walkable catchments around the Metropolitan Centres Zones are increased to 15 minutes.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.41	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.75	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group.</p> <p>10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.</p>	Disallow
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.12	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.</p> <p>Considers that walkable catchments around the City Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centres Zones should be defined as those within a distance which appropriately reflects the provision and frequency of public transport, the draw of the services and amenity within the city centre, the connectivity of the city centre and the Wellington topography, being 15 minutes.</p>	Seeks that walkable catchments around mass rapid transit stops are increased to 15 minutes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.42	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.76	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.13	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Rail Line is classified as a rapid transit route.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.9	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	305.26	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD requires the Council to take a place-based approach to setting District Plan rules, and this should be applied to Aro Valley, which is a suburb with unique characteristics. Considers that full use should be made of the NPS-UD qualifying matters and statutory framework to ensure that intensification in Aro Valley maintains and enhances the amenity and environment of Aro Valley, and the lived experience of new and existing residents. Considers that the NPS-UD and Wellington Spatial Plan require interpretation in a local context in order to enable sustainable development. [Refer to original submission for details/contextual information]	Seeks that further consideration is given to the unique characteristics of Aro Valley, including through the use of qualifying matters. [Inferred decision sought]
Wilma Sherwin	306.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as a Mass Rapid Transit line. The Johnsonville Line is a suburban commuter line with many stops, steep and winding tracks and few passing bays that cannot accommodate faster, longer or more trains. It has limited capacity. It is not a Rapid Transit System.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as a Mass Rapid Transit line.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wilma Sherwin	306.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure is a qualifying matter under NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.	Seeks that 3-waters infrastructure is interpreted as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.2	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Rod Bray	311.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Walkable Catchments under the NPS-UD should be reverted back to 15 minutes instead of 10 minute, as a large portion of city edge residents walk to work. The Auckland Council's walkable catchments analysis found that an excess of 50% of commuters walked further than 800m to their busway station. Although 'walkability' varies between individuals, a 15 minute walk remains realistic for a significant proportion of commuters. WCC should fall in line with the NPS to increase housing supply around CBD.	Opposes 10 minute walkable catchments as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.6	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.40	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.23	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.68	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.26	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	311.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Walkable Catchments under the NPS-UD should be reverted back to 15 minutes instead of 10 minute, as a large portion of city edge residents walk to work.</p> <p>The Auckland Council's walkable catchments analysis found that an excess of 50% of commuters walked further than 800m to their busway station. Although 'walkability' varies between individuals, a 15 minute walk remains realistic for a significant proportion of commuters. WCC should fall in line with the NPS to increase housing supply around CBD.</p>	Reinstate walkable catchments at 15 minutes in High Density Residential Zone in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.7	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.41	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.24	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.69	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.27	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.
Richard Murcott	322.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that 'qualifying matters' for Character Precinct Areas have only been applied in a very limited way, leaving many high character value residential areas out in the cold and exposed; all unnecessarily. Greater protection of character areas is needed through the application of qualifying matters. The character in Thorndon (NZ's oldest suburb) makes a significant contribution to Wellington's identity, and what makes this city attractive, liveable and different from others in NZ.	Seeks that qualifying matters in the Medium Density Residential Chapter be more inclusive of character values.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.46	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Trevor Farrer	332.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the walking catchment around the central city, which would allow buildings up to six storeys within it, should be reinstated at 15 minutes rather than 10 minutes. Walking catchments of 10 minutes will reduce land available for density and housing supply around the city centre. Many successful cities around the world are climate-friendly, liveable and walkable, with good urban planning.	Amend walkable catchment areas to 15 minutes.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.5	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Bruce Rae	334.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the walkable catchment for Johnsonville should be 5 minutes. It is appreciated that the walkable catchments took the effects of topography into account, rather than pretending Wellington was flat. A significant amount has been spent fairly recently on the Johnsonville line to ensure it is capable of using the same trains/electric units as the rest of the network. Given the above, it appears inconsistent that while the proposed plan set the tawa walkable catchments at 5 minutes (down from 10) it has deleted the 10 minute Johnsonville line walkable catchments completely, rather than also cutting them down to 5 minutes. Maps should be revised to include 5 minute walkable catchments associated with Johnsonville line stations areas of High density residential, as has been done with the Kapiti line stations in Tawa. It is also noted that territorial authorities are able to decide how they will implement the national policy statement on Urban Development 2020 . Thwart is not a synonym for implement, nor is the implementation task 'whether' rather than 'how'.	Amend maps to include 5 minute walkable catchments associated with the Johnsonville line stations as areas of high density residential as has been done with the Kapiti Line stations in Tawa.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Property Council New Zealand	338.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that the proposed a walkable catchment of 800 metres (or 10 minutes) for the City Centre zone is very limited and should be amended to 15 minutes. The current walkable catchment excludes Mount Victoria, Oriental Bay, Mount Cook and the area around Massey University Campus. Auckland, Hamilton and Christchurch city centres have a 1200 metres walkable catchment and Tauranga City have a 1500 metres walkable catchment. Limiting Wellington's walkable catchment will encourage urban sprawl, limit future intensification and be an impediment for the Council in achieving their carbon neutral goals.</p> <p>A 15 minute walkable catchment will better help the Council reach its commitment to reduce net carbon emissions to net zero by 2050, and will encourage more people to live closer to the city centre and reduce their carbon footprint.</p>	Reinstate Walkable Catchments at 15 minutes from the City Centre Zone in High Density Residential Zone under the NPS-UD - Policy 3.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.1	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.16	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.43	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.1	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that a limit of ten minutes on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington, and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last five minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for Wilkinson Street). People's propensity to walk decreases with distance.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	FS96.77	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, ViLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group.</p> <p>10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.</p>	Disallow
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.47	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rachel Leilani	FS132.6	Support	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	<p>Considers that a 15 minute catchment around the central city should be reinstated, particularly parts of Newtown which were included in the original 15 minute catchment are no longer included in the 10 minute catchment.</p> <p>As the Wellington Regional Hospital is located in Newtown, including Newtown in the walkable catchment for high density residential zoning is needed to provide affordable housing options for Wellington Hospital staff. Currently, the lack of housing, affordable housing and rentals are pushing Wellington Hospital workers out of Wellington City. If we want to retain our essential workers we must provide affordable housing within a walkable distance to their places of work. Without housing close to the city, people will not be willing to work in the city and will leave Wellington for other opportunities. A 10 minute catchment will not provide enough housing to ensure that our city has enough supply at an affordable level. These changes will impact future generations and it is important to make the correct decision now. Without affordable housing close to the city, we will lose the essential workers, creative artists, and young families who contribute to the quintessential Wellington City culture. Reinstating a 15 minute catchment will allow for enough supply to provide for affordable housing. A 15 minute catchment will let us essential workers keep hope for housing options close to work and will keep our city liveable and attainable.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.22	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.75	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.25	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Property Council New Zealand	338.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that the NPS-UD should be clarified to specify the starting point for the City Centre walkable catchment zone. Current mapping is unclear as to where the starting point is established, unlike other council's maps who clearly identify this.</p>	Clarify the starting point of the City Centre Zone walkable catchment in the NPS-UD.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.50	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that in classifying the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service, the Regional Transport Committee referenced the definition of rapid transit contained in the NPS-UD and considered the definitions for PT1 classification contained in Waka Kotahi's One Network Framework that includes all metro rail corridors and the Regional Public Transport Plan.</p> <p>Local authorities identify and enable rapid transit services within the Wellington Region through the Regional Land Transport Plan and the Joint Leadership Committee. This in turn enables territorial authorities to 'up-zone' surrounding walkable catchment areas under NPS-UD Policy 3c. It is important to note that the identification of a rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Rail Line is a key part of the region's transport network, and well placed to increase its future role. This rail line is a dedicated public transport corridor. As a dedicated corridor, it does not have the challenges of segregation with other users required on other mixed-mode corridors. It is a key component of the regional transport network and is integrated into this network. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes the Johnsonville Railway Line not being classified as a rapid transit line and seeks amendment.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.1	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet NPS-UD definition of a rapid transit service. Seeks that the decision of Wellington City Council in the Proposed District Plan as notified stands. [Refer to original submission - 283]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission relating to the Johnsonville Rail Line being classified as a rapid transit line is disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.3	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Considers the identification of a rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them.	Allow / Seeks that the part of the submission that states that the identification of rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them is allowed.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.5	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.13	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the decision requested to classify Johnsonville Railway Line as a rapid transit line.	Allow
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.17	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.51	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that in classifying the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service, the Regional Transport Committee referenced the definition of rapid transit contained in the NPS-UD and considered the definitions for PT1 classification contained in Waka Kotahi's One Network Framework that includes all metro rail corridors and the Regional Public Transport Plan.</p> <p>Local authorities identify and enable rapid transit services within the Wellington Region through the Regional Land Transport Plan and the Joint Leadership Committee. This in turn enables territorial authorities to 'up-zone' surrounding walkable catchment areas under NPS-UD Policy 3c. It is important to note that the identification of a rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Rail Line is a key part of the region's transport network, and well placed to increase its future role. This rail line is a dedicated public transport corridor. As a dedicated corridor, it does not have the challenges of segregation with other users required on other mixed-mode corridors. It is a key component of the regional transport network and is integrated into this network.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks to add the Johnsonville Railway Line as a rapid transit line as classified in the RLTP 2021 and the Wellington Regional Growth Framework and amend the zoning accordingly where appropriate.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.2	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet NPS-UD definition of a rapid transit service. Seeks that the decision if Wellington City Council in the Proposed District Plan as notified stands. [Refer to original submission - 283]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission relating to the Johnsonville Rail Line being classified as a rapid transit line is disallowed.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.4	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Considers the identification of a rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them.</p>	Allow / Seeks that the part of the submission that states that the identification of rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them is allowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.18	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	<p>The UPS+F2245UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Character Housing and Areas should be listed as Qualifying Matters limiting 6-storey heights in High Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that character be a qualifying matter in High Density Residential Zones.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.88	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that sunshine access and privacy should be considered as Qualifying Matters when considering the suitability of sites for 6-story blocks.	Seeks that sunshine and privacy be treated as Qualifying Matters in High Density Residential Zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.89	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington, particularly as these matters are managed via standards.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.42	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that in the interim period before the district plan provisions become operative, noise should be introduced as a qualifying matter to manage the noise effects of having a State Highway next to areas that can be developed, or new noise sensitive activities.	Seeks that Noise R3 rules are applied as a qualifying matter.
Waka Kotahi	370.43	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The submitter does not agree that the ten-minute walkable catchments as proposed in the notified plan realise the development capacity required by the NPS-UD. [See original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that high density residential zoning to be applied to: - A minimum 1.5km catchment from the edge of the city centre zone. - A minimum 800m catchment from the edge of all metropolitan zones and the edge of all existing and planned rapid transit stops – including those along the Johnsonville line. - A 400m walkable catchment from the edge of Local Centre Zones. The catchment should be measured along pedestrian infrastructure (existing and planned) rather than 'as the crow flies'.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.3	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.20	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minute.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.14	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.51	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.94	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Greater Wellington consider Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified a rapid transit service to align with the Regional Land Transport Plan which support the 'upzoning' of walkable catchments. Johnsonville Rail Line is recognised as a key part of the region's transport network.	Allow / Seeks review of walkable catchments and reclassification of Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.16	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission seeking high density residential zoning for the identified walkable catchments, to the extent consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
Don MacKay	FS94.3	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that a limit of ten minutes on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington, and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last five minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for Wilkinson Street). People's propensity to walk decreases with distance.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.85	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.50	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers that by deciding on 10 Minutes as the size of the Walking Catchment as measured from the edge of the Metropolitan MDRZ under the NPS-UD, the WCC officers are claiming Johnsonville residents within 15 minutes walking to facilities should be in the MDRZ and permitted for high density housing.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Walking Report report does not provide any evidence or justification that the residential areas beyond the Johnsonville MDRA 10 Minute Walking Catchment are now walking accessible when they were excluded from the WCC's own analysis in 2013. In its submission to the 2021 WCC Spatial Plan, the JCA requested the proposed MDRZ walking catchment be reduced from 10 minutes to 5 minutes from the edge of the Metropolitan Business Zone for this reason. This is based on a correct and complete application of the MfE Guidance on setting the Walking Catchments and on the WCC's previous evidence to the Environment Court that the current MDRA is the 10 Minute Walking Catchment for Johnsonville. Finally, when the council reduced the CBD walking catchment to 10 minutes from the CBD boundary, it retained the 10 minutes catchment for Johnsonville. Considers that this ignores MfE Guidance that "the centre's size can also affect the size of the catchment". Johnsonville is small for a Suburban Centre with a less employment than other "lesser" suburbs such as Newtown or Kilbirnie. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes (400m) from the edge of the Metropolitan Zone.
Rachel Leilani	FS132.2	Support	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	<p>Considers that a 15 minute catchment around the central city should be reinstated, particularly parts of Newtown which were included in the original 15 minute catchment are no longer included in the 10 minute catchment.</p> <p>As the Wellington Regional Hospital is located in Newtown, including Newtown in the walkable catchment for high density residential zoning is needed to provide affordable housing options for Wellington Hospital staff. Currently, the lack of housing, affordable housing and rentals are pushing Wellington Hospital workers out of Wellington City. If we want to retain our essential workers we must provide affordable housing within a walkable distance to their places of work. Without housing close to the city, people will not be willing to work in the city and will leave Wellington for other opportunities. A 10 minute catchment will not provide enough housing to ensure that our city has enough supply at an affordable level. These changes will impact future generations and it is important to make the correct decision now. Without affordable housing close to the city, we will lose the essential workers, creative artists, and young families who contribute to the quintessential Wellington City culture. Reinstating a 15 minute catchment will allow for enough supply to provide for affordable housing. A 15 minute catchment will let us essential workers keep hope for housing options close to work and will keep our city liveable and attainable.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.17	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.81	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.20	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Jane Szentivanyi	376.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that particular focus needs to be taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MDRZ) to the Central Area, especially on a street like Moir St where the plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values. Character and heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".</p>	Seeks that particular focus be taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MDRZ) to the Central Area.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>The walking catchments used in the district plan are inconsistent between the rapid transit stops they relate to. These are also more conservative than those being proposed by both Porirua and Hutt City, and considerably more conservative than those proposed by Auckland City. In light of the urgent need to reduce Wellingtonians' carbon footprint, reduce congestion, and significantly improve housing options, this makes no sense. We seek that the plan takes a consistent approach, applying the definition provided by Section 5.5 the MfE guidance in relation to the NPS-UD, and revising its walking catchment definitions to at least match those of its adjacent cities.</p>	<p>Amend the walkable catchments associated with the central city, any areas classed as 'metropolitan centres' and with rapid transit stops to bring them in line with the approach being taken by Hutt City, Porirua and Auckland City, as follows:</p> <p>(a) A 15-minute walk (around 1200 metres) from the edge of the City Centre Zone; and (b) A 10-minute walk (around 800 metres) from existing and planned rapid transit stops (c) A 10-minute walk (around 800 metres) from the edge of a Metropolitan Centre Zone</p>
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.9	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP. [Inferred reference to submission 377.11]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Ann Mallinson	FS3.24	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.26	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.11	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.33	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.38	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.47	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Ann Mallinson	FS3.25	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.27	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium density residential zone) height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.38	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support in part	The intent of the PDP to provide intensification within walkable catchments is generally supported. However an extension of walkable catchments is requested.	Retain walkable catchments with amendment.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.17	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.39	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that walkable catchments should be extended to better align with Policy 3 of the NPSUD.	Seeks that walkable catchments are extended to better align with Policy 3 of the NPSUD.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.18	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.40	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that walking catchments should extend: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. Walkable catchment should be analysed by taking into consideration topography, amenities, and connectivity. Mapping changes are required to reflect amendments to the Centres hierarchy and a wider geographical spread of the HRZ. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including Appendix 4]	Seeks that walkable catchments extend: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. [Refer to original submission, Appendix 4 for proposed walkable catchment mapping]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.5	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.</p> <p>Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.</p>	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.17	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.19	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.26	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Don MacKay	FS94.5	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay).Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	FS96.6	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The proposal to extend walking catchments is opposed. Walking catchments have been extensively debated and it is inappropriate to alter them by submission at this stage. 10 minutes is a suitable walking distance in a city of Wellington's topography and weather.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.37	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Stride supports extending the walkable catchments as proposed. It is appropriate to apply a 15 minute walkable catchment to the Metropolitan zone to reflect the level of amenities and services provided.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.37	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Investore supports extending the walkable catchments as proposed. It is appropriate to apply a 15 minute walkable catchment to the Metropolitan zone to reflect the level of amenities and services provided.	Allow
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.19	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.34	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers that by deciding on 10 Minutes as the size of the Walking Catchment as measured from the edge of the Metropolitan MDRZ under the NPS-UD, the WCC officers are claiming Johnsonville residents within 15 minutes walking to facilities should be in the MDRZ and permitted for high density housing.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Walking Report report does not provide any evidence or justification that the residential areas beyond the Johnsonville MDRA 10 Minute Walking Catchment are now walking accessible when they were excluded from the WCC's own analysis in 2013. In its submission to the 2021 WCC Spatial Plan, the JCA requested the proposed MDRZ walking catchment be reduced from 10 minutes to 5 minutes from the edge of the Metropolitan Business Zone for this reason. This is based on a correct and complete application of the MfE Guidance on setting the Walking Catchments and on the WCC's previous evidence to the Environment Court that the current MDRA is the 10 Minute Walking Catchment for Johnsonville. Finally, when the council reduced the CBD walking catchment to 10 minutes from the CBD boundary, it retained the 10 minutes catchment for Johnsonville. Considers that this ignores MfE Guidance that "the centre's size can also affect the size of the catchment". Johnsonville is small for a Suburban Centre with a less employment than other "lesser" suburbs such as Newtown or Kilbirnie. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes (400m) from the edge of the Metropolitan Zone.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.6	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The proposal to extend walking catchments is opposed. Walking catchments have been extensively debated and it is inappropriate to alter them by submission at this stage. 10 minutes is a suitable walking distance in a city of Wellington's topography and weather.	Disallow
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.38	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.12	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.66	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.15	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.41	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the spatial application of the HRZ should extend across the urban environment.	Amend the extent of the High Density Residential Zone across the urban environment, including at least: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 15-20min/1500m from the edge of the City Centre Zone (CCZ) - 10min/800m from the edge of Metro Centre Zone (MCZ) and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) - 10 min/800m from Town Centre Zones (TCZ)
Generation Zero	FS54.5	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Support extending walkable catchments.	Allow / Seeks the extension of the walkable catchments and increased height limits in the walkable catchments.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.20	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.7	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The submission to extend the HRZ across the urban environment is opposed. This would cause widespread impacts on existing communities and is unwarranted as sufficient capacity has been created for needed housing.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.20	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.35	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers that by deciding on 10 Minutes as the size of the Walking Catchment as measured from the edge of the Metropolitan MDRZ under the NPS-UD, the WCC officers are claiming Johnsonville residents within 15 minutes walking to facilities should be in the MDRZ and permitted for high density housing.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Walking Report report does not provide any evidence or justification that the residential areas beyond the Johnsonville MDRA 10 Minute Walking Catchment are now walking accessible when they were excluded from the WCC’s own analysis in 2013. In its submission to the 2021 WCC Spatial Plan, the JCA requested the proposed MDRZ walking catchment be reduced from 10 minutes to 5 minutes from the edge of the Metropolitan Business Zone for this reason. This is based on a correct and complete application of the MfE Guidance on setting the Walking Catchments and on the WCC’s previous evidence to the Environment Court that the current MDRA is the 10 Minute Walking Catchment for Johnsonville. Finally, when the council reduced the CBD walking catchment to 10 minutes from the CBD boundary, it retained the 10 minutes catchment for Johnsonville. Considers that this ignores MfE Guidance that “the centre’s size can also affect the size of the catchment”. Johnsonville is small for a Suburban Centre with a less employment than other “lesser” suburbs such as Newtown or Kilbirnie. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes (400m) from the edge of the Metropolitan Zone.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.7	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The submission to extend the HRZ across the urban environment is opposed. This would cause widespread impacts on existing communities and is unwarranted as sufficient capacity has been created for needed housing.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.39	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.13	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.67	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.16	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.42	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that additional height and density should be provided for within a walkable catchment of centres to enable more intensification in areas of high accessibility to key centre.</p>	<p>Amend walkable catchments to provide additional height and density within a walkable catchment of centres to enable more intensification in areas of high accessibility to key centre, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 12 storeys within a 400m walkable catchment of the City Centre Zone and at least 8 storeys within a 800m walkable catchment - At least 10 storeys within a 400m walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone. - At least 8 storeys within a 400m walkable catchment of Town Centre Zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.6	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.</p> <p>Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.</p>	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.18	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
Generation Zero	FS54.6	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Support extending height limits within walkable catchments.	Allow / Seeks the extension of the walkable catchments and increased height limits in the walkable catchments.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.21	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.6	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.8	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Amendments to heights within walking catchments is opposed. These have already been extensively debated. Additional capacity is not needed and would cause significant impact on amenity.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.36	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers that by deciding on 10 Minutes as the size of the Walking Catchment as measured from the edge of the Metropolitan MDRZ under the NPS-UD, the WCC officers are claiming Johnsonville residents within 15 minutes walking to facilities should be in the MDRZ and permitted for high density housing.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Walking Report report does not provide any evidence or justification that the residential areas beyond the Johnsonville MDRA 10 Minute Walking Catchment are now walking accessible when they were excluded from the WCC's own analysis in 2013. In its submission to the 2021 WCC Spatial Plan, the JCA requested the proposed MDRZ walking catchment be reduced from 10 minutes to 5 minutes from the edge of the Metropolitan Business Zone for this reason. This is based on a correct and complete application of the MfE Guidance on setting the Walking Catchments and on the WCC's previous evidence to the Environment Court that the current MDRA is the 10 Minute Walking Catchment for Johnsonville. Finally, when the council reduced the CBD walking catchment to 10 minutes from the CBD boundary, it retained the 10 minutes catchment for Johnsonville. Considers that this ignores MfE Guidance that "the centre's size can also affect the size of the catchment". Johnsonville is small for a Suburban Centre with a less employment than other "lesser" suburbs such as Newtown or Kilbirnie. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes (400m) from the edge of the Metropolitan Zone.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.8	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Amendments to heights within walking catchments is opposed. These have already been extensively debated. Additional capacity is not needed and would cause significant impact on amenity.	Disallow
Richard Tweedie	392.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports that the walkable catchment for the Oriental Bay Precinct is 10 minutes.</p> <p>Anything longer does not reflect the reality of the weather, strong wind conditions, lack of shelter, and mainly elderly residents.</p>	Retain the walkable catchment for Oriental Bay Precinct as notified (10 minutes).
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.43	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.71	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
Rod Bray	FS137.34	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Murray Pillar	393.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the Johnsonville Train Line not being classified as Rapid Transit.	Retain the Johnsonville Train Line as notified (not being classified as Rapid Transit).
Murray Pillar	393.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the smaller 10 minute walkable catchments around the CBD and metropolitan areas.	Retain the walkable catchments around centres as notified (10 minutes).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.79	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Boffa Miskell - adoption Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all Add Character Precincts to areas missed 10min walkable catchment Character precincts and rules Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M. Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings	Allow
Murray Pillar	393.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the smaller 10 minute walkable catchments around the main Kapiti train stations.	Retain the walkable catchments around the main Kapiti train stations as notified (10 minutes).
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.18	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	FS96.55	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen — seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow
David Cadman	398.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.27	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.8	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.55	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
David Cadman	398.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
David Cadman	398.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Submitter notes that Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes educational facilities) is provided in urban growth and development areas. [see original submission for full reason].	Seeks enabling provisions for educational facilities in the relevant zones and relevant policy framework to achieve this outcome.
Investore Property Limited	405.18	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the creation of well-functioning urban environments (consistent with the direction set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)).	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.19	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the provision of six storey residential development in the wider Johnsonville catchment.	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.20	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the strategic direction set out by the NPS-UD, and its recognition of the role that Metropolitan Centres play in creating a well-functioning urban environment. The submitter's feedback on the provisions seeks to ensure that the rules and standards in the District Plan enable this outcome, particularly in respect of the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre.	Retain the strategic direction as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
Investore Property Limited	405.21	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that the exclusion of the Johnsonville rail line from "rapid transit" is inappropriate and inconsistent with the NPS-UD, Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan and Change 1 to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement.	Opposes exclusion of Johnsonville rail line from "rapid transit and seeks amendment the proposed District Plan to include the Johnsonville train line as a rapid transit and subject to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.22	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Investore Property Limited	405.22	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such apply full NPS-UD provisions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville Rail Line be classified as a mass rapid transit line for the purposes of implementing policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.23	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Investore Property Limited	405.23	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that the current zoning disregards the NPS-UD direction. The Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such it should apply full NPS-UD zoning (six-storey).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Rezone the Johnsonville line from MRZ to HRZ and provide building heights of at least six storeys within a 10-minute walkable catchment of the stations on the Johnsonville Rail Line. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.24	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.20	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed Plan should recognise rail as a qualifying matter. KiwiRail seeks that the railway corridor be identified as a qualifying matter and be applied to impose building setback requirements from the rail boundary as it is critical that the Proposed Plan provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway network. This is necessary to ensure our communities are built in healthy living environments, and the railway network can operate and develop in the future without constraint. An integrated and proactive approach to planning is critical to support the overall vision of our urban environments, and to ensure that our transport network can support the increasing growth and housing intensification.</p>	<p>Seeks that the rail corridor be identified as a qualifying matter to incorporate provisions which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor. Specifically, this qualifying matter needs to be applied in the Proposed Plan to require a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures in all relevant zones adjacent to the railway.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
				<p>The nature of railway operations means KiwiRail cannot fully internalise all its effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Environmental legislation and caselaw recognises the lawful emission of such effects. Increasing development around railway corridors consequentially means the introduction of more sensitive receivers to adverse effects of existing and lawful railway activities. With a likely increase in sensitive activities forecast to locate in proximity to the railway corridor as a result of the Amendment Act, KiwiRail is concerned that without appropriate planning measures in place at a territorial level, the risk of adverse health and amenity effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor, and reverse sensitivity effects constraining our operations is significantly elevated.</p> <p>For this reason, it is essential that the Proposed Plan appropriately manages the development of new sensitive activities in proximity to the railway corridor.</p> <p>The two primary ways which KiwiRail seeks to manage this interface is through the inclusion of the following controls in district plans:</p> <p>a. noise and vibration controls – requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor. Within 60m of the railway corridor, controls are sought that buildings containing new (or altered) sensitive uses are constructed to manage the impacts of vibration. These controls are important to ensure new development is undertaken in a way that achieves a healthy living environment for people locating within proximity to the railway corridor, minimising the potential for complaints about the effects of the railway network; and</p> <p>b. boundary setbacks – requiring a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures on sites adjoining the railway corridor. This is to ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents.</p>	
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.46	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports the rail corridor being identified as a qualifying matter to incorporate provisions which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor. Considers that, specifically, this qualifying matter needs to be applied in the Proposed Plan to require a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures in all relevant zones adjacent to the railway.	Allow / Seeks to incorporate changes as outlined by the submitter.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.29	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.21	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support in part	Supports urban development, including around transport nodes, and recognises the benefits of co-locating housing near transport corridors.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Emma Osborne	410.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Ann Mallinson	FS3.16	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.18	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.26	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.10	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.54	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.13	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Emma Osborne	410.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Ann Mallinson	FS3.17	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.19	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.13	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes decision that was made removing the designation of the Johnsonville line as rapid transit, thus leading it to have lesser densification.</p> <p>Considers that rapid transit should not be determined by the speed of which a train goes or how fast it goes along a track, but rather how long it would take for someone to get from their place of work to their home and that at 23mins from Johnsonville station to Wellington Station that this is a quick and efficient service.</p> <p>Considers that this journey and service will likely be quicker than light rail which will be built in the future and classified as rapid transit.</p> <p>Considers it incorrect that investment in the rail line will not increase in the future given the government's increased funding in recent years.</p> <p>Considers that all suburban areas, particularly those connected by public transport be densified such as along the Johnsonville line, and that not doing so will increase the cost of housing</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville train line be identified as a rapid transit service and increased housing density enabled.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.13	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]</p>	Disallow
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.28	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The U+F2258PS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.14	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of the City Centre Zone walking catchment.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere.</p> <p>Considers that a greater walking catchments should be enabled around the city centre as people living in these areas only have one 'leg' of a journey to complete, compared to those who need to use a rapid transit service.</p> <p>Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the walking catchment around the edge of the city centre zone where high density development is enabled be increased to 20 minutes from the edge of the city centre zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.46	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.80	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group.</p> <p>10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.</p>	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.8	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.48	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rachel Leilani	FS132.3	Support	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	<p>Considers that a 15 minute catchment around the central city should be reinstated, particularly parts of Newtown which were included in the original 15 minute catchment are no longer included in the 10 minute catchment.</p> <p>As the Wellington Regional Hospital is located in Newtown, including Newtown in the walkable catchment for high density residential zoning is needed to provide affordable housing options for Wellington Hospital staff. Currently, the lack of housing, affordable housing and rentals are pushing Wellington Hospital workers out of Wellington City. If we want to retain our essential workers we must provide affordable housing within a walkable distance to their places of work. Without housing close to the city, people will not be willing to work in the city and will leave Wellington for other opportunities. A 10 minute catchment will not provide enough housing to ensure that our city has enough supply at an affordable level. These changes will impact future generations and it is important to make the correct decision now. Without affordable housing close to the city, we will lose the essential workers, creative artists, and young families who contribute to the quintessential Wellington City culture. Reinstating a 15 minute catchment will allow for enough supply to provide for affordable housing. A 15 minute catchment will let us essential workers keep hope for housing options close to work and will keep our city liveable and attainable.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.76	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.40	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
VicLabour	414.15	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of the Metropolitan Centre Zone walking catchment.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere.</p> <p>Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the walking catchment around the edge of the metropolitan centre zone where high density development is enabled be increased to 20 minutes from the edge of the city centre zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.47	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.81	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
VicLabour	414.16	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of the Metropolitan Centre Zone walking catchment. Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere. Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the walking catchment around the edge of the metropolitan centre zone where high density development is enabled be increased to 20 minutes from the edge of the city centre zone.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.48	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.82	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
VicLabour	414.17	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of rapid transit stop walking catchments. Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere. Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the walking catchment around rapid transit stops where high density development is enabled be increased to 15 minutes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.49	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.83	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
VicLabour	414.18	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of rapid transit stop walking catchments. Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere. Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the walking catchment around rapid transit stops where high density development is enabled be increased to 15 minutes.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.50	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.84	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that placing restrictive heritage listings on an isolated home that does not stand out from others on the street, is outside of any heritage areas and is not publically accessible is directly at odds to the objectives of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and District Plan to improve the efficient use of land and housing supply within walking distance from the CBD. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments].	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ian Attwood	FS16.2	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	The constraints of scheduling seem contrary to the intent of the NPS-UD.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires district plans to enable building heights of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of the edge of metropolitan centre zones (Policy 3(c)).	Opposes that the areas surrounding the Kilbirnie Metropolitan Centre Zone are not included within the High Density Residential Zone (in a similar way to the inclusion of areas surrounding the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone and within Newtown).
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires district plans to enable building heights of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of the edge of metropolitan centre zones (Policy 3(c)).	Seeks that the areas surrounding the Kilbirnie Metropolitan Centre Zone be included within the High Density Residential Zone (in a similar way to the inclusion of areas surrounding the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone and within Newtown).
Penny Griffith	418.4	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports walking catchments being 10 minutes. Considers that this makes good practical sense for Wellington's topography, particularly around the CBD.	Retain Walking Catchments as notified (At 10 minutes).
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.8	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rachel Leilani	FS132.5	Oppose	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	<p>Considers that a 15 minute catchment around the central city should be reinstated, particularly parts of Newtown which were included in the original 15 minute catchment are no longer included in the 10 minute catchment.</p> <p>As the Wellington Regional Hospital is located in Newtown, including Newtown in the walkable catchment for high density residential zoning is needed to provide affordable housing options for Wellington Hospital staff. Currently, the lack of housing, affordable housing and rentals are pushing Wellington Hospital workers out of Wellington City. If we want to retain our essential workers we must provide affordable housing within a walkable distance to their places of work. Without housing close to the city, people will not be willing to work in the city and will leave Wellington for other opportunities. A 10 minute catchment will not provide enough housing to ensure that our city has enough supply at an affordable level. These changes will impact future generations and it is important to make the correct decision now. Without affordable housing close to the city, we will lose the essential workers, creative artists, and young families who contribute to the quintessential Wellington City culture. Reinstating a 15 minute catchment will allow for enough supply to provide for affordable housing. A 15 minute catchment will let us essential workers keep hope for housing options close to work and will keep our city liveable and attainable.</p>	Disallow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.35	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.30	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Josephine Smith	419.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the interpretation of 'Character' takes a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter.
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	<p>Considers that the NPS-UD requirements for maximising development is incompatible with some of the strategic objectives of the PDP expressed in the section on Urban Form and Development and in RMA Schedule 3A Clause 6.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Not specified.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.58	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.</p>	Allow
Luke Stewart	422.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	<p>Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.</p>	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.16	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.30	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.43	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.43	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Luke Stewart	422.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Luke Stewart	422.3	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.17	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.54	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen — seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the interpretation of 'Character' takes a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.17	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Considers that all international best-practice points to more and higher density residential developments within walking distance of the city. This should be expanded in Wellington to allow the highest possible residential intensity in areas within a 10-minute walking distance of the city's two biggest employers, Wellington Hospital (Newtown) and Victoria University (Kelburn campus).	Seeks that there are building heights of at least 6 storeys within a 10 minute walkable catchment of Wellington Hospital.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.18	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Considers that all international best-practice points to more and higher density residential developments within walking distance of the city. This should be expanded in Wellington to allow the highest possible residential intensity in areas within a 10-minute walking distance of the city's two biggest employers, Wellington Hospital (Newtown) and Victoria University (Kelburn campus).	Seeks the highest possible residential intensity in areas within a 10 minute walking distance of the City's two biggest employers, Wellington Hospital (Newtown) and Victoria University (Kelburn Campus).
Johnsonville Community Association	429.19	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	GWRC does not hold any specific criteria for MRT services under which the Johnsonville Line would be deemed "Mass Rapid Transit" The NPS-UD says that for a public transport service to be rapid transit, it must be "frequent". However the One Network Framework (ONF) directly contradicts the NPS-UD definition when it states that all metro rail lines are rapid transit "irrespective of frequency". Auckland Council haven't used this framework resulting in the Onehunga Line not being defined as rapid transit under their transport plan. On this basis the Johnsonville Line would also not be deemed rapid transit if it were in Auckland or in any other country in the world. It's not rapid transit and any claim it is, is simply a lie based on no evidence. [See original submission pages 13 - 16 for full reason]	Seeks that WCC asks the Greater Wellington Regional Council to review its use of the One Network Framework as the basis for determining which public transport services are rapid transit under the NPS-UD.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association	429.20	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested]	Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Johnsonville Community Association	429.21	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	<p>Considers that expanding the Johnsonville MDRZ Walking catchment is not justified.</p> <p>The draft District Plan ignored the Medium Density Residential Area walking catchment in favour of a larger 10 Minute Walking Catchment in the MDRZ based on "Sophisticated computer modelling analysis"</p> <p>The MDRA based walking catchment on the Johnsonville Triangle of Moorefield Road, Broderick Road, and Johnsonville Road. Where as NPS-UD requires walkable catchment from edge of Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone. But this still doesn't answer why the walking catchment is not 5 minutes walking from the edge, which better aligns with 10 minute walking from "Local facilities".</p> <p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan ignored NPS-UD direction in provision 5.5.3.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.22	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that Johnsonville, despite being much smaller than the CBD, has the same size catchment.</p> <p>MfE Guidance says that the centres size can also affect the size of the catchment.</p> <p>The catchment is effectively 15 minutes to the actual facilities in the MCZ because there aren't many facilities at the edge of the MCZ. A 5 minute walking catchment from edge of MCZ is more in line with the 10 minute walking catchment to the facilities.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.23	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Considers that Johnsonville Line stations are not rapid transit.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Line is not fast, infrequent and not high capacity.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Garvin Wong	432.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that Character Precincts should not be a qualifying matter to give property owners the flexibility to upgrade/rebuild houses without needing resource consents.	Seeks that Character Precincts be removed from qualifying matters.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.38	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	WCC Summary reads: Considers that Character Precincts should not be a qualifying matter. Seeks that the extent of Character Precincts be amended to remove properties in Thorndon.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.56	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers Thorndon character precincts protect significant heritage and character values.	Disallow
Miriam Moore	433.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the walking catchment should be increased to 15 minutes for all train stops. All stops on the Kāpiti Line should be 15 minutes to keep the line consistent with the stops outside of the Wellington jurisdiction.	Seeks to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for all train stops.
Miriam Moore	433.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the walking catchment should be increased to 15 minutes around the City Centre Zone. Notes that Wellington is known for high active transport and a walking time of 15 minutes is appropriate for this zone.	Seeks to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes around the City Centre Zone.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.1	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Miriam Moore	433.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the walking catchment should be increased to 15 minutes around the Metropolitan Centre Zones. Notes that Wellington is known for high active transport and a walking time of 15 minutes is appropriate for this zone.	Seeks to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes around the Metropolitan Centre Zone.
Miriam Moore	433.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be reinstated as a MRT route. While acknowledging it is not as fast as the bus, train travel is more appealing to many users (particularly given its better accessibility for families, wheelchairs, pushchairs and bikes to use it). More housing along more accessible routes is essential in Wellington where terrain is a constant challenge to accessibility. Public transport users are likely to walk further for trains, and having an efficient bus service as a faster option should not lessen a train line's suitability as an MRT line, but enhance it.	Seeks to include the Johnsonville line as a Mass Rapid Transit route.
Anna Kemble Welch	434.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support in part	Supports the Council using character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters that would be required under the NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Retain Character as a Qualifying Matter in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter.
Michelle Rush	436.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be identified as a rapid transit line. It is noted the line is noted as such in the GWRC Regional Land Transport Plan, fits well within the definition of rapid transit in the NPS-UD, and has many areas along it that could be densified. These suburbs have a high level of servicing with amenities, facilities and services within walking distance of the train catchment. If WCC is to meet its carbon reduction targets; reduce congestion; improve liveability through enabling more people to live in suburbs with high levels of amenities, it is essential the Johnsonville Rail Line is recognised as a high capacity route that meets 'rapid' transit criterium. The line runs at 12 minutes at peak times, and has capacity to increase this frequency into the future through the addition of further loops.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Michelle Rush	436.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that rapid transit stops provisions in the plan should be amended to clarify which stations are rapid transit stops and include stops missing from the Johnsonville Line and Kapiti Line. The Kaiwharawhara station should be included in the Kapiti Line, as whilst currently unused, the NPS-UD references future transport routes as well as current. This station, which could be easily reinstated, is in an area increasingly important for both commercial and industrial activities, and housing.	<p>Seeks that all rapid transit stops in Wellington be explicitly stated to users as follows:</p> <p>The following stations on the Kapiti Line are rapid transit stops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellington Station • Kaiwharawhara Station* currently in abeyance • Takapu Road Station • Redwood Station • Tawa Station • Linden Station • Kenepuru Station <p>The following stations on the Johnsonville Line are rapid transit stops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crofton Downs Station • Ngaio Station • Awarua Street Station • Simla Crescent Station • Box Hill Station • Khandallah Station • Raroa Station • Johnsonville Station <p>The following station on the Hutt/Melling Line is a rapid transit stop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngauranga Station.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that walking catchments should be further reduced. In particular the zoning of several blocks around the Newtown suburban centre for heights of up to 21m seems unnecessary and counter productive to maintaining a well functioning urban environment.	Seeks that walking catchments are reduced.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the damaging environmental effects of high rise developments in established low rise communities should be considered a 'qualifying matter' for modifying building heights and encouraging retention and adaptation of existing housing stock, under NPS-UD clause 3.32 (1) (h). (Option A)	Seeks that negative environmental effects of high rise development be considered a Qualifying matter under the NPS-UD.
Chrissie Potter	446.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dorothy Thompson	449.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (Medium Density Residential Zone) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.
John Wilson	453.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes the provisions in the Plan applying to the "Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone" and also to the "Kenepuru and Tawa railway stations Zone/Zones".	Not specified.
John Wilson	453.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the extent of the zones should be clearly defined, e.g. by lines on a map. If defined by distance from the centre point, this should be defined in terms of distance from the centre point. Not in terms of time eg say five or ten minutes walk from the centre of the zone as this requires a subjective interpretation of how far and how fast a typical pedestrian could walk.	Seeks to clarify how zones are defined in terms of distance from the centre point compared to time in minutes walked. [Inferred decision requested]
John Wilson	453.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	Further clarification is requested of Rapid Transport lines/stops. Questions why other railway stations not included, say Redwood or Takapu Road or Linden or even perhaps other stations on the Johnsonville Line or Ngauranga railway station.	Seeks to clarify what railway stops are considered Rapid Transport. [Inferred decision requested]
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.16	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD is divorced from actual need because it requires councils to deliver a great deal of new development capacity all at once above the amount required at the time. This includes raising height limits irrespective of need. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Council devises a series of Qualifying Matters that filter NPS-UD requirements through prioritising multiple attributes of the urban environment that the community wants to retain, including holding height limits at a level the community seeks for each suburb or area.
Rachel Leilani	464.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the smaller 10 minute walkable catchment from the city centre from the draft District Plan would have no benefits and shift development to less well-suited areas.	Amend the walkable catchment to a 15 minute walkable catchment (rather than the current 10 minute catchment).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.80	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.29	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased .</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.30	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.2	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.58	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Rod Bray	FS137.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.</p>	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased to a 15 minute walking catchment.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports the strategic direction set by the NPS-UD, and its recognition of the role that Metropolitan Centres play in creating a well functioning urban environment.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes the exclusion of the Johnsonville Rail Line as 'rapid transit', for the purposes of implementing Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Opposes exclusion of the Johnsonville Rail Line as 'rapid transit' as notified, seeks amendments.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.50	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes the Stride submission that the Johnsonville Rail Line is designated as a rapid transit stop and considers that Stride provides no justification for this and may be gaining competitive advantage through their submission and considers they have used none of their recent resource consents to create the better centre the community needs [Inferred reference to submission point 470.6]	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville rail line meets the definition of 'rapid transit service' in the NPS-UD as it has a peak time frequency of 15 minutes and is identified as planned rapid transit in the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021.	Seeks that the Johnsonville rail line is included as rapid transit for the purposes of implementing policy 3 of the NPS-UD.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.51	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes the Stride submission that the Johnsonville Rail Line is designated as a rapid transit stop and considers that Stride provides no justification for this and may be gaining competitive advantage through their submission and considers they have used none of their recent resource consents to create the better centre the community needs [Inferred reference to submission point 470.7]	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.29	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers all stations on the Johnsonville Rail Line should be included as rapid transit stops and that building heights of at least six storeys within a 10-minute walking catchment is provided.	Seeks that building heights of at least six storeys within a 10-minute walkable catchment of the stations on the Johnsonville rail line.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.52	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes the Stride submission that the Johnsonville Rail Line is designated as a rapid transit stop and considers that Stride provides no justification for this and may be gaining competitive advantage through their submission and considers they have used none of their recent resource consents to create the better centre the community needs [Inferred reference to submission point 470.8]	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.30	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.9	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.31	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.36	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.45	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.6	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	<p>Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.7	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	<p>Seeks that there are larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Christina Mackay	478.5	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Submitter supports the proposed application of a qualifying matter to exempt from intensification, sites in the proposed Character Precincts.	Supports the proposed application of a qualifying matter to exempt from intensification, sites in the proposed Character Precincts.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Elayna Chhiba	480.1	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that reducing Wellington City's walkable catchment to 10 minutes may work against having affordable housing supply around the city. It is already difficult for the young generation to save up to buy a house anywhere near Wellington City or rent a house of an adequate standard.</p> <p>Considers that even 15min walking is only 5mins on a scooter</p> <p>[see original submission for full reasons]</p>	Amend the walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone to be well over 10-minutes.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.27	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not specified	<p>Considers that what is in practice walkable depends on the street design. To achieve the spirit of the NPS-UD, improvements are needed to make highly walkable catchments, particularly around town centres and transit stops.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons and suggestions].</p>	<p>Seeks that improvements are made to make highly walkable catchments particularly around town centre and transit stops.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full details of suggestions for walkable catchments].</p>
Escape Investments Limited	484.2	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	<p>Considers that the high density residential zoning walkable catchment for the City Centre should revert back to 15 minutes in line with the NPS-UD objectives.</p> <p>Auckland has adopted a 15 minute walkable catchment.</p> <p>WCC reducing the walkable catchment size creates issues around less potential supply surrounding the CCZ, essential and service industry workers priced out of the city, and is unresponsive of the climate.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that the walkable catchment for the City Centre should be increased to 15 minutes.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.19	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.21	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.23	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Escape Investments Ltd's submission that seeks to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Helen Foot	FS62.21	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.21	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Reasons for opposing extension of walkable catchment beyond 10 mins are set out above in relation to Property Council : Considers that a limit of ten minutes on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington, and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last five minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for Wilkinson Street). People's propensity to walk decreases with distance.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be identified as a rapid transit line and concerned at the impact that the lack of identification will create in the future and justify expansion of cities to more greenfield development and further impact on the environment.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.11	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any zoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.32	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Jonathan Markwick	490.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.29	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.31	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.37	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.71	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.5	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow / Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.12	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.5	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.39	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Bray	FS137.8	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
Jonathan Markwick	490.9	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.30	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.32	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.38	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	FS96.72	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group.</p> <p>10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.</p>	Disallow
Jonathan Markwick	490.10	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Supports the NPS-UD 15 minute walkable catchment around the city centre.	Seeks that the walkable catchment around the city centre is increased to 15 minutes.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.31	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.23	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	<p>Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Hay St. Submitters repeats comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.</p> <p>Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).</p>	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.21	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Jonathan Markwick's submission that seeks to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.33	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.39	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.23	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Wilkinson Street, particularly its steepness, narrowness, and potentially hazardous nature which make high density intensification inappropriate. Also Don MacKay repeat comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.73	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Poneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
Jonathan Markwick	490.11	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line is Mass Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as Rapid Transit and accordingly has 6 storey buildings enabled within a walking catchment of its stops.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.8	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
Jonathan Markwick	490.12	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line is Mass Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD and should enable six storey high density residential zoning within 15 minute walkable catchments. The Johnsonville Line is a fully separated right-of-way, free from congestion. Unlike the LGWM "Mass Rapid Transit" line the Johnsonville line is already in place, and more housing supply should be allowed now.	Seeks that six storey high density residential zoning is allowed within 15 minute walkable catchments on stations along the Johnsonville Line.

Strategic Direction

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jonathan Markwick	490.13	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the 10 or 15 minutes walkable catchments for six storey high density residential zoning be applied for all the Kapiti Line stops, including the entirety of: Taylor Terrace and its side streets; Oxford Street (Tawa); Findlay Street; Handyside Street; Redwood Avenue and McKeefy Grove; Sunrise Boulevard.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.38	National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Environmental Standards	Support	Supports reference to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009, noting the NES prevails over the district plan provisions.	Retain the reference to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009.
Alan Fairless	242.10	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Not specified	Considers that the assessment of housing capacity in Wellington needs to be based on a target of realising at least 50% of the development capacity (as measured under the Operative Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the Draft Plan.	Seeks that the District Plan includes methods to achieve at least 50% of development capacity (as measured under the Operative Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the Draft Plan.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.39	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Support in part	Considers that although required under the National Planning Standards, the exact role of strategic direction and relationship to objectives and policies is not clear in the "Purpose and context of Strategic Direction" section. Transpower supports the guidance as drafted and the specific reference to the lack of a hierarchy. However, Transpower does have concerns with the section relating to plan implementation as it considers the objectives and policies will articulate and give effect to the strategic direction objectives and therefore there is no need to refer back 'up the chain'.	Retain the section, with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.40	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Amend	Considers that although required under the National Planning Standards, the exact role of strategic direction and relationship to objectives and policies is not clear in the "Purpose and context of Strategic Direction" section. Transpower supports the guidance as drafted and the specific reference to the lack of a hierarchy. However, Transpower does have concerns with the section relating to plan implementation as it considers the objectives and policies will articulate and give effect to the strategic direction objectives and therefore there is no need to refer back 'up the chain'.	Retain the section but reference to plan implementation be removed as follows: ... For the purpose of plan implementation (including the assessment of resource consents and notices of requirement): - The Strategic Objectives may provide guidance on what the objectives and policies in other chapters of the Plan are seeking to achieve. - The relevant objectives and policies of the plan (including Strategic Objectives) are to be considered together, and no fixed hierarchy exists between them. In addition to the specific objectives and policies contained in topic chapters of the Plan relevant Strategic Objectives in this chapter will also need to be assessed for any activity identified as Discretionary or Non-Complying.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.29	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Support	WIAL supports the clarification provided by this submitters refinements to the Strategic Direction chapter and will ensure it is clear that no hierarchy exists between the Strategic Objectives and the other chapters of the Proposed Plan.	Allow
Hilary Watson	321.10	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Support	Supports the Strategic Directions chapter.	Retain the Strategic Directions chapter as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Murcott	322.12	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Oppose	Considers that the strategic directions introduce measures that exceed what is needed in the foreseeable 10 years, as well as unnecessarily over-reach to negatively impact character areas. The recent Housing and Business Land Capacity Assessment (HBA) Update for WCC concluded that there already is sufficient capacity in Wellington's inner-city suburbs to meet the inner-city demand for the next 30 years. The drive to decimate inner city character areas is therefore unwarranted and should be abandoned, especially on the eastern side of the motorway.	Opposes Strategic Directions on the grounds that they over-reach and sacrifice character areas to unnecessarily increase housing capacity in the inner city.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.47	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Property Council New Zealand	338.5	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Amend	Considers that the overarching principles of the Plan's Strategic Direction should include urban design. With intensification, it is important that good urban design is not only maintained but supported to thrive. Given the strategic objectives will be an important part of resource consents and plan changes, this will help indicate to the Council's planners and Wellington City developers the importance of good urban design with urban form and development.	Seeks that urban design be included in the Strategic Direction chapter.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.203	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.203	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Woolworths New Zealand	359.7	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Amend	Strategic Directions should clearly articulate a positive framework for establishing new business zoned land or establishing enabling and flexible planning provisions for commercial activity, specifically supermarkets, across the urban zones.	Seeks that Strategic Directions clearly articulate a positive framework for establishing new business zoned land or establishing enabling and flexible planning provisions for commercial activity, specifically supermarkets, across the urban zones.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.8	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Amend	Considers that the PDP should err on the side of oversupplying business land; and/or enabling commercial/retail activities in other zones through a consenting pathway. Strategic Directions should clearly articulate a positive framework for establishing new business zoned land or establishing enabling and flexible planning provisions for commercial activity, specifically supermarkets, across the urban zones.	Seeks that the PDP provisionally provide for the oversupply of business land; and/or the enabling of commercial/retail activities in other zones through a consenting pathway.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.12	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Support in part	Generally supportive but consider it is not appropriate to balance environmental and economic matters. Instead, social, cultural and economic needs should be provided for an promoted, within environmental limits.	Not specified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.13	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Support	Supports the preamble in the Strategic Direction Chapter. Good to have clarity that matters in this section need to be assessed for any activities that are identified as Discretionary or Non-Complying.	Retain and highlight throughout each section with Discretionary or Non-Complying activities.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.24	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Support	Generally supports the strategic objectives of the Proposed Plan.	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.48	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Amend	<p>Considers that the airport is a lifeline utility operator under CDEM 2002.</p> <p>Wellington Airport serves an important role in facilitating the movement of people and goods, which in turn feeds the region's economy.</p> <p>Wellington Airport makes a significant contribution to the Wellington region's economy.</p> <p>The Airport also facilitates social connectivity and wellbeing.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Strategic Direction chapter of the Proposed District Plan is amended to require recognition of Wellington Airport.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.35	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Fabric Property Limited	425.8	Strategic Direction / General point on Strategic Directions / General point on Strategic Directions	Support	<p>Generally supports the strategic objectives of the PDP. In particular, Fabric supports:</p> <p>(a) the centres hierarchy and the recognition of the City Centre as the primary centre for the wider region under CEKP-O2;</p> <p>(b) the 'compact urban form' and emphasis on urban development within the City Centre provided under UFD-O1;</p> <p>(c) the recognition of the need to provide sufficient development capacity for business land under UFD-O5;</p> <p>(d) supporting the creation of 'well-functioning urban environments' under UFD-O7, consistent with the NPSUD.</p> <p>The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments, with the highest levels of density in city centre zones. Fabric supports the strategic direction set by the NPS-UD. The feedback that Fabric provides on the provisions below seeks to ensure that the rules and standards in the Proposed Plan enable this outcome.</p>	Retain Strategic Direction chapter as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.5	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / General AW	Support	[General] The Anga Whakamua – Moving into the future chapter is supported.	Retain the 'Anga Whakamua – Moving into the future' chapter as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.4	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / General AW	Support	Supports the Strategic Direction provisions in Anga Whakamua – Moving into the future chapter.	Retain the Anga Whakamua chapter as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.52	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / New AW	Amend	Considers it appropriate to have regard to Policy IM.1 in Proposed RPS Change 1, Greater Wellington considers that the objectives in 'Anga Whakamua – Moving into the future' should acknowledge the need for data and information availability in resource management decisions.	Add a new Objective to the 'Anga Whakamua Moving into the future' chapter to require resource management decisions to be made making use of best available information and mātauranga Māori.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.53	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-01	Support	Supports objective AW-01 as it aligns with Policies FW.3 and UD.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain Objective AW-01 as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.44	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-01	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective AW-01 (Resource management processes include mana whenua...) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.28	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-01	Support in part	Supports in principle AW-01. Considers that submitter has been engaged throughout the process and contributed to the development of these provisions.	Retain Objective AW-01 as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.43	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-01	Support	Objective AW-01 is generally supported.	Retain Objective AW-01 (Resource management processes include mana whenua...) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.12	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-01	Support	Supports the intent of AW-01.	Retain AW-01 (Resource management processes include mana whenua as active participants...) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.11	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-01	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions.	Retain AW-01 (Resource management processes include mana whenua as active participants) as notified, subject to amendments to AW-03 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua...) in subsequent submission points
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.10	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-02	Support	Supports AW-02, as it gives recognition to Tangata Whenua and the relationship they have with their lands and traditions. While Treaty Settlement references are not relevant to Tapu-te-Ranga, mention of the use and development of all other land to support aspirations of Tangata Whenua is acknowledged as supporting the Trust's land development aspirations and those of wider Māori populations.	Retain AW-02 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands and traditions is recognised and provided for) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.54	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-02	Support	Supports objective AW-02 as it aligns with Policies FW.3 and UD.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain Objective AW-02 as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.14	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S1	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Wellington Tenth's Trust	363.1	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-02	Support	Supports AW-02 on the basis that it provides for the development of its future aspirations.	Retain AW-02 as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.45	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-02	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective AW-02 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.14	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-02	Amend	Considers the objective unclear.	Seeks additional language to clarify strategic direction for the use development and expansion of land.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.29	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-02	Support in part	Supports in principle AW-02. Considers that submitter has been engaged throughout the process and contributed to the development of these provisions.	Retain Objective AW-02 as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.44	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-02	Support	Objective AW-02 is generally supported.	Retain Objective AW-02 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands...) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.13	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-02	Support	Supports the intent of AW-02.	Retain AW-02 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands and traditions is recognised...) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.12	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-02	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions.	Retain AW-02 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands and traditions is recognised and provided for...) as notified, subject to amendments to AW-03 (☐ Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua...) in subsequent submission points
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.55	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-03	Support	Supports objective AW-03 as it aligns with Policies FW.3 and UD.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain Objective AW-03 as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.15	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S2	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.46	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-03	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective AW-03 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities...) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.30	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-03	Support	Supports in principle AW-03. Considers that submitter has been engaged throughout the process and contributed to the development of these provisions.	Retain Objective AW-03 as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.45	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-03	Support	Objective AW-03 is generally supported.	Retain Objective AW-03 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary...) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.14	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-03	Support	Supports the intent of AW-03.	Retain AW-03 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities...) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.13	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-03	Amend	Considers the provisions need amending to strengthen and uphold iwi values.	Amend AW-03 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua...) to: Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua and kaitiaki with their own mātauranga Māori.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.56	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-04	Support	Supports objective AW-04 as it aligns with Policies FW.3 and UD.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain Objective AW-04 as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.16	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-53	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.47	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-04	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective AW-04 (The development and design of the City reflects...) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.31	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-04	Support	Supports in principle AW-04. Considers that submitter has been engaged throughout the process and contributed to the development of these provisions.	Retain Objective AW-04 as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.46	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-04	Support	Objective AW-04 is generally supported.	Retain Objective AW-04 (The development and design of the City...) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.15	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-04	Support	Supports the intent of AW-04.	Retain AW-04 (The development and design of the City reflects mana whenua...) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.14	Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-04	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions.	Retain AW-04 (The development and design of the City reflects mana whenua and the contribution of their culture...) as notified, subject to amendments to AW-03 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua...) in subsequent submission points
Yvonne Weeber	340.6	Strategic Direction / Capital City / General CC	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.5	Strategic Direction / Capital City / General CC	Support	Support	Retain CC – Tāone Kāwana - Capital City as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.5	Strategic Direction / Capital City / General CC	Not specified	The submitter is neutral regarding the Strategic Direction provisions in Capital City chapter.	Retain the Capital City Chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Waka Kotahi	370.48	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-01	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written and notes that these objectives align with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22-2030/31 (GPS)	Retain Strategic Objective CC-01 (Wellington City continues to be the primary economic...) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.6	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-01	Support	Objective CC-01 is generally supported.	Retain Capital City Objective CC-01 as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.47	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-01	Support	Objective CC-01 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CC-01 (Wellington City continues to be the primary...) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.16	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-01	Support	Supports the intent of CC-01.	Retain CC-01 (Wellington City continues to be the primary economic and employment hub...) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.21	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-02	Support	Considers that the Council has correctly identified the residential area of the land as an appropriate location to deliver urban intensification which will build on the existing urban form with quality developments.	Retain CC-02 (Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.11	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Support in part	Supports CC-O2's provisions for the social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing of current and future residents (2), and the delivery of urban intensification in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations (3). Opposes (3) and (6) to the extent those provisions are inconsistent with providing for urban intensification across Wellington City.	Retain CC-O2 (Strategic Objectives) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.12	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Amend	Supports CC-O2's provisions for the social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing of current and future residents (2), and the delivery of urban intensification in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations (3). Opposes (3) and (6) to the extent those provisions are inconsistent with providing for urban intensification across Wellington City.	Seeks amendment CC-O2 (Strategic Objectives) so that the wording in (3) and (6) is consistent with providing for urban intensification across Wellington City.
Waka Kotahi	370.49	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written and notes that these objectives align with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22-2030/31 (GPS)	Retain Strategic Objective CC-O2 (Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City...) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.15	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Amend	Considers the phrase "environmental wellbeing" is considered ambiguous.	Amend CC-O2 (Wellington City Council is a well-functioning Capital City where...) as follows: 2. <u>Current and future residents can meet their social, cultural and economic and environmental wellbeing and the environment is protected and enhanced.</u> 5. Innovation and technology advances that support the social, cultural and economic and environmental wellbeing of existing and future residents are promoted <u>and the environment is protected and enhanced.</u>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.9	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Support	Supports a Wellington City being a well-functioning Capital City where urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations. Supports recognition that the Wellington CBD is an economic hub and appropriate intensification and development should be enabled to provide for well-functioning urban environments	Retain Objective CC-O2 as notified
Wellington Civic Trust	388.7	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Support	Objective CC-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Capital City Objective CC-O2 as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.32	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Support in part	Support CC-O2(3).	Clarify how CC-O2(3) will be implemented.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.33	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Amend	Considers that implementation could include better cross-referencing throughout the whole plan back to CC-O2 strategic objective. The primacy, prominence and presence of Taranaki Whānui cultural visibility incorporated in all design and development proposals.	Seeks that the whole plan refers back to CC-O2.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.48	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Support in part	Objective CC-O2 is partially supported, and an amendment is sought so the objective is not overly constraining of where urban intensification can occur.	Retain Objective CC-O2 (Wellington City is a well-functioning...) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.21	Part 2/Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Oppose	WIAL considers that it is appropriate for the objective to qualify that intensification will only occur within "appropriate locations". What is "appropriate" or "inappropriate" is subsequently defined by objectives, policies and overlays identified in the Proposed Plan (such as the Air Noise Boundary).	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.49	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Amend	Considers that Objective CC-O2 is too restrictive of where urban intensification can occur and should be amended.	Amend Objective CC-O2 (Wellington City is a well-functioning...) as follows: Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where: ... 4. Urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations. ...
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.22	Part 2/Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Oppose	WIAL considers that it is appropriate for the objective to qualify that intensification will only occur within "appropriate locations". What is "appropriate" or "inappropriate" is subsequently defined by objectives, policies and overlays identified in the Proposed Plan (such as the Air Noise Boundary).	Disallow
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.49	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Oppose	Urban development and intensification in inappropriate locations could reduce the resilience of a community from natural hazards and the effects of climate change, and reduces the livability and sustainability of cities in the long term. It is important that the WCC proposed plan specifies that urban intensification occur only in appropriate areas.	Disallow
Hilary Watson	FS74.27	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Oppose	Considers that the proposed amendment is contrary to NPS-UD and MDRS. It is common sense that intensification ought to occur in appropriate locations.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.15	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-02	Oppose	Considers an important principle of District Planning is to identify appropriate locations for densification.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.111	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-02	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendment is contrary to the NPS-UD and MDRS. Considers that it is 'common sense' that intensification ought to occur in appropriate locations.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.22	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-02	Amend	Considers that text from the introduction of the Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter should be added to CC-02.	Amend CC-02 as follows: Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where: ... 4. Urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations, <u>and recognises that Historic Heritage is a key contributor to the City's vibrancy and sense of place</u>
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.23	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-02	Amend	Considers that wording from elsewhere in the plan should be integrated.	Amend CC-02 as follows: Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where: ... 6. Values and characteristics that are an important part of the City's identity and sense of place, <u>including historic heritage, the natural environment and sites and areas of significance to mana whenua, are identified and protected."</u>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.17	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-02	Support	Supports the intent of CC-02.	Retain CC-02 (Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where...) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.22	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Support	Considers that the Council has correctly identified the residential area of the land as an appropriate location to deliver urban intensification which will build on the existing urban form with quality developments.	Retain CC-03 (Development is consistent with and supports the achievement of the strategic city objectives...) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.50	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written and notes that these objectives align with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22-2030/31 (GPS)	Retain Strategic Objective CC-03 (Development is consistent with and supports...) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.10	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Support	Supports development that is consistent with and supports the achievement of strategic city objectives. Supports recognition that the Wellington CBD is an economic hub and appropriate intensification and development should be enabled to provide for well-functioning urban environments	Retain Objective CC-03 as notified
Wellington Civic Trust	388.8	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Support	Objective CC-03 is supported, in particular for its sub-points: CC03-2, a resilient city through good design; CC03-4, with a particular emphasis on comprehensive movement systems and attractive and accessible public spaces and streets; and CC03-05, with the emphasis on a greener city with the natural environment being protected, enhanced and integrated into the City's urban environment.	Retain Capital City Objective CC-03 as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.34	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Support	Support CC-03 (6).	Clarify how CC-03(6) will be implemented.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.50	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Support	Objective CC-03 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CC-03 (Development is consistent with and supports...) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.24	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Amend	Considers that Wellington's character areas and heritage buildings have been evolving over more than a hundred and fifty years relative to the city's topography, to light and climate and to people's needs and that it is important that new development respects this.	Amend CC-03 as follows:☐ Development is consistent with and supports the achievement of the following strategic city objectives: 1. Compact: Wellington builds on its existing urban form with quality development in the right locations <u>that respect character areas and historic heritage</u> ;
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.18	Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Support	Supports the intent of CC-03.	Retain CC-03 (Development is consistent with and supports the achievement...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Murcott	322.13	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / General CEKP	Oppose	<p>Considers that an enduring, prosperous city will be a liveable city that values character and heritage, and be successful at getting this balance right.</p> <p>Considers that the PDP is attempting to achieve or enable both a solution for the need for more housing as well as encouraging more affordable housing, including by the removal of panning protections in character neighbourhoods. The extent to which blanket upzoning of character and heritage zoning will provide any solution for affordable housing is doubtful because high land values in Thorndon mean private developments will be high-priced.</p> <p>Considers that the PDP is confusing and feels like an inappropriate response to the problem. It is a response that jeopardises aspects of areas of residential Thorndon that are highly desirable and valued by the community, city and nation (especially being in the Capital). The PDP is not adequately protecting the uniqueness of the city (i.e. significant parts of residential Thorndon has protections removed by this PDP).</p> <p>Considers that as it stands, the PDP may allow unintended consequences, and this is avoidable. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Council changes the incentives for significant property owners in the city to improve existing land use, by using levers outside of the District Plan and recognises the values of the character of the inner residential suburbs.
Yvonne Weeber	340.7	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / General CEKP	Amend	Considers that the CEKP chapter should reference the need to change our present economic model to reduce climate change.	Seeks that the 'City Economy, Knowledge and Prosperity' chapter reference the need to change the current economic model to reduce climate change.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.6	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / General CEKP	Support	Support	Retain CEKP – Te Ohaoha, Mōhioanga me te Taurikura ā-Tāone - City Economy, Knowledge and Prosperity as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.6	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / General CEKP	Amend	The Strategic Direction- City Economy, Knowledge and Prosperity chapter needs to reference the need to change our present economic model to reduce climate change.	Seeks that the City Economy, Knowledge and Prosperity chapter is amended to incorporate references to the need to change our present economic model to reduce climate change
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.16	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / New CEKP	Amend	Considers that there is an absence of policy recognition within the PDP of a new quarry site, or expansion of an existing site outside the Quarry Zone. Given the importance of quarries to the city and region, Horokiwi would support policy recognition outside the Special Purpose Quarry zone, and specific to the strategic objectives, the provision of a strategic objective which recognises the benefits of mineral utilisation. Such a policy would be consistent with the Greater Wellington Regional Council Proposed Natural Resources Plan Policy 12A, and the Regional Policy Statement Policy 60.	<p>Add new strategic objective as follows:</p> <p><u>CEKP-O6:</u></p> <p><u>When considering proposals that relate to the use of the Region's mineral resources, particular regard will be given to the benefits from the utilisation of those resources in the form of quarrying activities.</u></p>
Woolworths New Zealand	359.9	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain Objective CEKP-O1 (A range of commercial and mixed use environments...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.51	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Support	Objective CEKP-O1 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CEKP-O1 (A range of commercial and mixed use environments...) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.25	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Support	<p>Supports the provision of a range of commercial and mixed-use environments.</p> <p>The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Retain CEKP-O1 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.49	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Support in part	<p>Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs.</p> <p>While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	Retain CEKP-O1 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.23	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Oppose	Considers that Wellington Airport in its entire 'airport zone' should not be added to city centre, centres, mixed use and general industrial zones. Parts of the airport zone have suburban centre functions e.g. Rongotai retail area. However the majority of the 'airport zone' is based around airport activities.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.36	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.19	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O1.	Retain CEKP-O1 (A range of commercial and mixed use environments are provided...) as notified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.9	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Support	Supports CEKP-O1 (A range of commercial and mixed use environments...).	Retain as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.10	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that objectives and rationale in the CEKP chapter are concerning, as there is not sufficient information to determine whether the PDP achieves its growth objectives, namely UFD-O5 which states "sufficient land development capacity is available to meet the short-, medium- and long-term business land needs of the City, as identified in the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment."</p> <p>The PDP states that it has been prepared based on the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment – which cites that “the City will require up to 24ha of land that would accommodate 78ha of floor space for future business development and activities over the next 30 years”, based on the Council's population growth estimates.</p> <p>The 'supporting documents' page for the PDP provides a link through to the Regional Housing & Business Development Capacity Assessment 2022. A review of this indicates that so far analysis has only been completed with respect to housing development capacity and that a revision of this assessment will include business land but that analysis will not be completed until June 2024, in such time to inform the 2024 Long-Term Plans and a Future Development Strategy for the Wellington Region. Woolworths considers that there appears to be a timeframe misalignment in that the PDP will be adopted prior to the Business Development Capacity Assessment being undertaken and it is unclear therefore how Council has determined that sufficient areas of land within the various commercial and mixed-use zones (including Centres) have been provided for within the PDP.</p> <p>It is assumed that the PDP has been developed in response to the assessment undertaken in 2019 (as referenced in the Retail and Market Assessment - Sense Partners and Colliers November 2020) which identified a requirement for 49,992m2 of retail floorspace to 2047 (noting that this assessment was undertaken prior to the Covid-19 pandemic).</p>	<p>Seeks that more information is provided to determine whether the PDP achieves its own growth objectives in the City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity chapter.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.11	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Amend	Considers that the wording in CEKP-O2 should be amended to include passers-by activity. Neighbourhood Centres serve passers-by as well as their immediate residential neighbourhood. This wording is consistent with the current wording proposed in NCZ-P2 "Enable a range of activities that contribute positively to the purpose of the Zone and meet the convenience needs of the immediate neighbourhood and passers-by;" and as such this insertion ensures that the Part 3 NCZ provisions are in line with the matters at Part 2. Amending this objective as such would make it adaptive and responsive to evolving retailing, and achieve the best outcomes for the City and its communities.	Amend Objective CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres...) as follows: ... 4. Neighbourhood Centres - these centres service the immediate residential neighbourhood <u>and passers-by</u> and offer <u>generally</u> small-scale convenience-based retail for day-to-day needs. These centres are generally for small commercial clusters and community services. Neighbourhood Centres are accessible by public transport and active transport modes.
Waka Kotahi	370.51	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Amend	Considers this objective should also include a description of the "commercial zone" and spell out expectations around access and connectivity for that zone.	Seeks to include a description of the anticipated role and function of the commercial zone.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.11	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Support	Supports the Centres hierarchy and the recognition of the City Centre as the primary centre for the wider region. Supports the Proposed Plan to the extent that it provides for and supports the vibrancy of the city centre	Retain Objective CEKP-O2 as notified
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.52	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Support in part	Objective CEKP-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres...) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.23	Part 2/ Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it is not clear where the "town centres" are located and the extent to which these may / may not be located within the Air Noise Boundary of 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary for Wellington International Airport.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.53	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Amend	Considers that Objective CEKP-O2 should be amended to introduce the Town Centre Zone within the centres hierarchy and differentiates between the scale, role and function of Town and Local Centres to achieve consistency with the National Planning Standards, and better reflect growth outcomes and the role and function of centres within the urban environment.	Amend Objective CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres...) as follows: The City maintains a hierarchy of centres based on their role and function, as follows: ... 3. <u>Town Centres – these centres service the surrounding suburbs. Town centres contain a range of commercial, community, recreational and entertainment activities. Town Centres are well-connected to the City's public transport network and active transport modes are also provided for. Town Centres will play a role in accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth that is complementary to the City Centre and Metropolitan Centre Zones. This intensification is due to the capacity of the area to absorb more high-density housing with enablers of growth such as offering a walkable access to public transport, community facilities and services; and</u> 4. <u>Local Centres – these centres service the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs. Local Centres contain a range of commercial, community, recreational and entertainment activities. Local Centres are well-connected to the City's public transport network and active transport modes are also provided for. Local Centres will play a role in accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth that is complementary to the City Centre, and Metropolitan Centre, and Town Centre Zones. This intensification is due to the capacity of the area to absorb more medium density housing with enablers of growth such as walkable access to public transport, and community facilities and services and;</u> 4-5. <u>Neighbourhood Centres - ...</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.24	Part 2/ Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it is not clear where the "town centres" are located and the extent to which these may / may not be located within the Air Noise Boundary of 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary for Wellington International Airport.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.135	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP@O2	Oppose	Whether a particular centre services neighbouring suburbs is a key distinction between local centres and neighbourhood centres which ought to be preserved in the plan framework and centres hierarchy.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.27	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKPO2	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Investore Property Limited	405.26	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Support	Supports the recognition of the regional significance of the Metropolitan Centres of Johnsonville and Kilbirnie under CEKP-O2 as major live-work hubs, The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain CEKP-O2 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.20	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O2.	Retain CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres based on their role and function...) as notified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.10	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Support	Supports CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres based on their role..).	Retain as notified.
The Thorndon Society Inc	487.1	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Amend	Considers that business activities should be constrained to the City Centre to keep the city vibrant and to restrict businesses from pushing out residential accommodation	Amend CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a heirachy of centres ...) as follows: ... 2. Metropolitan Centres ... Intensification for housing and business needs will be enabled in these locations, to complement the City Centre; 3. Local Centres ...
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.74	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP@O2	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.12	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Amend	Considers that the wording in CEKP-O3 should be amended to enable a centres plus approach, by contemplating commercial activities outside of the Centres zones and beyond the Mixed Use and Industrial zones as currently proposed. This amendment now accommodates the inclusion of these activities in the Commercial zone and Residential zones – both of which contemplate commercial activities by way of restricted discretionary and discretionary consenting pathways and as such ensures that the Part 3 provisions are in line with the matters at Part 2.	Amend Objective CEKP-O3 (Mixed use and industrial areas outside of Centres...) as follows: Mixed use and industrial <u>Development</u> of areas outside of Centres: 1. Complement the hierarchy of Centres; 2. Provide for activities that are incompatible with other Centres-based activities; and 3. Support large scale <u>commercial</u> , industrial and service-based activities that serve the needs of the City and wider region.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.54	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Support	Objective CEKP-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CEKP-O3 (Mixed use and industrial areas outside of Centres...) as notified.
Newtown Residents' Association	FS63.1	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O8	Oppose	Considers that the original submission states that Character is not a NPSUD qualifying matter. We disagree - NPS-UD has provision for 'any other matter' determined by Council to be a qualifying matter. [Inferred reference to 391.91]	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.50	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Support in part	Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs. While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]	Retain CEKP-O3 (Strategic Objectives) with amendments.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.24	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Oppose	Considers that Wellington Airport in its entire 'airport zone' should not be added to city centre, centres, mixed use and general industrial zones. Parts of the airport zone have suburban centre functions e.g. Rongotai retail area. However the majority of the 'airport zone' is based around airport activities.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.37	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.51	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Oppose in part	Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs. While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]	Delete CEKP-O3 (Strategic Objectives) (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.25	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Oppose	Considers that Wellington Airport in its entire 'airport zone' should not be added to city centre, centres, mixed use and general industrial zones. Parts of the airport zone have suburban centre functions e.g. Rongotai retail area. However the majority of the 'airport zone' is based around airport activities.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.38	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.52	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Amend	<p>Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs.</p> <p>While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CEKP-O3 (Strategic Objectives) as follows:</p> <p>Mixed use and industrial areas outside of Centres, <u>including within the Airport Zone</u>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complement the hierarchy of Centres; 2. Provide for activities that are incompatible with other Centres-based activities; and 3. Support large scale industrial and service-based activities that serve the needs of the City, the Airport and wider region. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.26	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Oppose	Considers that Wellington Airport in its entire 'airport zone' should not be added to city centre, centres, mixed use and general industrial zones. Parts of the airport zone have suburban centre functions e.g. Rongotai retail area. However the majority of the 'airport zone' is based around airport activities.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.39	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.21	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O3.	Retain CEKP-O3 (Mixed use and industrial areas outside of Centres...) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.13	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Amend	Considers that the wording in CEKP-O4 should be amended to ensure that activities that have an operational and functional need can locate within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use, and General Industrial Zones while still protecting the City's hierarchy of centres. The removal of the term 'undermine' and replacement with a focus on avoiding adverse effects relative to the vibrancy, function and amenity of centres is consistent with the language used in the policies of the Centre Zones. As such, it ensures that the Part 3 provisions are in line with the matters at Part 2.	<p>Amend Objective CEKP-O4 (Land within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use,...) as follows:</p> <p>Land within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use, and General Industrial Zones is protected from activities that <u>do not demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone</u>; are incompatible with the purpose of the zone; or <u>have the potential to undermine adversely affect the vibrancy, function and amenity of the centre within</u> the City's hierarchy of centres.</p>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.12	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Support	Supports land within the City Centre being protected from activities that are incompatible with the purpose of the zone or have the potential to undermine the City's hierarchy of centres. Supports the Proposed Plan to the extent that it provides for and supports the vibrancy of the city centre	Retain Objective CEKP-O4 as notified
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.55	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Support	Objective CEKP-O5 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets including those that support Māori culture,...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.53	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs.</p> <p>While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	Retain CEKP-O4 (Strategic Objectives) with amendments.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.27	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Oppose	<p>Considers that Wellington Airport in its entire 'airport zone' should not be added to city centre, centres, mixed use and general industrial zones. Parts of the airport zone have suburban centre functions e.g. Rongotai retail area. However the majority of the 'airport zone' is based around airport activities.</p>	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.40	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Support	<p>Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.</p>	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.54	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs.</p> <p>While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	Delete CEKP-O4 (Strategic Objectives) (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.28	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Oppose	<p>Considers that Wellington Airport in its entire 'airport zone' should not be added to city centre, centres, mixed use and general industrial zones. Parts of the airport zone have suburban centre functions e.g. Rongotai retail area. However the majority of the 'airport zone' is based around airport activities.</p>	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.41	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Support	<p>Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.</p>	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.55	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Amend	<p>Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs.</p> <p>While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CEKP-O4 (Strategic Objectives) as follows:</p> <p>Land within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use, and General Industrial Zones <u>(including within the Airport Zone)</u> is protected from activities that are incompatible with the purpose of the zone or have the potential to undermine the City's hierarchy of centres. (Option b).</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.29	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Oppose	Considers that Wellington Airport in its entire 'airport zone' should not be added to city centre, centres, mixed use and general industrial zones. Parts of the airport zone have suburban centre functions e.g. Rongotai retail area. However the majority of the 'airport zone' is based around airport activities.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.42	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.22	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O4.	Retain CEKP-O4 (Land within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use, and General Industrial Zones is protected...) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.11	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Support	Supports the inclusion of this policy in general as it underpins Māori wellbeing.	Retain Strategic Objective CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets including those that support Māori culture, tourism, trade, education, research, and health and cultural wellbeing are provided for in appropriate locations) as notified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.11	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Amend	Considers that CEKP-O5 should make mention quarrying as a strategically important asset.	Amend Strategic Objective 5 in City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity to reference quarrying as a strategically important asset.
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.2	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Support	Given the importance of quarries to the city and region, Horokiwi would support policy recognition outside the Special Purpose Quarry zone, and specific to the strategic objectives, the provision of a strategic objective. Such a policy would be consistent with the Greater Wellington Regional Council Proposed Natural Resources Plan Policy 12A, and the Regional Policy Statement Policy 60.	Allow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.35	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Support in part	Supports CEKP-O5 in principle Taranaki Whānui have commercial aspirations regarding the planning of the city's future.	Retain CEKP-O5 as notified. [refer to original submission]
Ministry of Education	400.12	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Support	Supports the need for strategically important assets to support education in Wellington.	Retain CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.23	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O5.	Retain CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets including those that support Māori culture...) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.15	Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Support in part	Supports CEKP-O5 as it references cultural wellbeing.	Retain CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets including those that support Māori culture...) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.8	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General HHSASM	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain the 'Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori' chapter as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.16	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General HHSASM	Amend	Considers that in the introduction it is stated "Often sites [of significance to Maori] no longer exist physically". The submitter considers this to be clumsy wording as sites exist forever. It is the physical evidence that may no longer exist.	Amend the introduction statement as follows: "Often <u>the physical evidence</u> of sites no longer exists physically however their memory and association remains".
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.25	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General HHSASM	Amend	Considers that Wellington's character areas and heritage buildings play a significant role in the liveability of our city.	Amend the introduction to the Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori chapter as follows: "Historic and cultural heritage provides a connection with those who lived before us. It helps us define who we are and contributes to our sense of place <u>and to the liveability of the City</u> . Once destroyed, it cannot be replaced. It is a fundamental part of the wellbeing of people and communities."
Guardians of the Bays	452.7	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General HHSASM	Support	Supports the Strategic Direction provisions in Historic Heritage and Site and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.	Retain the Historic Heritage and Site and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.52	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-01	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-01 (Significant buildings, structures, areas, and sites...) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.36	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-01	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whanui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Retain HHSASM-01 with amendments.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.37	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-01	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whanui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.38	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-01	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.56	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-01	Support	Objective HHSASM-01 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-01 (Significant buildings, structures, areas,...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.24	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-01	Support in part	Supports HHSASM-01 in part. Considers that within HHSAM-02 it should be acknowledged that: - Wellington must achieve a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development; and - heritage buildings, structures, areas and sites must be clearly identified both in order to protect those sites and to provide clarity on where heritage protection does and does not apply.	Retain HHSASM-01 (Significant buildings, structures, areas, and sites that exemplify Wellington's historical...) as notified. [Support is based on requested amendments to HH-01 (Recognising historic heritage) and HH-02 (Protecting historic heritage)]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.16	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-01	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-01 (Significant buildings, structures, areas, and sites that exemplify Wellington's historical and cultural values are identified, recognised and protected) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.53	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-02	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-02 (Built heritage is resilient and has a sustainable long term...) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.38	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-02	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Retain HHSASM-02 with amendments.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.39	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-02	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.39	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-02	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.40	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-02	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.57	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-02	Support	Objective HHSASM-02 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-02 (Built heritage is resilient and has a sustainable...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.25	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O2	Support in part	Supports HHSASM-O2 in part. Considers that within HHSAM-O2 it should be acknowledged that: - Wellington must achieve a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development; and -heritage buildings, structures, areas and sites must be clearly identified both in order to protect those sites and to provide clarity on where heritage protection does and does not apply.	Retain HHSASM-O2 (Built heritage is resilient and has a sustainable long term use...) as notified. [Support is based on requested amendments to HH-O1 (Recognising historic heritage) and HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage)]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.17	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O2	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-O2 (Built heritage is resilient and has a sustainable long term use while ensuring heritage and cultural values are recognised and maintained) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.12	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Support	Supports the recognition of values associated with sites and areas of significance to Māori and the protection of these.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-O3 (The cultural, spiritual and/or historical values associated with sites and areas of significance to Māori are protected) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.54	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-O3 (The cultural, spiritual and/or historical values...) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.40	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whanui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Retain HHSASM-O3 with amendments.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.41	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.41	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whanui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.42	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.58	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Support	Objective HHSASM-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-O3 (The cultural, spiritual and/or historical values...) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.56	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Support in part	Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified. Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.	Not Specified
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.57	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Oppose	Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified. Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.	Delete HHSASM-O3 (Cultural, spiritual and/or historical values) (Option A).
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.83	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Oppose	The submitter requests for HHSASM-O3 to be deleted and seeks provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O3 to provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas particularly where the site has been heavily modified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. It is inappropriate for SASM objectives to be removed from City's Strategic Direction chapter.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.58	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Support in part	Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified. Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.	Seeks that any provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O3 (Cultural, spiritual and/or historical values) provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site has been heavily modified (Option B).
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.84	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Oppose	The submitter requests for HHSASM-O3 to be deleted and seeks provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O3 to provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas particularly where the site has been heavily modified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. It is inappropriate for SASM objectives to be removed from City's Strategic Direction chapter.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.18	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-O3 (The cultural, spiritual and/or historical values associated with sites and areas of significance to Māori are protected) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.13	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Support	Supports the recognition of sites of significance and their relationship to mana whenua with interests and associations (including cultural importance). While they are not part of Taranaki Whānui, they appreciate their recognised Mana Whenua status across Wellington.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-O4 (Sites of significance to Māori are identified and mana whenua's relationships...) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.42	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Retain HHSASM-O4 with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.43	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.43	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.44	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.59	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Support	Objective HHSASM-O4 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-O4 (Sites of significance to Māori are identified...) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.59	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Support in part	Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified. Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.	Not Specified
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.60	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Oppose	Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified. Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.	Delete HHSASM-O4 (Cultural, spiritual and/or historical values) (Option A).
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.85	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Oppose	The submitter requests HHSASM-O4 to be deleted and seeks provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O4 to provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas particularly where the site has been heavily modified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. It is inappropriate for SASM objectives to be removed from City's Strategic Direction chapter.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.61	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Support in part	Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified. Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.	Seeks that any provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O4 (Cultural, spiritual and/or historical values) provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site has been heavily modified (Option B).
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.86	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Oppose	The submitter requests HHSASM-O4 to be deleted and seeks provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O4 to provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas particularly where the site has been heavily modified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. It is inappropriate for SASM objectives to be removed from City's Strategic Direction chapter.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.19	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-O4 (Sites of significance to Māori are identified and mana whenua's relationships, interests and associations with their culture...) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.44	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O5	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Retain HHSASM-O5 with amendments.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.45	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O5	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.45	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O5	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.46	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O5	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.60	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O5	Support	Objective HHSASM-O5 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-O5 (Recognise that only mana whenua...) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.20	Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O5	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-O5 (Recognise that only mana whenua can identify impacts on their relationship with their culture, traditions, ancestral lands...) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.9	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain the 'Natural Environment' chapter as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.20	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Oppose in part	As written, the natural environment strategic objectives fail to address the issues identified in the introduction. Furthermore, there is a lack of clear strategic direction to protect and maintain biodiversity values, in accordance with s6, 31, and the RPS.	Amend the NE chapter to address issues identified in the Introduction and clarify strategic direction to protect and maintain biodiversity values in alignment with S6 and S31 of Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.25	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Oppose	WIAL considers it appropriate to ensure the provisions of the Proposed Plan give effect to Part 2 of the RMA and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement. WIAL opposes the submission however, as no specific drafting has been provided in association with this submission point and therefore WIAL cannot determine the appropriateness or otherwise of the amendments in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.21	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Support in part	Considers the Introduction does not recognise council's function for integrated management, particularly with respect to the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity, the protection of wetlands and Te Mana o Te Wai.	Amend NE - Introduction to recognise council's function for integrated management, particularly with respect to the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity, the protection of wetlands and Te Mana o Te Wai.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.57	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Support in part	Supports the Natural Environment Strategic objectives except as noted below.	Retain Natural Environment Objectives, subject to amendments.
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.17	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S4	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.8	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Support	Supports the Strategic Direction provisions in Natural Environment chapter.	Retain the Natural Environment Chapter as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.58	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / New NE	Amend	Considers it appropriate to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, the use and development of land needs to be undertaken in an integrated manner recognising the many interconnections between the natural and physical resources. The interconnectedness of the whole environment should be recognised at the strategic level to guide all development in a holistic way.	Add a new Objective to the 'Natural Environment' chapter as follows: <u>Natural and physical resources are managed in an integrated manner recognising the importance of ki uta ki tai and the interconnectedness between ecosystems, natural processes and freshwater.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.22	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O1	Support in part	Considers the objective fails to protect and maintain biodiversity values, in accordance with s6, s31 of the RMA and the RPS. Natural character, features, landscapes and ecosystems are not just of value because they contribute to the City's identity, they include matters of national importance. We seek amendment of the strategic objective to give effect to council's responsibilities under s6 and functions under s31.	Amend NE-O1: The natural character, landscapes and features, <u>indigenous biodiversity</u> and ecosystems, <u>including wetlands, that contribute to the City's identity of the District, including those that</u> and have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are identified, recognised, protected, and, where possible, enhanced.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.26	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O1	Oppose	The recommended amendments to the objective conflate section 6 and 7 matters of the RMA.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.17	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O1	Support	Considers there is insufficient focus on the cultural heritage of mana whenua compared with European history and culture: this strategic objective helps to re-balance this.	Retain Objective NE-O1 as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.15	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O1	Support	Supports proposed Objective NE-O1.	Retain objective NE-O1 as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.46	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O1	Support in part	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Retain NE-O1 with amendments.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.47	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O1	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.47	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O1	Amend	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.48	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.61	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Support	Objective NE-01 is generally supported.	Retain Objective NE-01 (The natural character, landscapes and features,...) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.62	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission.]	Supports NE-01 (Natural character that contributes to city identity and has significance for mana whenua) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.63	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission.]	Amend NE-01 (Natural character that contributes to city identity and has significance for mana whenua) as follows: The natural character, landscapes and features, and ecosystems that contribute to the City's identity and have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are identified, recognised, protected <u>maintained</u> and, where possible, enhanced.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.26	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Support	Supports the intent of NE-01.	Retain NE-01 (The natural character, landscapes and features, and ecosystems that contribute ...) as notified.
Paul M Blaschke	435.4	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Support	NE-01 is supported.	Retain Strategic Objective NE-01 (he natural character, landscapes and features, and ecosystems that contribute to the City's identity and have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are identified, recognised, protected, and, where possible, enhanced) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.23	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-02	Support in part	Considers the objective fails to give effect to the NPS-FW which requires territorial authorities to provide for Te Mana o Te Wai through integrated management ki uta ki tai from mountains to sea. The strategic direction of this plan should recognise the interactions between freshwater, land, water bodies, ecosystems, and sensitive receiving environments. Water quality is not only threatened by future development; poor water quality has resulted from historic development and inadequate investment in infrastructure upgrades. The effects of which also need to be managed. We seek amendment to give effect to the NPS-FW.	Amend NE-02: Future subdivision, <u>land use</u> and development contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's <u>fresh water</u> , water bodies, <u>ecosystems and sensitive receiving environments</u> and recognises mana whenua and their relationship to water (Te Mana o Te Wai)
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.59	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-02	Support in part	Supports the objective to recognise the relationship of to water as this aligns with Policy FW.3 of Proposed RPS Change 1	Retain Objective NE-02, subject to amendments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.60	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-02	Amend	Considers that this objective should more widely address the values of tangata whenua and seek that those values are protected and enhanced. These amendments will ensure Policy FW.3 is more wholly given regard to.	Amend Objective NE-02 as follows: Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's water bodies, <u>protects and enhances Māori freshwater values</u> and recognises mana whenua and their relationship to water (Te Mana o Te Wai).
Waka Kotahi	370.55	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-02	Amend	Considers that improving water quality is an extremely high threshold, though Waka Kotahi agrees that gradual improvement is necessary not all works, specifically maintenance activities, can improve water quality. Instead, the submitter seeks that all works shall not worsen water quality.	Amend Strategic Objective NE-02 (Future subdivision and development contributes...) as follows: Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in <u>maintains</u> the quality of the City's water bodies, and recognises mana whenua and their relationship to water (Te Mana o Te Wai).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.9	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Support	Agrees that improving water quality is a high threshold for development and maintenance of the quality of water bodies is more appropriate. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.90	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Oppose	Greater Wellington consider the approach taken by WCC which seeks to improve water quality is appropriate and aligns with the requirements of the NPS-FM and has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that direction for improving the quality of water bodie in NE-O2 is retained.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.18	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Support	The submitter understand that about 80% of Freshwater bodies within Wellington City have unacceptable pollutant levels: it is important that use and development in natural and rural areas is done in a way that sees us improve water quality, as is being recommended for similar activities in the urban parts of the city. Recognising the relationship of mana whenua to water is an important aspect of this, as it sees water quality put first in terms of importance.	Retain Objective NE-O2 as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.16	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Support	Supports proposed Objective NE-O2.	Retain objective NE-O2 as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.48	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Support in part	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Retain NE-O1 with amendments.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.49	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.49	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Amend	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.50	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.62	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Support	Objective NE-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective NE-O2 (Future subdivision and development contributes...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.27	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Support	Supports the intent of NE-O2.	Retain NE-O2 (Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in the quality...)as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.21	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Support in part	Supports the intention behind NE-O2	Retain NE-O2 (Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's water bodies...) in the Natural Environment chapter as notified, subject to the amendments below.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.22	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Amend	Considers NE-O2 can be strengthened so that subdivision and earthworks would not only 'contribute' but 'maintain and protect' the values the submitter has for water resources.	Amend NE-O2 (Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's water bodies...) to: Future subdivision and development play a key role improving water quality and they support protecting and enhancing freshwater values contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's water bodies by recognizing mana whenua values and their relationship to water (Te Mana o Te Wai).
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.110	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Support	Greater Wellington also consider that NE-O2 can be strengthened to further protect Māori freshwater values.	Allow / Seeks that the NE-O2 be reworded as requested in Greater Wellington's original submission [refer to submission point 351.60].
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.23	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to provide appropriate open space connections across the city where enabling residential development of the Submitters land will contribute to creating these connections.	Retain NE-O3 (The City retains an extensive open space network across the City that...) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.24	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Support in part	Considers the objective would be clearer with specific use of the words Significant Natural Areas to give effect to s6 and reference to maintenance of indigenous biodiversity to give effect to council's functions under s31. Furthermore, wetlands need to be included to give effect to the RPS	Amend NE-O3: The City retains an extensive open space network across the City that: 1. Is easily accessible; 2. Connects the urban and natural environment; 3. Supports <u>Protects significant natural areas, wetlands and</u> ecological, cultural, and landscape values; and 4. <u>Maintains indigenous biodiversity; and</u> 5. Meets the needs of anticipated future growth.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.27	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Oppose	The recommended amendments to the objective are inconsistent with and go further than section 6 and 7 of the RMA.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.98	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Support	Greater Wellington agree that replacing "support" with "protect" in clause 3 would give greater effect to the requirements of section 6 of the RMA and that reference to wetlands would align with direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.19	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Amend	Considers this should be amended to include the concept of protection.	Add an extra point to NE-O3 (The city retains an extensive open space network...) as follows: ... <u>5. Is protected and gazetted under the Reserves Act.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.20	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Support	Considers that as the population grows, preserving, and where possible, adding to the open space network across the city is increasingly important. Research increasingly shows the importance of access to natural areas, and 'biophilic' environments as keys to human health and well-being, as well as helping reduce crime, and of course being a critical part of protecting biodiversity. On this matter, Wellington as a city is playing a critical role in providing refuge for formerly at risk native birds, e.g. kaka, and with efforts such as the Halo Project and Predator Free initiatives being undertaken by thousands of Wellingtonians, it is important our city's district plan provides legal and policy support to this.	Retain Objective NE-O3 as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.9	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Support in part	Supports the intention of NE-O3, as it relates to the city's green network, however as currently worded it suggests that the network is satisfactory and all that is needed is to "retain" the network.	Retain Amend Natural Environment Objective NE-O3 with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.10	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Amend	Considers NE-O3 should be amended to clarify that the open space network can and should be expanded, as well as retained. The current wording suggests that the network is satisfactory and all that is needed is to "retain" the network. As currently written, NE-O3 does not suggest that the City intends to add to the amount of open space accessible and available to City residents, workers and visitors. It is essential that the need for more open space is signalled at the strategic level if the Council is to actively pursue the acquisition of more public open space and that it is going to ensure that new development contributes to this provision.	Amend Natural Environment Objective NE-O3 as follows: The City retains <u>expands its open space network so that</u> an extensive open space network is <u>provided and retained</u> that."
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.28	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Oppose	WIAL does not have any issue with the open space network being retained and/or expanded throughout the wider District. WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it may fetter with the ability for WIAL to completed ongoing seawall upgrade and replacement works within the Open Space area located between Moa Point and Lyall Bay.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.63	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Support	Objective NE-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective NE-O3 (The City retains an extensive open space...) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.28	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O3	Support	Supports the intent of NE-O3.	Retain NE-O3 (The City retains an extensive open space network across the City...)as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.25	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O4	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain NE-O4 as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.21	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O4	Support	Considers there is insufficient focus on mana whenua and their ability to exercise kaitiaki following their own mātauranga: this strategic objective helps to re-balance this.	Retain Objective NE-O4 as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.50	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O4	Support in part	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Retain NE-O1 with amendments.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.51	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O4	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.51	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O4	Amend	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.52	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O4	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.64	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O4	Support	Objective NE-O4 is generally supported.	Retain Objective NE-O4 (Mana whenua are able to exercise their...) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.29	Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O4	Support	Supports the intent of NE-O4.	Retain NE-O4 (Mana whenua are able to exercise their customary responsibilities ...)as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.26	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Oppose in part	Considers the introduction and objectives are not consistent with sustainable management as per s5 of the RMA. They fail to integrate environmental outcomes and the protection of biodiversity into the objectives for the City/Wellington district.	Amend the Introduction to be consistent with sustainable management as set out in Section 5 of the Resource Management Act.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.30	Part 2 /Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Oppose	Considers it appropriate to ensure the Proposed Plan gives effect to Part 2 of the RMA. WIAL opposes the submission however, as no specific drafting has been provided in association with this submission point and therefore WIAL cannot determine the appropriateness or otherwise of the amendments in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.6	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Support	The SCA objectives for infrastructure under this chapter are supported when considering the addition of waste facilities as inclusive of infrastructure types for the purposes of the strategic objectives.	Retain the Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure chapter as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.64	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Support	Supports the recognition of Wellington International Airport, as regionally significant infrastructure, within the Introduction of the "Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure" section of the District Plan.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure Chapter introduction as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.43	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.30	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Amend	Considers that the objectives for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend. The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that out-of-sequence infrastructure costs are dealt with exclusively through the development contributions or financial contributions policy.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.2	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	The SCA-O1 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure O1 as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.16	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support in part	Considers that infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, is essential to support the safe, efficient and effective functioning of Wellington's community. Achieving resilience in infrastructure networks will require continual development, maintenance, adaptation and upgrading of existing infrastructure to meet future growth and changing needs. If Wellington, along with the Wellington region and New Zealand, are to successfully transition away from dependence on fossil fuels and meet the nation's climate change obligations, there will need to be a substantial increase in generation of electricity from renewable sources. Regional and district plans need to anticipate this and enable increased renewable electricity generation.	Retain Objective SCA-O1 (Infrastructure) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.17	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Amend	Considers that infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, is essential to support the safe, efficient and effective functioning of Wellington's community. Achieving resilience in infrastructure networks will require continual development, maintenance, adaptation and upgrading of existing infrastructure to meet future growth and changing needs. Considers that if Wellington, along with the Wellington region and New Zealand, are to successfully transition away from dependence on fossil fuels and meet the nation's climate change obligations, there will need to be a substantial increase in generation of electricity from renewable sources. Regional and district plans need to anticipate this and enable increased renewable electricity generation.	Amend Objective SCA-O1 (Infrastructure) as follows or similar wording to achieve the same outcome: Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that: 1. The social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised; 2. The City is able to function safely, efficiently and effectively; 3. The infrastructure network is resilient in the long term; 4. <u>Infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation facilities, contribute to the transition away from dependence on fossil fuels;</u> and 5. Future growth and development is enabled and can be sufficiently serviced.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.31	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Oppose	WIAL supports, in principle, the transition away from dependence on fossil fuels and seeks to encourage such changes at the Airport where practicable, including through the gradual electrification of infrastructure at the Airport. WIAL submits however, that there a number of factors outside of its control that will affect the transition towards alternative fuel sources for aircraft using the Airport. WIAL therefore opposes this submission to the extent that the changes need to be qualified, for example, with the term "practicable".	Disallow
Kilmarnston Developments Limited and Kilmarnston Properties Limited	290.24	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.	Retain SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.11	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	SCA-O1 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to the establishment, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-O1 as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.41	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	Supports the provision of a strategic objective specific to Infrastructure, given its importance to the city, region and nation. Considers the objective gives effect to RPS Objective 10 and policies 7 and 8.	Retain SCA-O1 as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.27	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Oppose	Considers it is not clear whether this objective should be regarding RSI or not as it appears to reflect policy 7 of the RPS which is for RSI, not infrastructure generally. Infrastructure can have significant adverse effects on the environment from construction to operation, maintenance and upgrades. s6 matters still apply and this objective needs to ensure infrastructure doesn't impact the protection of biodiversity.	Amend SCA-O1: Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that: 1. The social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised; 2. The City is able to function safely, efficiently and effectively; 3. The infrastructure network is resilient in the long term; and 4. Future growth and development is enabled and can be sufficiently serviced; <u>and</u> 5. <u>Indigenous biodiversity is retained, protected and enhanced.</u>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.17	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Oppose	WELL do not support this submission point as it seeks to, at a high-level, restrict the provision of infrastructure to Wellington City's businesses and communities. Infrastructure is a fundamental component to enable social, cultural and economic wellbeing. The amendments sought by the submitter are unbalanced and in effect will diminish the positive effects of efficient infrastructure provision. The submission point seeking that the words "Indigenous biodiversity is retained, protected and enhanced" is noble, however, is considered to be out of place in the purpose and intent of Proposed SCA-O1.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.32	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-01	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submits as it conflicts with WIAL's primary submission that seeks for these objectives to be retained as notified. WIAL also submits that the changes proposed seek to "cherry pick" section 6 and 7 matters. Section 6 and 7 matters are addressed by other provisions within the Strategic Direction of the Proposed Plan. Changes recommended to the Strategic Directions (Transpower 315.40) will clarify that these provisions which give effect to section 6 and 7 of the RMA will apply, ensuring that infrastructure providers have to look to the broader strategic direction provisions, not just those contained in the Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure section.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.10	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-01	Oppose	Rejects deletion of clause 1. Considers benefits of infrastructure must be recognised in strategic direction. KiwiRail also considers that the retention, protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity is provided for in NE-01. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.14	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-01	Oppose	Considers that all infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, delivers benefits for the Wellington City communities. All relevant benefits should be recognised. There is no mandate in the RMA or any of the higher order documents for retaining, protecting and enhancing all indigenous biodiversity. There is mandate in section (6) of the RMA and the NZCPS for protecting significant indigenous biodiversity and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.	Disallow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.3	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-01	Oppose	It is important that the social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of infrastructure are recognised in Strategic City Assets Objective SCA-01.	Disallow / Reject submitter's relief and retain Strategic City Assets Objective SCA-01 as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.56	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-01	Amend	Considers that additional wording is needed to give effect to carbon reduction.	Amend Strategic Objective SCA-01 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained...) as follows: Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that: 1. The social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised; 2. The City is able to function safely, efficiently and effectively; 3. The infrastructure network is resilient in the long term; and 4. Future growth and development is enabled and can be sufficiently serviced. <u>5. Infrastructure shall be delivered in a way which provides for carbon reduction targets.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.33	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-01	Oppose	Considers that while WIAL has been actively encouraging the transition to lower carbon alternatives where practicable (such as the electrification of GPUs and APUs and investigating the use of renewable energy sources) at the Airport, there a number of factors outside of its control that will affect the transition towards alternative fuel sources for aircraft using the Airport. WIAL therefore opposes this submission to the extent that it requires infrastructure to be delivered in a way that "provides" for carbon reduction targets. Alternative drafting or qualification of this statement (for example, using the term "where practicable") would better reflect this scenario.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.11	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	Agrees that infrastructure shall be delivered in a way that provides for carbon reduction targets. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.91	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support this submission point and consider this amendment would contribute positively to reducing carbon emissions	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.22	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Amend	Considers that this objective should be clarified in two ways: Firstly, the infrastructure should provide value rather than value being recognised as a side benefit. Secondly, the protection or enhancement of the environment should be a prerequisite	Amend SCA-O1 (infrastructure is established, operated...) as follows: Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that: 1. It provides The social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised; ... 5. <u>The environment is protected or enhanced</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.34	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Oppose	WIAL submits that the amendments conflate and oversimplify the directions set out in sections 6 and 7 of the RMA. Furthermore, the environment includes “natural and physical resources”, therefore the amendments do not provide any further assistance in terms of clarifying which resources are to be “protected” or “enhanced”. WIAL submits that other provisions within the Strategic Directions address the issues raised by the submitter.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.15	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Oppose	Considers that the intention of the objective is, consistent with the approach adopted generally nationwide, that in making decisions about new and upgraded infrastructure the listed benefits must be recognised This approach gives effect to the relevant higher order National Policy statements and is to be preferred over the requested amendment. There is no mandate in the RMA or the higher order policy instruments for protecting or enhancing the environment in an absolute sense as suggested.	Disallow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.4	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Oppose	NZDF supports the policy directive of Strategic City Assets Objective SCA-O1 Clause (1) that the social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of infrastructure are recognised; as opposed to infrastructure providing for the aforementioned benefits. NZDF opposes the amendment sought to include new Clause (5) to protect or enhance the environment	Disallow / Reject submitter’s relief and retain Strategic City Assets Objective SCA-O1 as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.65	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	Objective SCA-O1 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated,...) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.13	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support in part	Supports Objective SCA-O1 in part.	Retain SCA-O1 (infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.14	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Amend	<p>Seeks that SCA-O1 includes reference to 'additional infrastructure'. The submitter notes that under the NPS-UD and the Definitions Chapter of the Proposed District Plan, educational facilities are included in the definition of 'additional infrastructure'.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the amendment will ensure educational facilities are enabled to service future growth and support the community's social and educational needs.</p> <p>The submitter seeks to highlight that Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure is provided in development and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Amend SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) as follows:</p> <p>Infrastructure and <u>additional infrastructure</u> is established...</p> <p>...</p>
CentrePort Limited	402.33	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support in part	<p>Considers that the Strategic direction in relation to infrastructure resilience would be enhanced by also referring to the ability to provide for infrastructure recovery after short term natural hazard events.</p>	<p>Retain SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) with amendment.</p>
CentrePort Limited	402.34	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Amend	<p>Considers that the Strategic direction in relation to infrastructure resilience would be enhanced by also referring to the ability to provide for infrastructure recovery after short term natural hazard events.</p>	<p>Amend SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. The infrastructure network is resilient in the long term <u>and can effectively recover from short term Natural Hazard events</u>; and</p> <p>...</p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.35	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	<p>Considers that as a lifeline utility operator with Civil Defence responsibilities, WIAL supports the amendments proposed to subparagraph 3.</p>	<p>Allow</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.65	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	<p>Considers that it is appropriate for the strategic objectives to recognise the significance and importance of regionally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>Supports SCA O1.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 and 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	<p>Retain SCA-O1 (Establishment, operations, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure) as notified.</p>
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.44	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	<p>Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.</p>	<p>Allow</p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.22	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	<p>Supports the strategic direction to establish, operate, maintain and upgrade infrastructure so that clauses 1 to 4 can be achieved. This will ensure the importance of rail and ferry infrastructure is recognised and the network is a resilient network that can function efficiently and effectively in the long term.</p>	<p>Retain SCA-O1 as notified.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.31	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Amend	<p>Considers that the objectives (including SCA-O1) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend.</p> <p>The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.6	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Support	Considers that it is important to provide for the establishment, operation, maintenance, and upgrading of infrastructure in Wellington City, and recognise that infrastructure provides a range of benefits through supporting the safe and efficient functioning of the City, along with future growth and development.	Retain SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...)as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.3	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Support	The SCA-O2 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure O2 as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.25	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.	Retain SCA-O2 (New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.12	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Support	SCA-O2 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-O2 as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.28	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Oppose	Considers the objective does not adequately safeguard matters of national importance in s6 of the RMA as well as give effect to the NPS-FW regarding Te Mana o Te Wai.	<p>Amend SCA-O2:</p> <p>New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity, <u>protect indigenous biodiversity, and can ensure protection of Te Mana o Te Wai</u> or where this is not the case the development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can meet the development infrastructure costs associated with the development <u>which also provides for the protection of indigenous biodiversity and Te Mana o Te Wai,</u> and 2. Supports a significant increase in development capacity for the City.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.18	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Oppose	WELL do not support these submission points because they seek to conflate high-level ecological and biodiversity concepts into an area of the PDP specifically focused on the importance of strategic infrastructure provision and development growth. The matters sought to be inserted in to the objectives by the Submitter would be best placed in to the PDP provisions pertaining to ecological and biodiversity matters – where their effects and sought protection would be better balanced and accounted for as appropriate. WELL seek the purpose and integrity of SCA-O2 and O3 is maintained and for Council to reject these submission points.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.16	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Oppose	Considers that there is no mandate in the RMA or higher order policy instruments for protection of all indigenous biodiversity. The NPS-FM requirement is that freshwater (as opposed to land resources) is managed to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai (NPS-FM 2020 Policy 1).	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.13	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Oppose in part	Supports the recognition in (1) that development that is not supported by sufficient infrastructure capacity can proceed if it meets its own infrastructure requirements. However, Opposes the qualifier in (2) that requires such development to support a "significant increase in development capacity". This additional qualifier is not necessary if development meets its own infrastructure requirements. This objective is inconsistent with THW-O2.	Opposes SCA-O2 (Strategic Objectives) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.14	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Amend	Supports the recognition in (1) that development that is not supported by sufficient infrastructure capacity can proceed if it meets its own infrastructure requirements. However, Opposes the qualifier in (2) that requires such development to support a "significant increase in development capacity". This additional qualifier is not necessary if development meets its own infrastructure requirements. This objective is inconsistent with THW-O2.	Seeks amendment to SCA-O2 (Strategic Objectives) to provide for development where it is supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity or where the development can provide for its own infrastructure requirements (e.g. through on-site works).
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.17	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Support in part	Supports Objective SCA-O2 in part as it ensures development and the provision of infrastructure is coordinated and aligned from an infrastructure delivery perspective. However, the use of the limited term 'Development Infrastructure' omits the provision of other key infrastructure such as the Wellington Electricity Lines Limited electricity distribution network.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure Objective SCA-O2 with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.18	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Amend	Considers that Objective SCA-O2 should be amended to not neglect coverage of critical infrastructure that is not defined as 'Development Infrastructure'. As it stands the Objective supports a "significant increase in development capacity for the City", whereby such development capacity is exclusive to Additional Infrastructure, such as the electricity distribution network. For such higher-level PDP objectives, it is considered that the provision of all key infrastructure is identified at the strategic level – not solely directed towards Council owned or controlled infrastructure as is currently drafted in the objective.	Amend Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure Objective SCA-O2 as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity, or where this is not the case the development: 1. Can meet the development infrastructure costs associated with the development, and 2. Supports a significant increase in development capacity for the City.
Waka Kotahi	370.57	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Amend	Notes a broken link for the definition of 'development infrastructure'	Amend SCA-O2 (New urban development occurs in locations...) to fix the broken link to 'development infrastructure' definition.
Waka Kotahi	370.58	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-O2 (New urban development occurs in locations) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.66	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Support	Objective SCA-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-O2 (New urban development occurs in locations...) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.32	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O2	Amend	Considers that the objectives (including SCA-O2) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend. The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal. [See original submission for full reason]	Amend SCA-O2 (New urban development occurs in locations that are supported...) as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity, or where this is not the case the development: 1. Can meet the <u>net increase in</u> development infrastructure costs associated with the development (as assessed against the costs expected to be incurred by Council were it not for the development) and 2. Supports a significant increase in development capacity for the City.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.4	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Oppose in part	The intent of SCA-O3 is supported as it recognises the role of Additional Infrastructure (other than three-waters and transport infrastructure) to support growth. This is consistent with the NPS-UD. However, there is a cross referencing error. The objective cross refers to Objective UFD-O6 which is the previous draft plan reference for this provision. It should be amended to UFD-O7.	Amend Objective SCA-O3 such that the cross reference is made to Objective UFD-O7.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.26	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.	Retain SCA-O3 (Additional infrastructure is incorporated into new urban developments of a nature and scale that supports Strategic Objective UFD-O6 or provides significant benefits at a regional or national scale) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.13	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Support	SCA-O3 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to the incorporation of additional infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-O3 as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.29	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Support in part	Considers the objective does not sufficiently provide for S6 matters in the RMA.	Amend SCA-O3: Additional infrastructure is incorporated into new urban developments of a nature and scale that supports Strategic Objective UFD-O6 or provides significant benefits at a regional or national scale <u>while protecting indigenous biodiversity.</u>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.19	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Oppose	WELL do not support these submission points because they seek to conflate high-level ecological and biodiversity concepts into an area of the PDP specifically focused on the importance of strategic infrastructure provision and development growth. The matters sought to be inserted in to the objectives by the Submitter would be best placed in to the PDP provisions pertaining to ecological and biodiversity matters – where their effects and sought protection would be better balanced and accounted for as appropriate. WELL seek the purpose and integrity of SCA-O2 and O3 is maintained and for Council to reject these submission points.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.17	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Oppose	Considers that the RMA, NZCPS and RPS require protection of significant indigenous biodiversity (not all indigenous biodiversity).	Disallow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.15	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Oppose in part	Opposes the requirement for new urban development to incorporate 'additional infrastructure' (e.g. public open space, community facilities) that is not required by the development or relate to effects of the development. Considers that new development will contribute to such infrastructure through development contributions and this provision may result in 'double dipping'.	Delete SCA-O3 (Strategic Objectives) in its entirety as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.59	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-O3 (Additional infrastructure is incorporated into new urban...) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.24	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Support in part	Supports strategic objective SCA-O3 subject to hospitals being expressly included in the definition of 'additional infrastructure' as sought above.	Retain SCA-O3 as notified, if the amendment sought to the definition of ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE' is made.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.25	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Amend	Considers alternative amendment to strategic objective SCA-O3, to ensure that hospitals are recognised as social infrastructure that must be incorporated in urban developments to provide significant regional and potentially national benefits.	Seeks for strategic objective SCA-O3 to alternatively be amended to the following: "Additional infrastructure (<u>including hospitals</u>) is incorporated into new urban developments of a nature and scale that supports Strategic Objective UFD-O6 or provides significant benefits at a regional or national scale."
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.67	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Support	Objective SCA-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-O3 (Additional infrastructure is incorporated...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.33	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O3	Amend	<p>Considers that the objectives (including SCA-O3) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend.</p> <p>The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason].</p>	Delete SCA-O3 (Additional infrastructure is incorporated into new urban developments...) in its entirety.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.5	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	The SCA-O4 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure O4 as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.18	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	Considers objective SCA-O4 (Regionally significant infrastructure) appropriately gives effect to the NPS-Renewable Electricity Generation 2011. The policies and rules of the Plan that give effect to Objective SCA-O4 need to be refined to genuinely provide for renewable electricity generation activities, as an essential form of regionally significant infrastructure, if New Zealand's aim of transitioning away from fossil fuels is to be achieved.	Retain Objective SCA-O4 (Regionally significant infrastructure) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.14	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	SCA-O4 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to the provision of Regionally Significant Infrastructure and the benefits recognised and provided for.	Retain Objective SCA-O4 as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.42	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	Supports SCA-O4 on the basis that it recognises the development of new infrastructure, noting SCA-O1 relates to existing infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-O4 as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.10	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Amend	Considers that SCA-O4 should be reworded to apply to all new infrastructure and to recognise the limits of existing infrastructure's location. It is considered that many present day regional significant infrastructure would not be placed in their present location using present day planning practices. The objective SCA-O4 suggests that existing regionally significant infrastructure e.g. Wellington Airport is in an 'appropriate location'. However, it is unclear whether building Wellington Airport in a location surrounded by residential neighbourhoods and coastal environments would be deemed an 'appropriate location' currently. SCA-O4 should be reworded to apply to all new infrastructure, but recognise existing infrastructure is not always in the most 'appropriate location', does not provide a full suite of benefits and needs to improve its planning and management to create social, cultural and environmental benefits.	Amend Objective SCA-O4 so that it clarifies that it applies to all new infrastructure and recognises the limits of existing infrastructure's location.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.36	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Oppose	WIAL submits that the "limits" sought by this submitter are defined by Objective SCA-O5.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.18	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Oppose	Meridian does not agree that all existing infrastructure can be considered to be inappropriately located. In the absence of any specific wording, it is not reasonable to properly consider the implications of, or allow, the request.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.30	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support in part	Considers the objective does not align with policy 7 of the RPS that directs the recognition of the benefits of RSI and the consideration of social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits. It does not direct that RSI would be provided for over environmental protections which are to be provided for under s6 of the Act or over Councils functions to maintain indigenous biological diversity. PS objective is for recognition and protection of RSI. Seek amendment to ensure alignment with RPS	Amend SCA-O4: Regionally significant infrastructure is provided for in appropriate locations and the social, cultural economic, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised and provided for .
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.20	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Oppose	WELL do not support the sought amendment to SCA-O4 which is the deletion of the words "... and provided for" in relation to the social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits provided for by regionally significant infrastructure. The sought deletion will diminish the purpose and intent of the objective, and as such, the submission point is not supported by WELL.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.14	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Oppose	Policy 1 of the NPSET requires that the "decision makers must recognise and provide for the national, regional, and local benefits of sustainable, secure, and efficient electricity transmission". SCA-O4 as notified is therefore supported.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.19	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Oppose	Considers that recognising and providing for the benefits of infrastructure gives effect to relevant National Policy Statement direction and is appropriate.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.60	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-O4 (Regionally significant infrastructure is provided for in appropriate...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.68	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	Objective SCA-O4 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-O4 (Regionally significant infrastructure is provided...) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.35	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain SCA-O4 (Regionally significant infrastructure is provided for in appropriate locations and the social, cultural economic, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised and provided for) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.66	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission.]	Retain SCA-O4 (Regionally significant infrastructure) as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.45	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.23	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Support	Supports that the objective recognises the benefits of and provides for regionally significant infrastructure in appropriate locations.	Retain SCA-O4 as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.34	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Amend	<p>Considers that the objectives (including SCA-04) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend [See original submission for full reason].</p> <p>The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason].</p>	Not specified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.9	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Amend	<p>Many present day regional significant infrastructure would not be placed in their present location using present day planning practices. This objective suggests that existing regionally significant infrastructure e.g. Wellington Airport is in an 'appropriate location'. However, it is very doubtful if the Wellington Airport location surrounded by residential neighbourhoods and coastal environments would be built now and deemed an 'appropriate location'. Ideally the submitter would like this objective reworded to apply to all new infrastructure but recognising existing infrastructure is not always in the most 'appropriate location' and does not provide a full suite of benefits but needs to improve its planning and management to create social, cultural and environmental benefits.</p>	Amend the wording of the objective to recognise the submitters concerns in respect of existing infrastructure location
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.37	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Oppose	WIAL submits that the "limits" sought by this submitter are defined by Objective SCA-05.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.20	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Oppose	Meridian does not agree that all existing infrastructure can be considered to be inappropriately located. In the absence of any specific wording, it is not reasonable to properly consider the implications of, or allow, the request.	Disallow
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.6	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Support	The SCA-05 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure 05 as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.19	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Support in part	Considers objective SCA-05 (adverse effects of infrastructure) appropriately gives effect to the NPS-Renewable Electricity Generation 2011. However, the expression adopted by the National Planning Standards and typically used is 'functional needs' and 'operational needs' (rather than 'technical needs') and 'functional need' is a defined term in the Plan.	Retain Objective SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.20	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Amend	Considers objective SCA-05 (adverse effects of infrastructure) appropriately gives effect to the NPS-Renewable Electricity Generation 2011. However, the expression adopted by the National Planning Standards and typically used is 'functional needs' and 'operational needs' (rather than 'technical needs') and 'functional need' is a defined term in the Plan.	<p>Amend Objective SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.) to align with the National Planning Standards as follows:</p> <p>The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical functional and operational needs of infrastructure.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.27	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.	Retain SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.15	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Support	SCA-05 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to the provision of Regionally Significant Infrastructure and the benefits recognised and provided for.	Retain Objective SCA-05 as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.43	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Support	Supports the provision of a strategic objectives specific to infrastructure, given its importance to the city, region and nation. Considers the objective gives effect to RPS Objective 10 and policies 7 and 8.	Retain Objective SCA-05 as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.31	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Oppose in part	Considers it is not clear whether this objective should be regarding RSI or not as it appears to reflect policy 7 of the RPS which is for RSI, not infrastructure generally. The RPS acknowledges that regionally significant infrastructure can also have adverse effects on the surrounding environment and community.	Amend SCA-05: The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed avoided while having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.21	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Oppose	WELL do not support the amendments sought by the submission point as they seek to constrain the provision of development and additional infrastructure which is required to serve Wellington communities and businesses. The submission point seeks to include the word 'avoided' in regard to infrastructure provision – which is considered inappropriate in the context of the strategic growth and development objective. The submission point seeks to unduly influence the provision of effective and efficient infrastructure with unavoidable environmental effects.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.15	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Oppose	Notwithstanding whether the strategic objective should apply to RSI or infrastructure generally, a blanket avoid directive with no consideration of the scale or nature of the adverse effect is not supported at a strategic objective level.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.38	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate for the all adverse effects, regardless of the nature or scale of those effects, to be avoided, nor has such a management threshold been applied to other activities in the District. Furthermore, the submitters concerns appear to relate to the application of this objective to infrastructure more generally (i.e. not just to RSI).	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.12	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Oppose	Considers that infrastructure cannot always avoid all adverse effects on the environment, as recognised by the RPS and the PDP. KiwiRail seeks the retention of 'manage' effects of infrastructure and recognition of the benefits of infrastructure in this objective. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.21	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O5	Oppose	Considers that it is not consistent with the RMA framework, or with the relevant higher order policy instruments, to require all adverse effects of infrastructure to be avoided. Economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits are relevant in terms of the RMA framework and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.61	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O5	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-O5 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.69	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O5	Support	Objective SCA-O5 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-O5 (The adverse effects of infrastructure...) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.36	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O5	Support in part	Considers that the use of the word managed is open to interpretation and is of limited assistance to decision makers.	Retain SCA-O5 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure) with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.37	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O5	Amend	Considers that the use of the word managed is open to interpretation and is of limited assistance to decision makers.	Amend SCA-O5 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure) as follows: The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed avoided, remedied or mitigated having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.67	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission.]	Retain SCA-O5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.46	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O5	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.24	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O5	Support	Supports the direction to manage the adverse effects of infrastructure having particular regard to the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.	Retain SCA-O5 as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.35	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O5	Amend	Considers that the objectives (including SCA-O5) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend. The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal. [See original submission for full reason]	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.7	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	The SCA-O6 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure O6 as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.21	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Considers SCA-O6 (efficient and safe infrastructure) appropriately gives effect to the NPS-Renewable Electricity Generation 2011 and is necessary to protect all infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-O6 (efficient and safe infrastructure) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.28	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.	Retain SCA-O6 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.16	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	SCA-O6 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes sought for the efficient and safe operation of the infrastructure, and protection from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects on the infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-O6 as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.44	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support in part	Supports the provision of a strategic objective specific to Infrastructure, given its importance to the city, region and nation. However, an amendment is sought to the SO to reflect that in addition to reverse sensitivity, infrastructure needs to be protected to ensure it is not compromised. Considers the sought amendment would make it clear that effects on infrastructure are not confined to reverse sensitivity.	Supports Strategic Direction SCA-O6, with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.45	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Amend	Supports the provision of a strategic objective specific to Infrastructure, given its importance to the city, region and nation. However, an amendment is sought to the SO to reflect that in addition to reverse sensitivity, infrastructure needs to be protected to ensure it is not compromised. Considers the sought amendment would make it clear that effects on infrastructure are not confined to reverse sensitivity.	Amend Strategic Direction SCA-O6 as follows: Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities, <u>including those</u> that may create reverse sensitivity effects <u>or compromise the Infrastructure.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.39	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	The proposed amendments provide further clarification around the interpretation and application of the objective.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.22	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Meridian agrees that reverse sensitivity is not the only potential adverse effect that can compromise the operation of infrastructure. Examples of other adverse effects include the establishment of activities or allowing traffic activities that have the potential to interfere with safe access to existing lawfully established infrastructure sites, or the establishment of activities or public access that introduces a risk of direct damage to lawfully established infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure).	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.6	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Support amendment to the objective for the protection of infrastructure from incompatible development and activities, including those that may create reverse sensitivity effects or compromise infrastructure.	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.32	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Oppose	This policy appears to give effect to policy 8 of the RPS but again, that is for RSI not infrastructure more generally. We do not support blanket protection of infrastructure from incompatible development. It is for infrastructure to not impact on the environment, not the other way around.	Delete SCA-O6.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.22	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Oppose	WELL do not support the submission point to delete SCA-O6 given the high-level and strategic intent of the objective. SCA-O6 is an objective, rather than a policy as indicated by the submitter, and given the strategic importance of infrastructure provision – Objective SCA-O6 should be retained, with the submission point rejected.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.16	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Oppose	Notwithstanding whether the strategic objective should apply to RSI or infrastructure generally, Strategic Objective SCA-O6 is supported in that it recognises the effect of other activities on infrastructure. The provision of such an objective does not negate the need for infrastructure to manage its adverse effects on the environment. On that basis, the relief sought by the submitter is opposed.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.40	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Oppose	Considers that reverse sensitivity is a significant concern for a number of infrastructure operators. The concept of reverse sensitivity relates to other activities establishing within proximity to existing and lawfully established (infrastructure) activities, and then complaining about the effects of this activity.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.13	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of this objective. Considers it is important that adverse effects on infrastructure are recognised in the Plan and there are appropriate provisions in place to protect infrastructure. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.5	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Oppose	It is appropriate for the policy direction of the Proposed Plan to provide for the protection of infrastructure from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects.	Disallow / Reject submitter's relief and retain Strategic City Assets Objective SCA-O6 as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.19	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Supports Objective SCA-O6 as it clearly recognises the protection of existing electricity distribution infrastructure in the wake of housing intensification across the City. It is noted that the PDP is striving to facilitate responsible compact urban development and the consequential infill through the recently imposed Housing Supply Legislation. Consequently it is agreed that the protection of existing RSI and associated facilities are important that such infill does not result in enhance reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain SCA-O6 of the Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure chapter as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.62	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support in part	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-O6 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely...), subject to amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.63	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Amend	Considers it appropriate to add a reference to adverse health effects	Amend Strategic Objective SCA-O6 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely...) as follows: Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects <u>or adverse health effects</u> .

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.70	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Objective SCA-O6 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-O6 (Infrastructure operates efficiently...) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.38	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain SCA-O6 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.68	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Considers that it is of significant importance to the ongoing operation and protection of regionally significant infrastructure, such as airports, that adverse reverse sensitivity effects are avoided. Supports the inclusion of SCA-O6. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 and 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]	Retain SCA-O6 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely) as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.47	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.25	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Supports strategic direction to protect the operation of infrastructure from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain SCA-O6 as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.36	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Amend	Considers that the objectives (including SCA-O6) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend. The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal. [See original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.7	Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	Support	Considers that it is important to protect infrastructure from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain SCA-O6 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.7	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Support	Supports the PDP's intentions of 'growing up' instead of out and creating a compact city. Supports compact housing.	Not specified.
Roland Sapsford	305.27	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Amend	Considers that the District Plan should focus its action on climate change by applying targeted and focal intensification to create local nodes or "urban villages" rather than broad brush intensification or intensification focussed in already dense areas. Considers that Emission reduction through intensification occurs largely through changes in the ways and distances people travel. Intensifying already dense areas has little effect on emissions. Rather it is modest changes in focal density in lower density areas that has the most impact.	Seeks that the District Plan be amended to focus on reducing existing emissions through focal intensification and the creation of nodes or "urban villages" in areas of relatively low density, rather than simply a broad brush approach to intensification.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Yvonne Weeber	340.11	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Support	The net zero emission city' by 2050 goal set for Wellington City is supported. It is considered one of the most important aspects of the plan. Setting a goal of net zero emissions, has to be supported with clear objectives, policies, rules and standards throughout the plan if it is going to be achieved.	Retain the mention of 'net zero emission city by 2050' in the Introduction of the 'Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change' chapter.
Yvonne Weeber	340.12	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Support in part	The fourth paragraph of the Introduction is generally supported, but it is considered that climate change adaptation should be included within the introduction on Sustainability, Resilience and climate change.	Retain the fourth paragraph of the Introduction of the 'Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change' chapter with amendment.
Yvonne Weeber	340.13	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Amend	Considers that climate change adaptation should be included within the introduction of the Sustainability, Resilience and climate change chapter.	Amend the fourth paragraph of the Introduction of the 'Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change' chapter as follows: ... There remains a level of uncertainty about the full extent of the impacts of climate change and sea level rise. This means the planning framework needs to retain a level of flexibility to enable the City to adapt in response to changing circumstances <u>including includes climate change adaptation</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.33	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Support in part	Supports the intent of the Introduction but are unclear how it integrates across the Plan.	Clarify SRCC - Introduction to integrate across the Plan.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.61	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Support in part	Supports WCC taking a science-based approach for City-wide carbon emissions target setting.	Retain Introduction, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.62	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Amend	Considers there is an inconsistency in the references to carbon reduction objectives across strategic objectives, including 'net zero' 'zero-emission city; and 'zero carbon'.	Seeks to amend the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter to ensure references to carbon reduction objectives are consistent and clear.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.22	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Support	The Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter is supported, as it signals a direction to reduce carbon emissions and effects on climate change through the use of renewable energy technologies. This direction is reflected in the Renewable Energy Generation chapter which seeks to enable large and small-scale renewable energy investigation and generation activities.	Retain the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.23	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Amend	Considers that the Introduction of the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change should be amended to have consistency of language regarding the city's response to climate change. It is laudable to see a commitment to align with the goal of net zero emissions by 2050. However, this section uses inconsistent language and does not fully express the urgency needed to address climate change, nor the critical role that cities can play through their Plans.	Amend the Introduction to the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter to give effect to the clarification of "net zero emission " or " zero carbon".
Guardians of the Bays	452.10	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Support	Supports the intentions of the chapter. The submitter considers is one of the most important aspects of this plan. Setting a goal of net zero emissions, has to be supported with clear objectives, policies, rules and standards throughout the plan if it is going to be achieved.	Retain the sentence in the introduction of the chapter' Wellington City has a goal of being a net zero emission city by 2050' as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.11	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Support in part	Supports paragraph four of the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter.	Retain paragraph four in the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change) chapter subject to amendments below.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.12	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Amend	Considers climate change adaptation should be included within the introduction on Sustainability, Resilience and climate change	Amend paragraph 4 of the introduction as follows: There remains a level of uncertainty about the full extent of the impacts of climate change and sea level rise. This means the planning framework needs to retain a level of flexibility to enable the City to adapt in response to changing circumstances <u>including includes climate change adaptation.</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.23	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / New SRCC	Amend	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the used of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Seeks that the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change objectives are amended to ensure that resilience is built in all spheres, being environmental, cultural, social and economic as they are interconnected and specifically better support cultural resilience.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.22	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Support	Considers that an increase in the generation of electricity from renewable sources (including wind and solar) is necessary to meet growing demand locally and nationally and to enable New Zealand to meet its objectives for renewable electricity generation and minimise the use of fossil fuels.	Retain Objective SRCC-O1 (built environment) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.14	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Support in part	The Objective SRCC-O1 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective SRCC-O1 with amendment.
Yvonne Weeber	340.15	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Amend	Considers that Objective SRCC-O1 needs an additional bullet point to reflect the need to consider climate change adaptation.	Amend Objective SRCC-O1 as follows: ... <u>5. Climate change adaptation</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.34	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Support in part	Considers that the objectives may allow renewable energy sources (e.g. windfarms) being built in the CMA and the protection of biodiversity and adverse effects being over looked at the expense of renewable energy generation. Suggest tightening relevant objectives to ensure s6 matters are provided for.	Amend SRCC-O1 to ensure matters set out in Section 6 of the Resource Management Act are provided for.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.63	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of a strategic objective that supports a reduction in carbon emissions.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.41	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Oppose	WIAL has filed as submission with respect to PC1 of the Proposed RPS and the target to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Considers that it would be premature to impose such requirements on the Proposed Plan, when those provisions have yet to go through the hearings and decision making process.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.64	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Amend	Considers the objective is different to the carbon reduction target made by WCC in October 2021 to reduce city emissions by 57% by 2030 compared to 2020 levels, and then net zero by 2050. Proposed RPS Change 1 has a similar target of 50% by 2030 compared to 2019 levels, and then net zero by 2050. Greater Wellington supports WCC for setting this target and seek for this target to be reflected in the PDP. This will ensure consistency and appropriate levels of ambition with regard to WCC's contribution to the region's emission reduction targets	Seeks that the carbon reduction objective should match that made by WCC in October 2021 to reduce city emissions by 57% by 2030 compared to 2020 levels, and to net zero by 2050.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.42	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Oppose	WIAL has filed as submission with respect to PC1 of the Proposed RPS and the target to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Considers that it would be premature to impose such requirements on the Proposed Plan, when those provisions have yet to go through the hearings and decision making process.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.64	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Amend	As written, O1.3 does not reference the move needed away from private cars to other transport modes, which has additional benefits not captured by O1.1. Freeing up carparking spaces for greener uses, having less embodied energy (in the vehicle fleet) & having greater transport resilience in the event of an earthquake are examples of this.	Amend Strategic Objective SRCC-01 (The City's built environment supports...:) as follows: The City's built environment supports: 1. A net reduction in the City's carbon emissions by 2050; 2. More energy efficient buildings; 3. An increase in the use of renewable energy sources; and 4. <u>Multi-modal transport options including but not limited to walking, cycling, and public transport, and</u> 5. Healthy functioning of native ecosystems and natural processes.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.92	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Support	Greater Wellington support this submission point which aligns with Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies CC.1 and CC.3).	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.24	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Amend	Considers that Objective SRCC-01 is not worded with a sufficient degree of ambition and urgency. Nor will it achieve the stated goal of being a zero carbon emission city by 2050. It leaves the door open for inadequate incremental progress which could lock us in to a path of failure.	Amend Objective SRCC-01 as follows: The City's built environment supports: 1. A net reduction in the City's carbon emissions <u>to net zero</u> by 2050; 2. More A requirement for all buildings to be energy efficient buildings; 3. An increase in the use of renewable energy sources <u>up to 100% by 2030</u> ; and 4. Healthy functioning of <u>the full range of</u> native ecosystems and natural processes.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.43	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Oppose	WIAL has filed as submission with respect to PC1 of the Proposed RPS and the target to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Considers that it would be premature to impose such requirements on the Proposed Plan, when those provisions have yet to go through the hearings and decision making process.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.23	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-01	Oppose	Considers that it is not clear what the rationale is for a limit of doubling (increase of 'up to 100%') is necessary or helpful if the ambition is to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.11	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Support in part	SRCC-01 is generally supported, but there is concerns that sea level rise risks are not well characterised.	Retain Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change Objective SRCC-01, with amendment.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.49	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.12	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Amend	Considers that SRCC-01 should be amended to 'tighten up' in respect to climate change and natural hazard risks.	Seeks to clarify SRCC-01 in respect to climate change and natural hazards.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.3	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The submitter seeks to include four additional buildings which front Civic Square within SCHED1. Willis Bond and Company Limited agree Wellington Central Library (a Category 1 Historic Place) should be included, but not Michael Fowler, CAB or MOB. We agree with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (sub 70.35) that the proposed Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct provisions adequately address heritage considerations within the area.	Disallow / Disallow the submission (except in respect of Wellington Central Library which should be included in SCHED1).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.71	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Support	Objective SRCC-01 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SRCC-01 (The City's built environment supports...) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.69	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Support	Supports the overall intent of SRCC-01, with particular focus on the increase in renewable energy sources. [See paragraph 4.25 to 4.29 in original submission for full reason]	Retain SRCC-01.3 (Increase of renewable energy sources) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.37	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Support	Supports the direction of SRCC-01.	Retain SRCC-01 (The City's built environment supports...) as notified.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.11	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Support in part	SRCC-01 is supported, but the way the objective is reflected in the PDP is lacking.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-01 as notified with amendments.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.12	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Amend	<p>Considers that the practical application of SRCC-01 is limited in the PDP and will not be met due to loss of sunlight in residential areas. A central objective of the NPS-UD 2020, and by extension the RMA schedule 3A and the WCC Proposed District Plan, is that "Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety now and into the future."</p> <p>A extended definition of 'well functioning urban environment' contains these points: f- supports reduction in greenhouse gas emissions; and g - are resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change</p> <p>When it comes to the built environment, the application of liveable, well-functioning urban environments seems to lead to sporadic development of high rise buildings in narrow, packed, low-rise streets. The major environmental effects come with the loss of sunlight. Sunlight is important for a carbon-zero lifestyle – it fuels solar panels, helps gardens grow, dries the washing, and heats people's homes. If tall buildings are able to overshadow low-rise homes the latter risk becoming cold and damp, leading to illness, and in some cases the homes will become unfit for purpose. Sunlight is vital for everyday life. With new developments the standards require a certain amount of sunlight access but there is no guarantee of this being protected for existing neighbouring properties. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the PDP better ensures that SRCC-01 Objectives are implemented.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.13	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Support in part	Supports SRCC-01.	Retain paragraph SRCC-01 subject to amendments below.
Guardians of the Bays	452.14	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Amend	Considers SRCC-01 needs the addition of a further bullet point to reflect the need to consider climate change adaptation	Amend SRCC-01 as follows: The City's built environment supports: 1. A net reduction in the City's carbon emissions by 2050; 2. More energy efficient buildings; 3. An increase in the use of renewable energy sources; and 4. Healthy functioning of native ecosystems and natural processes. <u>5. Climate Change Adaptation</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.24	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-01	Support in part	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the used of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Retain SRCC-01 (The City's built environment supports...) as notified, subject to amendments.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.20	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-02	Support	Supports the objective in that it requires the risks from natural hazards, which include fire as per the definition within the Proposed District Plan, to be appropriately managed, mitigated, and where necessary, avoided.	Retain SRCC-02 as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.35	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-02	Support in part	Considers that the objectives may allow renewable energy sources (e.g. windfarms) being built in the CMA and the protection of biodiversity and adverse effects being over looked at the expense of renewable energy generation. Suggest tightening relevant objectives to ensure s6 matters are provided for.	Amend SRCC-02 to ensure matters set out in Section 6 of the Resource Management Act are provided for.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.65	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-02	Support	Supports this strategic objectives.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-02 as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.13	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-02	Support	Supports risks from natural hazards being appropriately identified, and natural and coastal hazards being identified and risks apportioned appropriately, and in a way which identifies and recognises the existing investment, development and role of the city centre	Retain Objective SRCC-02 as notified
Wellington Civic Trust	388.13	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-02	Support in part	SRCC-02 is generally supported, but there is concerns that sea level rise risks are not well characterised.	Retain Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change Objective SRCC-02, with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.14	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-02	Amend	Considers that SRCC-02 should be amended to 'tighten up' in respect to climate change and natural hazard risks. SRCC-02 may not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement in its requirement to avoid increasing the risks from climate change in areas of new development. The bar of avoiding when risks are "intolerable" in item 3 of this objective suggests a very high threshold to prevent further subdivision and development, including intensification, which exposes more people to the effects of sea level rise in the future.	Seeks to clarify SRCC-02 in respect to climate change and natural hazards.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.72	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-02	Support	Objective SRCC-02 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SRCC-02 (Risks from natural hazards are...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.39	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Support in part	Considers that ensuring that all risks are low in clause 2 may be very difficult to achieve for all infrastructure providers in all circumstances who work within specific constraints. It would be more accurate to state that residual risks after adaptation and mitigation measures have been applied are acceptable.	Retain SRCC-O2 (Risks from Natural Hazards are...) with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.40	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Amend	Considers that ensuring that all risks are low in clause 2 may be very difficult to achieve for all infrastructure providers in all circumstances who work within specific constraints. It would be more accurate to state that residual risks after adaptation and mitigation measures have been applied are acceptable.	Amend SRCC-O2 (Risks from Natural Hazards are...) as follows: ... 2. Planned for through adaptation and mitigation measures to ensure <u>residual</u> risks are low <u>acceptable</u> ; and ...
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.70	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Support in part	Intolerable risk to natural hazards is a relative and subjective concept. Given the subjectiveness of the concept of intolerable risk and the strong directive set out in sub-paragraph 3, Objective SRCC-O2 needs to recognise that in the case of regionally significant infrastructure, functional or operational requirements of that infrastructure may necessitate locating in an area that is subject to natural hazard risk.	Retain SRCC-O2 (Risks from natural hazards) with amendments.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.71	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Amend	Intolerable risk to natural hazards is a relative and subjective concept. Given the subjectiveness of the concept of intolerable risk and the strong directive set out in sub-paragraph 3, Objective SRCC-O2 needs to recognise that in the case of regionally significant infrastructure, functional or operational requirements of that infrastructure may necessitate locating in an area that is subject to natural hazard risk.	Amend SRCC-O2 (Risks from natural hazards) as follows: Risks from natural hazards are: 1. Identified and understood; 2. Planned for through adaptation and mitigation measures to ensure the risks are low; 3. <u>Except as provided for in 4, Avoided</u> where the risks are intolerable; <u>and</u> 4. <u>Managed to the extent practicable where an activity has an operational or functional need to locate within an identified natural hazard area.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.14	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Support	Supports recognition of the functional and operational requirements of infrastructure to be located in areas subject to natural hazard risk. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.72	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Amend	Intolerable risk to natural hazards is a relative and subjective concept. Given the subjectiveness of the concept of intolerable risk and the strong directive set out in sub-paragraph 3, Objective SRCC-O2 needs to recognise that in the case of regionally significant infrastructure, functional or operational requirements of that infrastructure may necessitate locating in an area that is subject to natural hazard risk.	Delete Objective SRCC-O2.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.38	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Support	Supports the direction of SRCC-O2.	Retain SRCC-O2 (Risks from natural hazards are..) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.25	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Support in part	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the used of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Retain SRCC-O2 (Risks from natural hazards are...) as notified, subject to amendments.
Yvonne Weeber	340.16	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Support in part	The Objective SRCC-O3 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective SRCC-O3 with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.44	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Oppose	Considers that infrastructure falls within the scope of "activities" identified through the use of the phase "subdivision, use and development". Separately identifying activities that fall within this term (and excluding others) leads to potential interpretation issues.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.17	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Amend	Considers the Objective SRCC-O3 should be amended to add infrastructure into the list of the starting sentence.	Amend Objective SRCC-O3 as follows: Subdivision, <u>infrastructure</u> , development and use: ...
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.45	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O4	Oppose	Considers that infrastructure falls within the scope of "activities" identified through the use of the phase "subdivision, use and development". Separately identifying activities that fall within this term (and excluding others) leads to potential interpretation issues.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.36	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Support in part	Considers that the objectives may allow renewable energy sources (e.g. windfarms) being built in the CMA and the protection of biodiversity and adverse effects being over looked at the expense of renewable energy generation. Suggest tightening relevant objectives to ensure s6 matters are provided for.	Amend SRCC-O3 to ensure matters set out in Section 6 of the Resource Management Act are provided for.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.66	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Support	Supports objective as it recognises that working with the natural environment, adopting adaptive pathway planning and employing a risk lens to urban development, are effective principles for addressing the uncertainties inherent in climate change.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-O3 as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.14	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Support	Supports strategic objectives which support subdivision, development and use that manage the risks associated with climate change and sea level rise and support adaptation, and natural and coastal hazards being identified and risks apportioned appropriately, and in a way which identifies and recognises the existing investment, development and role of the city centre	Retain Objective SRCC-O3 as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.15	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Support in part	SRCC-O3 is generally supported, but there is concerns that sea level rise risks are not well characterised.	Retain Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change Objective SRCC-O3, with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.16	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Amend	Considers that SRCC-O3 should be amended to 'tighten up' in respect to climate change and natural hazard risks.	Seeks to clarify SRCC-O3 in respect to climate change and natural hazards.



Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.73	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-03	Support	Objective SRCC-03 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SRCC-03 (Subdivision, development and use: ...) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.41	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-03	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain SRCC-03 (Subdivision, development and use) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.26	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-03	Amend	Considers that: "Early research shows that sympathetically upgrading and reusing existing buildings, rather than demolishing and building new, could dramatically improve a building's energy efficiency and would make substantial energy savings because the CO ₂ emissions already embodied within existing buildings would not be lost through demolition," Historic England Heritage Counts report, 2020.	Amend SRCC-03 as follows: Subdivision, development and use: 1. Effectively manage the risks associated with climate change and sea level rise; 2. Support the City's ability to adapt over time to the impacts of climate change and sea level rise; and 3. Support natural functioning ecosystems and processes to help build resilience into the natural and built environments and ; 4. Recognise the environmental benefits of retaining buildings, especially heritage buildings.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.39	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-03	Support	Supports the direction of SRCC-03.	Retain SRCC-03 (Subdivision, development and use...) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.15	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-03	Support in part	Supports SRCC-03.	Retain paragraph SRCC-03 subject to amendments below.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.46	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-05	Oppose	Considers that infrastructure falls within the scope of "activities" identified through the use of the phase "subdivision, use and development". Separately identifying activities that fall within this term (and excluding others) leads to potential interpretation issues.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.16	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-03	Amend	Considers the objective needs to be amended to add 'infrastructure' in the title.	Amend SRCC-03 as follows: Subdivision, <u>infrastructure</u> , development and use...
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.47	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-06	Oppose	Considers that infrastructure falls within the scope of "activities" identified through the use of the phase "subdivision, use and development". Separately identifying activities that fall within this term (and excluding others) leads to potential interpretation issues.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.26	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-03	Support in part	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the used of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Retain SRCC-03 (Subdivision, development and use...) as notified, subject to amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.37	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Support in part	Considers that the objectives may allow renewable energy sources (e.g. windfarms) being built in the CMA and the protection of biodiversity and adverse effects being over looked at the expense of renewable energy generation. Suggest tightening relevant objectives to ensure s6 matters are provided for.	Amend SRCC-04 to ensure matters set out in Section 6 of the Resource Management Act are provided for.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.16	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Oppose in part	Opposes the requirement for development to “integrate[e] natural processes that provide opportunities for carbon storage, natural hazard risk reduction and support climate change adaptation” as it is unclear what this objective requires.	Delete SRCC-04 (Strategic Objectives) in its entirety as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.67	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Support	Supports this strategic objectives.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-04 as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.14	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Amend	Considers that the wording in SRCC-04 should be amended to ensure that there is recognition of the potential for non-natural processes to achieve the same environmental outcomes in an efficient way (e.g., storm filters and other proprietary devices still achieve low impact design and quality / quantity benefits for stormwater runoff and can be more easily accommodated on urban sites where swales, raingardens and other space-intensive activities cannot) such that the matters at the Three Waters chapter are consistent with this Part 2 Objective.	Amend Objective SRCC-04 as follows: Land use, subdivision and development design integrates natural processes that provide opportunities for carbon storage, natural hazard risk reduction and support climate change adaptation, <u>promoting natural processes where possible</u> .
Waka Kotahi	370.65	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Support in part	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-04 (Land use, subdivision and development design...), subject to amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.66	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Amend	Considers it appropriate to add a reference to the need to reduce carbon as an option prior to storing the produced carbon	Amend Strategic Objective SRCC-04 (Land use, subdivision and development design...) as follows: Land use, subdivision and development design integrates natural processes that provide opportunities for <u>carbon reduction</u> , carbon storage, natural hazard risk reduction and support climate change adaptation.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.93	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Support	Greater Wellington support this submission point and consider carbon reduction provides further opportunities to meet reduced carbon targets.	Allow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.15	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Support	Supports strategic objectives which support subdivision, development and use that manage the risks associated with climate change and sea level rise and support adaptation, and natural and coastal hazards being identified and risks apportioned appropriately, and in a way which identifies and recognises the existing investment, development and role of the city centre	Retain Objective SRCC-04 as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.17	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Support in part	SRCC-04 is generally supported, but there is concerns that sea level rise risks are not well characterised.	Retain Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change Objective SRCC-04, with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.18	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Amend	Considers that SRCC-04 should be amended to 'tighten up' in respect to climate change and natural hazard risks.	Seeks that SRCC-04 in respect to climate change and natural hazards.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.74	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O4	Support	Objective SRCC-O4 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SRCC-O4 (Land use, subdivision and development...) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.40	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O4	Support	Supports the direction of SRCC-O4.	Retain SRCC-O4 (Land use, subdivision and development design...) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.27	Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O4	Support in part	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the used of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Retain SRCC-O4 (Land use, subdivision and development design integrates natural processes...) as notified, subject to amendments.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.8	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Support	Supports the strategic direction in the PDP to increase housing choice and affordability.	Not specified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.9	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the effects of urban development, including building emissions or land disruption, on native birds or trees in the surrounding areas are monitored.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.14	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Support	Supports the recognition of an undersupply of housing in the City, and the approach to increase housing choice and affordability by enabling development across the housing spectrum – from assisted housing solutions through to private home ownership.	Retain introduction for the Urban Form and Development chapter as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.7	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Support	Support	Retain UFD – Te Āhua Tāone me te Whanaketanga - Urban Form and Development as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.68	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Support in part	Supports the objectives that aim to ensure development is well connected to the transport network.	Retain the Urban Form and Development Objectives, subject to amendments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.69	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Amend	Considers that these strategic objectives have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms. Consent decisions should need to consider how particular subdivision, use or development is contributing to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments.	Amend wording of these strategic objectives as required to have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments, as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.1	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Support	It is appropriate that territorial authorities align their plans with directions in the relevant Regional Policy Statement, including its description of well-functioning urban environments to ensure consistency in the application of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) across the Tier 1 Councils in the Greater Wellington urban area.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.7	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Amend	Considers that a staged approach to development capacity is more appropriate. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development requires the Council to enable sufficient development capacity in the short, medium term and long term. This means a staged approach is appropriate given the changing demographics and needs of our city over the next 30 years. Given building consent figures, further development capacity does not appear to be necessary until the medium term (2024 - 2031). [Refer to original submission for full reason and figures]	Seeks that a staged approach to housing development be adopted.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.26	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Support	Supports the direction of the Proposed Plan to support well functioning urban environments. This is important because the Proposed Plan is required to give effect to the NPS-UD, and the NPS-UD identifies the appropriate level of intensification that should be enabled in tier 1 urban environments such as Wellington – including recognising that urban environments change over time.	Retain Urban Form and Development strategic objectives as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.75	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Oppose	Opposes the definition of 'Assisted Housing' and its reference in the UFD chapter.	Opposes the term 'Assisted housing' in the Urban Form and Development chapter.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.76	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Amend	Considers that the references to 'assisted housing' should be removed from the UFD Chapter	Amend the Urban Form and Development chapter to remove all references to 'assisted housing'.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.77	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Amend	Considers that the references to 'assisted housing' should be removed from the UFD-Introduction.	Amend the Urban Form and Development chapter to remove all references to 'assisted housing' including and not limited to the introduction.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.3	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Support	Supports the principles outlined in the Urban Form and Development chapter and the extension of Wellington City into the greenfield areas identified using those principles.	Retain UFD (Urban form and development) chapter as notified.
Metlifecare Limited	413.4	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Amend	<p>In the Urban Form and Development section, the primary issue identified is population growth resulting in a higher demand for housing in circumstances where capacity modelling shows that this demand is unlikely to be met.</p> <p>The introduction explains this issue but does not explicitly recognise the crucial role that retirement and aged care facilities have in providing for the health and wellbeing of the New Zealand community and the provision of housing for elderly residents.</p> <p>This fails to recognise that the local community benefits from the provision of retirement villages. For example, they release pressure on social and health services and contribute to employment in New Zealand, both in the construction sector and day-to-day operations. They also allow residents to live in familiar suburbs where they often have family and friends in close proximity. Further, Retirement Villages have a crucial role in the general housing market because the supply of retirement village housing releases existing housing stock into the market and reduces pressure on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Metlifecare seeks amendments to be made to this section to recognise the growing role that retirement villages will have in providing healthy, safe, affordable homes that meet the needs of older people in the community and in keeping up with housing demand. This should then filter down into other objectives and policies in the Proposed Plan</p>	<p>Amend the introduction as follows: “Enabling sufficient land supply for housing and business activity is crucial for the ability of residents to meet their social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development requires the Council to provide sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing and business land over the short (3 years), medium (3-10 years), and long term (10-30 years). This District Plan sets the policy foundation to enable growth to be accommodated beyond the life of the Plan. <u>Particular consideration also needs to be given to the growing demand for housing for the elderly, including retirement villages. The demand for retirement village housing is increasing as more New Zealanders are choosing to live in retirement villages, enjoying the range of facilities, housing options, activities, and social and health benefits on offer which are able to suit the needs of older people in the community.</u>”</p> <p>...</p> <p>The District Plan approach is to increase housing choice and affordability by enabling development across the housing spectrum – from assisted housing solutions through to private home ownership. <u>In doing so, the District Plan must recognise and provide for the functional and operational requirements of these different types of housing solutions, including retirement villages.</u>”</p>
Newtown Residents' Association	440.13	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Not specified	Considers that UFD Objectives are incompatible with requirements from the NPS-UD 2020 and the RMA Schedule 3B and will enable negative unintended consequences.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.70	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / New UFD	Amend	Considers that further policy direction is required to achieve these objectives. Specifically, to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9), a new policy should be included in the PDP that prioritises development, whether it be greenfield or brownfield development, in areas where there are effective public transport links.	Add a new Objective to the 'Urban Form and Development' chapter that directs the prioritisation of development in locations where there are effective public transport links.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.48	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / New UFD	Oppose	Considers that while WIAL considers it is appropriate to concentrate development along transportation routes, such decision making also needs to take into consideration the presence and proximity of regionally significant infrastructure and potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.55	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / New UFD	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, however the RVA's primary position is that retirement villages do not rely on public transport links the same as other residential developments, and therefore the new rule sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission point, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this objective.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.55	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / New UFD	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose this submission point in principle, however Ryman's primary position is that retirement villages do not rely on public transport links the same as other residential developments, and therefore the new rule sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission point, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this objective.
Metlifecare Limited	413.5	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / New UFD	Amend	Consider that as currently drafted this objective does not recognise the importance of housing being able to provide both social and health benefits in the community.	Seeks that a new strategic objective is incorporated as follows: <u>UDF - 09 The housing and care needs of the ageing population are recognised and provided for across the City to meet demand.</u>
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.10	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O1	Support	Support growing new urban centres in highly connected suburbs. Considers that they have the capability to service an intensified community and provide an urban centre for business and recreation. The focus should be on the growth of urban areas along transport routes and in suburbs with easily accessible transport lines.	Seeks that the chosen areas for growing new urban centres should focus on highly connected suburbs with easily accessible transport lines. [Inferred decision requested]
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.29	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O1	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-O1 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained with the majority of urban development located within the City Centre, in and around Centres, and along major public transport corridors.) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.15	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O1	Support	UFD-O1 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-O1 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.67	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O1	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective UFD-O1 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.15	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O1	Support	Supports objective. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.16	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Support	Supports maintaining Wellington's 'compact urban form'. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments. Argosy supports the strategic direction set by the NPS-UD. The feedback that Argosy provides on the provisions below seeks to ensure that the rules and standards in the District Plan enable this outcome	Retain Objective UFD-01 as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.78	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Support	Objective UFD-01 is generally supported.	Retain Objective UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form...) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.27	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Support	Supports provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification provided under UFD-01. The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain UFD-01 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.41	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Support	Supports the direction of UFD-01.	Retain UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...) as notified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.11	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Support	Supports UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...)	Retain as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.28	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.11	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Support	Supports the goal of UFD-02 (Urban Form and Development - Objectives). Considers that compact urban forms are needed to reduce the city's carbon emissions and the need for residents to travel in private vehicles.	Retain UFD-02 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.17	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Oppose in part	Opposes in part the 'centres and transport corridors' approach to urban intensification. Considers that this approach does not recognise that retirement villages are required in all areas.	Opposes UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) and seeks amendment to recognise that the centres and transport corridor approach is not appropriate for some forms of development.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.18	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Amend	Opposes in part the 'centres and transport corridors' approach to urban intensification. Considers that this approach does not recognise that retirement villages are required in all areas.	Seeks amendment to UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) to recognise that the centres and transport corridor approach is not appropriate for some forms of development.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.19	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Support in part	Considers that UFD-02 refers to 'identified greenfield areas', but no such identification of the greenfield areas referred to is provided elsewhere in the District Plan.	Retain UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) and seeks clarification as to what/where the 'identified greenfield areas' are located; or seeks amendment UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) as follows:  Urban development in identified greenfield areas: 

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.20	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Amend	Considers that UFD-O2 refers to 'identified greenfield areas', but no such identification of the greenfield areas referred to is provided elsewhere in the District Plan.	Seeks amendment to UFD-O2 (Strategic Direction) either clarify as to what/where the 'identified greenfield areas' are located; or amend UFD-O2 (Strategic Direction) as follows: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> Urban development in identified greenfield areas: ... </div>
Woolworths New Zealand	359.16	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Support	UFD-O2 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-O2 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas:...) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.68	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Amend	The submitter would like to see direction in this section for new greenfield developments to include some areas dedicated to 'central neighbourhood' functions, to meet the day-today needs of future residents without the need for private vehicle travel.	Amend Strategic Objective UFD-O2 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas:...) as follows: Urban development in identified greenfield areas: 1. Is environmentally and ecologically sensitive; 2. Makes efficient use of land; 3. Is well-connected to the public transport network, and 4. Reinforces the City's compact urban form.; and 5. <u>A mix and distribution of land uses within greenfield area to provide opportunities for business activities and employment, community facilities and open space close to where people live.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.79	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Support	Objective UFD-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective UFD-O2 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas:...) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.73	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Not specified	Incompatible urban development, particularly greenfield development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Amend UFD-O2 (Urban development in greenfield areas) as follows: Urban development in identified greenfield areas: 1. Is environmentally and ecologically sensitive; 2. Makes efficient use of land; 3. Is well-connected to the public transport network. and 4. Reinforces the City's compact urban form; <u>and</u> 5. <u>Is compatible with surrounding regionally significant infrastructure.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.30	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Oppose	Considers that regionally significant infrastructure does not need to be included UFD-02 wording UFD-03. [Inferred reference to submission 406.73]	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.48	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.42	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Support	Supports the direction of UFD-O2.	Retain UFD-O2 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas:...) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.29	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-O2 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas:...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.12	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Support	Supports growing new urban centres in highly connected suburbs, such as Khandallah. The train line to Khandallah in particular is the fastest train route on offer in the Wellington network and operates every 15 minutes, making this ideal for intensification.	Supports residential intensification in Khandallah due to its transport connectivity.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.24	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow
Phillippa O'Connor	289.3	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Support	Supports the Objective UFD-03 as notified.	Retain UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are...) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.30	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are...) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.46	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Amend	Considers that within the General Residential Zone qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive within UFD-03 is supported, the submitter supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification.	Amend Objective UFD-03 as follows: UFD-03 Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and 3. Served by public open space and other social infrastructure; <u>Noting that medium to high density housing developments may not be appropriate in qualifying matter areas.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.24	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is considered unnecessary and inconsistent with their original submission.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.47	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Support in part	Considers that within the General Residential Zone qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive within UFD-03 is supported, the submitter supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification.	Amend UFD-03 as follows: UFD-03 Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and 3. Served by public open space and other social infrastructure; <u>Noting that medium to high density housing developments may not be appropriate in qualifying matter areas.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.49	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Support	WIAL considers that it is appropriate for the objective to qualify that intensification may not be appropriate in all locations. The subsequent objectives, policies and overlays identified in the Proposed Plan (such as the Air Noise Boundary) will define where such activities are and are not appropriate.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.21	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Oppose in part	Opposes in part the 'centres and transport corridors' approach to urban intensification. Considers that this approach does not recognise that retirement villages are required in all areas. Also considers the requirement for developments to be served by public open space and other social infrastructure may be overly restrictive for retirement villages which provide on-site amenities for their residents. Considers that the use of the phrasing 'are located in' is very restrictive. As large areas of the city have been zoned for medium to high density development (i.e. the Medium Density and High Density Residential Zones) the application of this policy within those zones has the potential to further limit the area within which such developments are supported. Considers that this is contrary to the purpose / function of the Enabling Housing Act.	Opposes UFD-O3 (Strategic Direction) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.22	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Amend	Opposes in part the 'centres and transport corridors' approach to urban intensification. Considers that this approach does not recognise that retirement villages are required in all areas. Also considers the requirement for developments to be served by public open space and other social infrastructure may be overly restrictive for retirement villages which provide on-site amenities for their residents. Considers that the use of the phrasing 'are located in' is very restrictive. As large areas of the city have been zoned for medium to high density development (i.e. the Medium Density and High Density Residential Zones) the application of this policy within those zones has the potential to further limit the area within which such developments are supported. Considers that this is contrary to the purpose / function of the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend UFD-O3 (Strategic Direction) as follows: Medium to High high density and assisted housing developments are located <u>encouraged</u> in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and 3. Served by public <u>or on-site</u> open space and other social infrastructure.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.17	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Support	UFD-O3 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-O3 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.80	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Amend	Considers that the references to 'assisted housing' should be removed from UFD-O3.	Amend the Urban Form and Development chapter to remove all references to 'assisted housing' including and not limited to UFD-O3 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments...).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.81	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Support in part	Objective UFD-O3 is partially supported.	Retain Objective UFD-O3 (Medium to high density and assisted housing...) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.82	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Amend	Considers that Objective UFD-O3 should be amended to enable higher density residential living across the city, including the city centre zone. Aligned to the NPSUD.	Amend Objective UFD-O3 (Medium to high density and assisted housing...) as follows: Medium to high High density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near <u>a City Centre Zone or</u> a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and 3. Served by public open space and other social infrastructure.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.28	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD03	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Ministry of Education	400.15	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Support	The Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure and schools) is provided in urban growth and development (see Policy 10 and 3.5 of Subpart 1 of Part 3: Implementation, in particular).	Retain UFD-O3 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.74	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Not specified	Incompatible urban development, particularly greenfield development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Delete Objective UFD-O2.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.31	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Oppose	Considers that regionally significant infrastructure does not need to be included UFD-02 wording UFD-03. [Inferred reference to submission 406.74]	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.117	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks to retain UFD-O2 as notified. The proposed relief sought provides a potential conflict between urban development around the airport and the airport. Compatible is a relatively high threshold which could have an unintended consequence of unnecessarily limiting development.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.49	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.75	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Oppose in part	Incompatible medium and high density housing development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 from original submission for full reason]	Opposes UFD-O3 (Medium/high density and assisted housing developments) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.32	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Oppose	Considers that regionally significant infrastructure does not need to be included UFD-02 wording UFD-03. [Inferred reference to submission 406.75]	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.50	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.76	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O3	Amend	Incompatible medium and high density housing development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 from original submission for full reason]	Amend UFD-O3 (Medium/high density and assisted housing developments) as follows: Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and 3. Served by public open space and other social infrastructure; and 4. Compatible with surrounding regionally significant infrastructure.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.33	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Oppose	Considers that regionally significant infrastructure does not need to be included UFD-02 wording UFD-03. [Inferred reference to submission 406.76]	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.118	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the effects of medium and high density housing development can be managed so as not to constrain and / or curtail the airport operation. Measures proposed in the PDP such as acoustic insulation and ventilation requirements for noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Overlays will manage the potential effects without constraining development. The neighbourhoods surrounding the airport are well placed for high density development due to transport network, public open spaces and social infrastructure and proximity to employment and commercial activities.	Disallow / Kāinga Ora seeks that UFD-03 is retained and amended as per their original submission.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.51	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.77	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Amend	Incompatible medium and high density housing development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 from original submission for full reason]	Delete Objective UFD-03
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.34	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Oppose	Considers that regionally significant infrastructure does not need to be included UFD-02 wording UFD-03. [Inferred reference to submission 406.77]	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.2	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Oppose	WIAL is justified in its concerns around reverse sensitivity to airport noise. However, an appropriate response would be to allow development where the developer is required to mitigate the effects of airport noise when developing.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.52	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.43	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Amend	Considers that UFD-03 is not consistent with the medium density residential standards as it appears to limit areas in which medium density housing is to be provided.	Amend UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments...) as follows: Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are:
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.30	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.57	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Amend	Considers that the housing bottom lines are to be inserted in the PDP without using Schedule 1 and are operative from that point.	Amend by replacing to left of UFD-O4 "P1 Sch1" with a red gavel. Remove P1 Sch 1
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.31	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-O4 (Housing bottom lines that need to be met or exceeded) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.20	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Not specified	Neutral' on provision. The term land development capacity in UFD-O4 is applied in such a way as to emphasise the term development infrastructure. The term development infrastructure is exclusive of Additional Infrastructure – thus, by default, excluding the provision of key electricity distribution from this strategic objective. The high-level direction provided for in the PDP is supported, however, this support is based on a suitable level of recognition of the fundamental role and service a secure supply of electricity provides to the Urban Form and Development of the City. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.18	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Support	UFD-O4 is supported provided that Council has an evidential basis which supports the numbers referenced in Objective UFD-O4.	Retain Objective UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity...) as notified.
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.8	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Amend	Considers that UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected...) should be amended to have its numbers put into the context of the housing consents granted in Wellington in the last three years. The Council can guide and encourage the location and timing of the development capacity by zoning, objectives, policies, rules and development infrastructure to meet the expected demand. The expected demand figures specified in UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected...) needs to be put into the context of the numbers of housing consents granted in Wellington in the last three years (2019 - 2021). The submitter notes that while there will be lag between the granting of building consents and completion of the property, the current rate of building consents appears to far exceed the demand figures specified. To meet the demand figures (including competitiveness margin) for the full thirty year period requires only 1,220 new house per year which is significantly less than the number of building consents granted in each of the years 2019 - 2021. [Refer to original submission for full reason and figures]	Amend UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected...) to clarify demand figures according to past numbers of housing consents granted in Wellington.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.83	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Support in part	Objective UFD-O4 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient,...) with amendment.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.41	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose	HH-R4 in conjunction with HH-S2 control the addition of buildings on sites of heritage buildings. New buildings on heritage sites have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values and it is appropriate that this matter is controlled by district plan rules.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.84	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Amend	Considers that Objective UFD-O4 should be amended to clarify that the specified development capacity is a minimum to be provided in the District Plan rather than a target.	Amend Objective UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient,...)as follows: In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected housing demand, the following housing bottom lines below are to be met or exceeded in the short-medium and long term in Wellington City as contained in the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment (Housing Update 2022). ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.42	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose	HH-R4 in conjunction with HH-S2 control the addition of buildings on sites of heritage buildings. New buildings on heritage sites have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values and it is appropriate that this matter is controlled by district plan rules.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.9	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD04	Oppose	Changing the requirement to 'exceed' capacity is not warranted. The target for the District Plan should be to provide sufficient land. Making the target more than this makes it meaningless and is not warranted. Specified development capacity already builds in extensive buffers for feasibility – therefore it does not need to be 'exceeded'. The current definition meets the requirements of the NPS-UD. Anything else could have perverse outcomes through 'over upzoning'.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.9	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Oppose	Changing the requirement to 'exceed' capacity is not warranted. The target for the District Plan should be to provide sufficient land. Making the target more than this makes it meaningless and is not warranted. Specified development capacity already builds in extensive buffers for feasibility – therefore it does not need to be 'exceeded'. The current definition meets the requirements of the NPS-UD. Anything else could have perverse outcomes through 'over upzoning'.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	405.28	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Support	Supports the recognition of the need to provide sufficient development capacity for housing and business land. The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain UFD-04 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.44	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Support in part	Support UFD-04 in part.	Retain UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity...), with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.45	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Amend	Considers that UFD-04 should acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing. Submitter considers that Wellington's affordability issues are well-documented. A lack of affordable housing risks harming the City's ability to attract workers and to sustain a vibrant arts scene.	Amend UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity...) to acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.14	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Not specified	Considers that the amount of prescribed housing to meet before 2030 stated in UFD-04 could be met within Medium Density Residential Zones and does not require 6-storey developments.	Not specified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.12	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Support	Supports UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity...)	Retain as notified.
The Thorndon Society Inc	487.2	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Amend	Considers that the demand figures in UFD-04 should be further broken down to better determine the real demand and housing needs. Considers that the figures need clarification over what part of the need is by families (who may need larger properties with more land) and what part by individual people and couples who may enjoy apartment or town house living.	Seeks that the demand figures in UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity ...) should be broken down further to better determine the real demand and housing needs.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.84	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD04	Support	Break down housing demand figures Infrastructure capacity insufficient – limit development Construction of buildings for business purposes should not be permitted in a residential area.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.75	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.31	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected housing demand...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points
Woolworths New Zealand	359.19	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Support	UFD-05 is supported provided that there is actual sufficient land development capacity available to meet the short-, medium- and long-term business land needs of the City as identified in Objective UFD-05. With particular regard to business land, it is currently unclear if adequate supply has been made in accordance with the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment.	Retain Objective UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available...) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.17	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Support	Supports the recognition of the need to provide sufficient development capacity for housing and business land. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments. Argosy supports the strategic direction set by the NPS-UD. The feedback that Argosy provides on the provisions below seeks to ensure that the rules and standards in the District Plan enable this outcome	Retain Objective UFD-05 as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.85	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Support in part	Objective UFD-05 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity...) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.86	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Amend	Considers that Objective UFD-05 should be amended to clarify that the specified development capacity is a minimum to be provided in the District Plan rather than a target and feasible development should be provided for.	Amend Objective UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity...) as follows: <u>At least</u> sufficient, <u>feasible</u> land development capacity is available to meet the short, medium, and long-term business land needs of the City, as identified in the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.10	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Oppose	The target for the District Plan should be to provide sufficient land. Making the target more than this makes it meaningless and is not warranted. Specified development capacity already builds in extensive buffers for feasibility – therefore it does not need to be 'exceeded'. The current definition meets the requirements of the NPS-UD. Anything else could have perverse outcomes through 'over upzoning'.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.10	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Oppose	The target for the District Plan should be to provide sufficient land. Making the target more than this makes it meaningless and is not warranted. Specified development capacity already builds in extensive buffers for feasibility – therefore it does not need to be 'exceeded'. The current definition meets the requirements of the NPS-UD. Anything else could have perverse outcomes through 'over upzoning'.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	405.29	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Support	Supports the recognition of the need to provide sufficient development capacity for housing and business land. The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain UFD-05 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.46	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Support in part	Support UFD-05 in part.	Retain UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available...) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.47	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Amend	Considers that UFD-05 should acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing. Submitter considers that Wellington's affordability issues are well-documented. A lack of affordable housing risks harming the City's ability to attract workers and to sustain a vibrant arts scene.	Amend UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available...) to acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.13	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Support	Supports UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available...)	Retain as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.32	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available to meet the short-, medium- and long-term business land needs...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points
Oranga Tamariki	83.4	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support	Oranga Tamariki support this objective which now specifically provides for supported residential care, as sought through the Draft Plan feedback. This achieves consistency with the underlying residential zone rules which provide for supported residential care activities (up to 10 residents) as a Permitted activity.	Retain UFD-06 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.9	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Oppose	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety. However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then the wording of Strategic Objective UFD-06 (which references and enables supported residential care activities), should be retained as notified	Seeks that the references to "supported residential care activity" from Strategic Objective UFD-06 (Variety of housing types...) are removed.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.6	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of the reference to supported residential care activities and its definition. The objective appropriately describes the range of activities expected across the city.	Disallow
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.10	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Oppose in part	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety. However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then the wording of Strategic Objective UFD-06 (which references and enables supported residential care activities), should be retained as notified	If council are to retain the "supported residential care activity" definition, then the wording of Strategic Objective UFD-06 (variety of housing types...) should be retained as notified.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.7	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of the reference to supported residential care activities and its definition. The objective appropriately describes the range of activities expected across the city.	Disallow
Phillippa O'Connor	289.4	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support	Supports the Objective UFD-06 as notified.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options, are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs.) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.32	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options, are available across the City...) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.15	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support	Support the recognition of papakāinga housing options in Urban Form and Development – Objective 6.	Retain UFD-06 (variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.23	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support in part	Supports UFD-06 to the extent it reflects the MDRS Objective 2.	Retain UFD-06 (Strategic Direction) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.24	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support in part	Supports UFD-06 to the extent it reflects the MDRS Objective 2.	Seeks amendment to UFD-06 (Strategic Direction) to more closely reflect MDRS Objective 2.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.20	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support	UFD-06 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures,...) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.18	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support	Supports the creation of 'well-functioning urban environments consistent with the NPS-UD. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments. Argosy supports the strategic direction set by the NPS-UD. The feedback that Argosy provides on the provisions below seeks to ensure that the rules and standards in the District Plan enable this outcome	Retain Objective UFD-06 as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.52	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Amend	Seeks clarification of the use of papakāinga.	Amend Objective UFD-06 to the following: A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakāinga papakāinga options, are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs. [Inferred decision requested] [Inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.87	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Amend	Considers that the references to 'assisted housing' should be removed from UFD-06.	Amend the Urban Form and Development chapter to remove all references to 'assisted housing' including and not limited to UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures,...)
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.88	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support in part	Objective UFD-06 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective UFD-06 (A variety of housing types,...) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.89	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Amend	Considers that Objective UFD-06 should be amended to clarify that the tenure is not relevant to achieving quality urban environments, but the range of types and sizes of housing are.	Amend Objective UFD-06 (A variety of housing types,...) as follows: A variety of housing types and sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options, are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs.
Metlifecare Limited	413.6	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Oppose	Consider that as currently drafted this objective does not recognise the importance of housing being able to provide both social and health benefits in the community.	Seeks to ensure that this objective recognises that housing must not only meet social, cultural and economic housing needs, it must also meet health needs.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Metlifecare Limited	413.7	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Amend	Consider that as currently drafted this objective does not recognise the importance of housing being able to provide both social and health benefits in the community.	Seeks that UDF-06 is amended as follows: A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options, are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs <u>and to reflect demand.</u>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.48	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support in part	Support UFD-06 in part.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing...) with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.49	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Amend	Considers that UFD-06 should acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing. Submitter considers that Wellington's affordability issues are well-documented. A lack of affordable housing risks harming the City's ability to attract workers and to sustain a vibrant arts scene.	Amend UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing...) to acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.50	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Amend	Considers that UFD-06 should acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing. Submitter considers that Wellington's affordability issues are well-documented. A lack of affordable housing risks harming the City's ability to attract workers and to sustain a vibrant arts scene.	Amend UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing...) as follows: A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options, <u>and affordable housing options</u> , are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.33	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.34	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Support in part	Supports reference to papakainga in UFD-06.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options...) as notified.
Oranga Tamariki	83.5	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Amend	Oranga Tamariki seek amendments to UFD-06 to provide specific direction in relation to community needs and well-being. It is considered that the proposed amended objectives can better provide for Part 2 of the RMA in relation to people and communities providing for their social, economic and well-being and for their health and safety.	Amend UDF-07 (Strategic objectives) as follows: Development supports the creation of liveable, well-functioning urban environments that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety now and into the future. Development will achieve this by: 1. Being accessible and well-designed; 2. Supporting sustainable travel choices, including active and micro mobility modes; 3. Being serviced by the necessary infrastructure appropriate to the intensity, scale and function of the development and urban environment; 4. Being socially inclusive; 5. Being ecologically sensitive; 6. Respecting of the City's historic heritage; 7. Providing for community well-being; and 8. Adapting over time and being responsive to an evolving, more intensive surrounding context; <u>and</u> <u>9. Provides for community well-being.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.8	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	UFD-07 is supported as it appropriately recognises the need for a well-functioning urban environment to be served by the necessary infrastructure appropriate to the intensity, scale and function of the development and urban environment.	Retain Objective UFD-07 as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.33	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.25	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support in part	Supports UFD-07 to the extent it reflects MDRS Objective 1. However, is concerned the objective is overly directive as to how this outcome will be achieved, through listing 8 broad and undefined matters that need to be satisfied.	Retain UFD-07 (Strategic Direction) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.26	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Amend	Supports UFD-07 to the extent it reflects MDRS Objective 1. However, is concerned the objective is overly directive as to how this outcome will be achieved, through listing 8 broad and undefined matters that need to be satisfied.	Seeks amendment to UFD-07 (Strategic Direction) to acknowledge that development will not achieve all of the listed matters in all cases.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.21	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Supports Objective UFD-07 for its effective messaging as to the need of the electricity distribution network in achieving well-functioning urban environments.	Retain UFD-07 of the Urban Form and Development Objective chapter as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.21	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	UFD-07 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable,...) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.69	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective UFD-07 as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.16	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Supports objective. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.27	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Supports strategic objective UFD-07 as it recognises that development will support the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment that enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, and this will be achieved by environments adapting over time to a more intensive surrounding context.	Retain Urban Form and Development strategic objective UFD-07 as notified

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.90	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Objective UFD-07 is generally supported.	Retain Objective UFD-07 (Development supports the creation...) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.16	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support in part	Requests the inclusion of 'additional infrastructure' to be included within UFD-07. Under the NPS-UD and the Definitions Chapter of the Proposed District Plan, educational facilities are included in the definition of 'additional infrastructure'. This will ensure that subdivision and development include provision for the expansion of existing or new educational facilities to accommodate the demand of development.	Amend UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of...) as follows: ... Development will achieve this by: ... 3. Being serviced by the necessary infrastructure and <u>additional infrastructure</u> appropriate to the intensity, scale and function of the development and urban environment; ...
Investore Property Limited	405.30	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Supports the creation of well-functioning urban environments under UFD-07, that is consistent with the direction set out in the NPS-UD. The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain UFD-07 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.78	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Oppose in part	Poorly sited noise sensitive activity has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Considers that such activities should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Opposes UFD-07 as is and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.119	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the effects of medium and high density housing development can be managed so as not to constrain and / or curtail the airport operation. Measures proposed in the PDP such as acoustic insulation and ventilation requirements for noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Overlays will manage the potential effects without constraining development. The neighbourhoods surrounding the airport are well placed for high density development due to transport network, public open spaces and social infrastructure and proximity to employment and commercial activities.	Disallow / Kāinga Ora seeks that UFD-07 is retained as notified
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.53	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.79	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Amend	Poorly sited noise sensitive activity has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Considers that such activities should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Amend UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment) as follows: ... 7. Providing for community well-being; and 8. Adapting over time and being responsive to an evolving, more intensive surrounding context; <u>and</u> 9. Avoiding the effects of reverse sensitivity on Regionally Significant Infrastructure.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.54	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.80	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Amend	Poorly sited noise sensitive activity has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Considers that such activities should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Delete Objective UFD-07.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.55	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.1	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Amend	Considers that UFD-07 is too extensive in its demands on development and is not consistent with the more permissive direction in the medium density housing standards and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). The submitter considers that the items mentioned are generally dealt with elsewhere in the PDP.	Seeks that UFD-07 is reviewed for alignment with the medium density housing standards, NPS-UD and the balance of the Proposed District Plan. [If the objective is not deleted in its entirety]
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.51	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Oppose	Considers that UFD-07 is too extensive in its demands on development and is not consistent with the more permissive direction in the medium density housing standards and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). The submitter considers that the items mentioned are generally dealt with elsewhere in the PDP.	Delete UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning...) in its entirety.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.14	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support	Supports UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable...)	Retain as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.35	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points
Woolworths New Zealand	359.22	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Support	UFD-08 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-08 (Areas of identified special character are recognised...) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.70	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Amend	Considers it would be helpful if the District Plan identified under what specific circumstances "where possible" pertains to. As currently written the objective is subjective.	Amend Strategic Objective UFD-08 to clarify what 'where possible' pertains to.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.91	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Oppose	Objective UFD-08 is opposed due to the recognition of 'special character' at the strategic level of the Plan. This is more appropriately addressed through the relevant zone provisions and precincts. Character is not a NPSUD qualifying matter and as these are not referenced here then neither should special character.	Delete Objective UFD-08 (Areas of identified special character...) in its entirety.
Matthew Plummer	FS7.1	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Oppose	The NPSUD makes provision for "any other matters" determined by the Council to be a qualifying matter. Character Precincts are important to protect the character and heritage of Wellington City in general, and Mount Cook in particular. [Inferred reference to submission 391.91]	Disallow

Energy, Infrastructure and Transport

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Matthew James Underwood	FS17.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Oppose Sub No/Point by Kainga Ora Homes and Communities which seeks to delete Objective UFD-08 and rejects its recognition of “special character” at the strategic level of the Plan on. Support character precincts because they comply with the NPSUD and are an important qualifying matter under the RMA. [Inferred reference to submission 391.91]	Disallow
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.11	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Oppose	WCC summary of submission reads: <i>Objective UFD-08 is opposed due to the recognition of 'special character' at the strategic level of the Plan. This is more appropriately addressed through the relevant zone provisions and precincts. Character is not a NPSUD qualifying matter and as these are not referenced here then neither should special character.</i> Wellington is a boutique capital with unique characteristics that are highly valued and celebrated for collectively adding to the charm of this unique city. The special character of the city's inner residential areas are a well recognised part of the city's international reputation, and these deserve robust consideration and planning control. Special character precincts would seem to enable a more rigorous and sustainable control.	Disallow
Hilary Watson	FS74.1	Part 2 / Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that the original submission states that Character is not a NPSUD qualifying matter. Hilary Watson disagrees - NPS-UD has provision for 'any other matter' determined by Council to be a qualifying matter. [Inferred reference to submission 391.91]	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.52	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Support	Supports the direction of UFD-08.	Retain UFD-08 (Areas of identified special character are recognised...) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.36	Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-08 (Areas of identified special character are recognised and new development within those areas...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points
Trelissick Park Group	168.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / General point on Energy Infrastructure and Transport / General point on Energy Infrastructure and Transport	Not specified	The submitter recognises the difficulty that some sites would have to achieve neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development. The suggested offsets would need to be funded by the developer as a part of the consent.	Seeks that the offsets requirements of sites, as suggested by the submitter, would need to be funded by the developer as a part of the consent.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.81	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / General point on Energy Infrastructure and Transport / General point on Energy Infrastructure and Transport	Amend	Considers that Wellington Airport has been excluded from the Infrastructure Chapter of the Proposed Plan. This exclusion is to ensure that the consent requirements within the Infrastructure Chapter do not inadvertently capture airport purpose or airport related activities within the Airport Zone Considers that the Airport still comprises “infrastructure” for the purposes of the section 2 of the Act and is a network utility under section 166 of the RMA. Furthermore, WIAL undertakes airport and airport related, albeit beyond the Airport Zone.	Seeks that the wording in the introduction of the Infrastructure Chapter is updated to make clear that the infrastructure chapter, and the infrastructure specific overlay sub-chapters, do not apply to airport and airport related activities within the Airport Zone.

Energy, Infrastructure and Transport - Three Waters

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / General point on Energy Infrastructure and Transport / General point on Energy Infrastructure and Transport	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.56	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / General point on Energy Infrastructure and Transport / General point on Energy Infrastructure and Transport	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Aro Valley Community Council	87.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Not specified	Considers that there are constraints to building in Te Aro that the PDP fails to recognise, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council's GNZ SLIDE geomorphology map indicates expensive foundations would be required to support development higher than 3 storeys. - The groundwater levels on either side of the street are high and require expensive foundations. - The existing three waters infrastructure will not support large increases in population in Aro Valley. 	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.33	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Hugh Good	90.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Not specified	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure should not be a qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.	Seeks that three waters infrastructure should not be a qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.
Janice Young	140.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Not specified	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure should be a qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.	Seeks that 3-waters infrastructure is a qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.
David Stevens	151.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Not specified	Considers that the state of Three Waters infrastructure throughout the Broadmeadows to Crofton Downs corridor is inadequate to meet any significant or concentrated housing growth.	Not specified.
Trelissick Park Group	168.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	Supports that THW (Three Waters) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain the Three Waters chapter, with amendments.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	Supports Council’s actions for water management under the proposed District Plan	Retain the Three Waters chapter as notified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers the importance of te mana o te wai to be upheld as it is clear that the current system is failing. Supports a strengthened focus on upholding the rights of mana whenua in relation to water.	Seeks that the PDP is amended to strengthen the focus on upholding the rights of mana whenua in relation to water.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.1	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	WCCERG agree with the need for a strengthened focus on upholding the rights of mana whenua in relation to water.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.19	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	The submitter seeks that the PDP is amended to strengthen the focus on upholding the rights of mana whenua in relation to water. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because the rights of mana whenua in relation to wai is a matter of national importance. Alongside this Te Mana o Te Wai should be upheld.	Allow
Wellington City Youth Council	201.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Not specified	Supports hydraulic neutrality and considers that it should inform future-proof water management approach.	Not specified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that council considers how it can better manage and use greywater to avoid inefficient use of our limited clean water resources.
Tyers Stream Group	221.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers that existing three waters infrastructure in the area has suffered from lack of maintenance and renewals, and shows signs of significant failure, causing adverse environmental effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that all building developments, including infill housing, mandate at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.
Tyers Stream Group	221.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers that pipes can block, causing up and downstream flooding. There is an ongoing cost to keep pipe entrances clear. Pipes remove instream habitat and can impede fish passage, reducing access to suitable habitat. Pipes destroy the natural character of riparian margins. Piping separates people from the streams running through their neighbourhoods, and increases the likelihood of people not knowing about or respecting their waterways.	Seeks addition of piping of waterways other than short sections for access roads and tracks to be non-complying.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers amendments required to wording to align with the NPS-FM.	<p>Amend the Three Waters introduction as follows:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>Te Mana o te Wai <u>is a hierarchal framework that</u> means that the health and wellbeing of water <u>bodies and freshwater ecosystems</u> must be prioritized <u>first</u>, followed by the health needs of people and then the ability for people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being <u>now and in the future</u>. The Three Waters chapter in the District Plan has a role to play by promoting positive effects and avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects of urban development on water in relation to three waters infrastructure, by including objectives, policies and rules which help to achieve these outcomes and contribute towards <u>gives effect to</u> Te Mana o te Wai.</p> <p>The projected increase in urban development in the city will put additional pressure on the existing stormwater network due to increased runoff, with this likely to be further exacerbated by future climate change-induced flooding events. To address this, all new subdivision and development will need to demonstrate that the discharge quantity, and flow rate of associated stormwater runoff generated is no greater than the peak runoff and volumes discharged from the site in an undeveloped state. New development will also need to include water sensitive design methods so that development contributes to promoting positive effects and avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the health and well-being of water.</p> <p>Degradation of water quality in urban freshwater ecosystems can occur when stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces is channelled directly into streams and rivers. The ‘first flush’ of stormwater during a rain event can include higher levels of contaminants. New development using copper or zinc building materials (two common contaminants) will need to treat these surfaces or the stormwater from these surfaces to avoid copper or zinc from entering stormwater. New development will also need to include water sensitive design methods so that development contributes to promotes positive effects and avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the health and well-being of water <u>bodies, freshwater ecosystems and receiving environments</u>. The adoption of stormwater capture and retention and water sensitive design techniques will assist in managing the environmental effects of the ‘first flush’ of stormwater as well as peak flows and volumes.</p>
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	<p>Considers that the report on the readiness of the 3-waters infrastructure in our district for development (“Three Waters Assessment – Growth Catchments Mahi Table and Cost Estimates”, Wellington Water, March 2021) shows that it is either already low-pressure (water supply), under-capacity (waste water), or unknown (storm water), so does not support the development enabled by the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the state of the 3-waters infrastructure in Khandallah is considered a qualifying matter.
Tawa Community Board	294.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Not specified	<p>Considers that the PDP should provide significant encouragement for new developments to include greywater reuse as a means to future-proof the city against water supply issues.</p> <p>Considers that given the time it will take to fix our water infrastructure and the likelihood of extreme weather leading to increased drought events.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provides strong enough direction and encouragement to developers on this issue.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.2	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	WCCERG agree that the PDP should provide significant encouragement for new developments to include greywater reuse where practical.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Murcott	322.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Not specified	Considers that population intensification in Thorndon should be throttled back until 3 waters infrastructure investment has been committed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that population intensification in Thorndon be throttled back until infrastructure investment has been committed.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.48	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
The Sustainability Society	339.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers that the Three Water chapter should be clarified to avoid confusion and ensure robust retention of stormwater can be achieved when mentioning peak runoff flowrates and overall stormwater volumes.	Amend the 'Three Waters' chapter Introduction as follows: ... "To address this, all new subdivision and development will need to demonstrate that the discharge quantity (<u>volume</u>), and flow rate of associated stormwater runoff generated is no greater than the <u>pre developed volume and</u> peak runoff <u>flowrate and volumes</u> discharged from the site in an undeveloped state." ...
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	Support the addition / clarification suggested, and making clear what should be achieved/measured.	Allow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	Support	Retain THW – Te Tūāhanga o Ngā Wai e Toru - Three Waters as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.71	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	Supports the direction of the three waters chapter to protect and enhance the health and well-being of freshwater bodies, and recognise this is an important step for WCC to give effect to the NPS-FM, the Te Whanganui-a-Tara Whaitua Implementation Programme, Te Mahere Wai, Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua and the Ngāti Toa statement. We recognise the significant work undertaken between the draft District Plan and notification to incorporate water sensitive urban design provisions. This is an important aspect of having regard to Policy FW.3 in the Proposed RPS Change 1	Retain the Three Waters chapter as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.72	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers that the proposed RPS Change 1 contains a new definition for hydrological controls which set out the requirements for managing stormwater run-off flows or volumes in relation to a site's undeveloped state, and this is referenced in Policies FW.3 and 42. The proposed hydraulic neutrality provisions should have regard to this approach.	Seeks to amend the PDP hydraulic neutrality provisions to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 in relation to hydrological controls and how they have been defined.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	Support the proposal from GWRC that hydraulic neutrality provisions have regard to proposed RPS Change 1. It is important there is consistency between city and region.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.73	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers it would also make more sense to have permeable surface provisions in the Three Waters chapter.	Seeks for Wellington City Council to consider whether permeable surface requirements could be included in this chapter.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.74	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers that for permeable surfaces is currently only in the residential zones where the MDRS apply, and therefore does not apply to properties where there are more than four units.	Seeks for WCC to consider whether permeable surface requirements for more than four units could be included in this chapter.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	Support the proposal from GWRC that permeable surface provisions should apply to more than just residential zones where MRDS applies. Agree permeable surface provisions should apply to properties where there are more than four units.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.75	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers the three waters infrastructure standards in the subdivision chapter to have discrepancies from the standards in the Three Water chapter	Seeks to ensure that the Three Waters rules and standards fully align with the rules and standards in the Subdivision chapter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers that Wellington needs a robust storm water and sewerage regime. The city is facing a climate and ecological emergency illustrated by the weather events that have occurred over the last 12 or so months, causing natural hazards such as flooding and slips throughout the city and the resulting contaminated overflow impacting properties and the harbour. These events elevate the need for a robust storm water and sewerage regime.	Seeks that provisions be made in the District Plan to provide a robust storm water and sewerage regime. [Inferred decision requested]
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Not specified	Considers that substantial amounts of water have been leaking from the water system. 16 leaks have been notified, by the submitter, to the Council since the 8 March 2022 in various locations in Mt Victoria and the CBD. In some instances those leaks have comprised substantial amounts of water leaking from the water system.	Not specified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support in part	Support the direction of this chapter.	Support introduction direction, seeks amendment.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Amend to include role of Taranaki Whānui.	Seeks amendment to mention role of Taranaki Whānui transitioning to Entity C and Three Waters reform within introduction.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.92	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support in part	The Three Waters chapter is generally supported, but references to Natural Hazard Overlays should be replaced with Natural Hazard Area.	Retain the Three Waters chapter with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.56	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.93	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers that the Three Waters chapter should be amended so that references to 'Natural Hazard Overlays' are replaced with 'Natural Hazard area'.	Amend the Three Waters chapter as follows: ... Other relevant District Plan Provisions ... - Natural Hazards - the Natural Hazards chapter addresses subdivision, use and development in the Natural Hazard Overlays areas .
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.50	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Oppose	MfE discussion paper on National Planning Standards: Zones and Overlays supports the use of the term 'overlay' to mean mapped areas which "introduce more restrictive built form controls than apply to the underlying zone". As this is the purpose of the WCC proposed plan's Natural Hazard Overlays, the term should be retained. Regulatory natural hazard overlays, including for flood, are an important tool to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk.	Disallow
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers the discussion in the Introduction about hydraulic neutrality is forcing developments (particularly multi-unit developments) to over-compensate for stormwater discharges, and existing capacity constraints in Council infrastructure are reduced in favour of smaller developments. Considers that Council should instead focus on levying development contributions to fund additional infrastructure capacity to accommodate growth, with reference to the Financial Infrastructure Strategy 2021-2051.	Amend the Introduction to: The projected increase in urban development in the city will put additional pressure on the existing stormwater network due to increased runoff, with this likely to be further exacerbated by future climate change-induced flooding events. To address this, all new subdivision and development will need to demonstrate that the discharge quantity, and flow rate of associated stormwater runoff generated is no greater than the peak runoff and volumes discharged from the site in its current or undeveloped state . New development will also need to include water sensitive design methods, <u>where practical</u> , so that development contributes to promoting positive effects and avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the health and well-being of water. ... In response to these challenges, <u>Council has a significant role</u> , future growth and development in the city will be managed <u>via Council's programmed upgrades and also</u> through the District Plan to...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Notes that "Managing Stormwater Runoff" document is not listed in documents incorporated by reference.	Amend list of materials incorporated by reference to include "Managing Stormwater Runoff"
Peter Jack	450.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Not specified	Considers that more catchment or reservoir storage be looked at for the future. With all this excessive water we are getting in the winter now rather than let it go, store it.	Not specified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support in part	Supports inclusion of Te Mana o Te Wai in the Three Waters chapter.	Retain reference to Te Mana o Te Wai in the Three Waters Chapter as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Support	Considers that the Three Waters chapter is a big step forward in improving the quality of freshwater impacted by land use activities and giving effect to NPS-FM.	Retain the Three Waters chapter as notified, subject to amendments below.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Amend	Considers that it is unclear how financial contributions can be used when stormwater treatment is needed offsite and how this can be incorporated into a Stormwater Management Plan and how costs can be determined.	Seeks that the Three Waters chapter in amended to include financial contributions to be made for offsite stormwater treatment and management.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.213	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Oppose	While clarification is needed on the relief sought, The RVA opposes the relief on the basis that it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.213	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / General THW	Oppose	While clarification is needed on the relief sought, Ryman opposes the relief on the basis that it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. Ryman opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow
Wellington City Council	266.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers addition of new THW-P6 needed as this policy is more appropriately located in the THW chapter. This policy has been relocated from the MRZ and HRZ chapters (MRZ-P9 and HRZ-P9) and amended to include 'and improve water quality'.	Add a new Policy in the Three Waters chapter as follows: <u>THW-P6 Permeable surface</u> <u>Require development to provide a minimum level of permeable surface to assist with reducing the rate and amount of storm water run-off and improve water quality.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the MRZ and HRZ policy and permeable surface rules are better suited to the Three Waters Chapter and support the amendments.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the MRZ and HRZ policy and permeable surface rules are better suited to the Three Waters Chapter and support the amendments.	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.12	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Support	Support the inclusion of a new permeable surface provision in this chapter, as suggested. Including moving rules to this chapter; and suggest the rules should include development where there are more than four units.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.238	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and the MDRS.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.238	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the MDRS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers this new rule arises from the deletion of MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) and HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) which have been combined and relocated from the Three Waters Chapter. Given that permeable surfaces are not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this policy in the THW chapter.	<p>Add a new Rule in the Three Waters chapter as follows:</p> <p>Zones that this rule applies to: Medium Density and High-Density Residential Zones</p> <p><u>THW-R7 Permeable Surface 1-3 residential units</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> a. A minimum of 30% of the net site area is permeable surface.</p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> a. Compliance with the requirements of THW-R7.1.a cannot be achieved.</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. Any measures used to mitigate stormwater runoff;</u> <u>2. The capacity of, and effects on, the stormwater network; and</u> <u>3. The matters in THW-P6.</u></p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the MRZ and HRZ policy and permeable surface rules are better suited to the Three Waters Chapter and support the amendments.	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.13	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Support	Support the inclusion of a new permeable surface provision in this chapter, as suggested. Including moving rules to this chapter; and suggest the rules should include development where there are more than four units.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.239	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and the MDRS.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.239	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the MDRS.	Disallow
Wellington City Council	266.61	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers this new rule arises from the deletion of LLRZ-S9 (Permeable surface area) that has been relocated from the Three Waters Chapter. Given that permeable surfaces are not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this policy in the THW chapter.	<p>Add a new Rule in the Three Waters chapter as follows:</p> <p>Zones that this rule applies to: Large Lot Residential Zone</p> <p><u>THW-R8 Large Lot Residential Zone</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted Where:</u> a. A minimum of 60% of the net site area is permeable surface.</p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where:</u> a. Compliance with the requirements of THW-R8.1.a cannot be achieved.</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u> a. Any measures used to mitigate stormwater runoff; b. The capacity of, and effects on, the stormwater network; and c. The matters in THW-P6.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the MRZ and HRZ policy and permeable surface rules are better suited to the Three Waters Chapter and support the amendments.	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.14	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Support	Support the inclusion of a new permeable surface provision in this chapter, as suggested. Including moving rules to this chapter; and suggest the rules should include development where there are more than four units.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.240	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and the MDRS.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.240	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the MDRS.	Disallow
The Sustainability Society	339.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers that the Three Water chapter should have a rule requiring a retention depth metric for future development at all scales. Retention of stormwater to manage stormwater volumes to avoid flashy rainfall runoff requires an initial depth of rainfall to be captured and not allowed to discharge as stormwater. where soils allow, this can be via infiltration but in Wellington is likely to require rainwater harvest and reuse to reduce volume which is fundamental to mimic natural losses from vegetation and undeveloped soils. In other jurisdictions this retention depth generally varies from 5 - 10 mm.	Add a rule in the 'Three Waters' chapter requiring a retention depth for future developments of all scales.
The Sustainability Society	339.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers that new rules relating to how future development will manage stormwater for contaminants and changed frequent flow hydrology are needed. At present GWRC is looking to have limits for water quality but WCC should be mandating means of meeting these limits through clear and enforceable rules. Without these rules there will be limited ability for WCC, WWL or future Entity C to ensure that development does not persist to degrade freshwater and coastal ecosystems and not uphold the intent of Te Mana o Te Wai and aspirations of mana whenua groups as expressed through the Whaitua process.	Seeks to add new rules in the 'Three Waters' chapter mandating water quality management and limits for future development.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.76	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers it appropriate to give effect to Section 77E(2) of the RMA and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.4).	Seeks a new policy regarding financial contributions to be paid where stormwater treatment and management is provided offsite under a Stormwater Management Plan.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.56	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow / Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.56	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. Ryman opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow / Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.77	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers it appropriate to give effect to Section 77E(2) of the RMA and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.4).	Seeks to Add permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity rules with an associated permitted standard, matter of control or matter of discretion (if necessary) that requires payment of the financial contribution (where not already collected as development contribution) (separate or part of subdivision rule conditions).
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.57	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow / Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.57	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. Ryman opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow / Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.78	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers it appropriate to give effect to Section 77E(2) of the RMA and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.4).	Seeks to include discretionary, non-complying or prohibited activity rule where any required financial contribution is not paid.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.58	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow / Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.58	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. Ryman opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow / Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.79	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers it appropriate to give effect to Section 77E(2) of the RMA and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.4).	Seeks to add a method for determining the costs of the contribution may need to be a schedule or appendix.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.59	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow / Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.59	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. Ryman opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow / Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.80	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Support in part	Supports the policy direction provided in the Three Waters chapter regarding development occurring where there is sufficient infrastructure to serve the demand.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.81	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers the current policies do not include consideration of how climate change may influence existing water supplies and existing demand for water.	Seeks to Add a new policy to require new development to ensure adequate available water supply including consideration of how climate change may affect existing supplies and the need to develop further water supply sources as a result.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.82	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / New THW	Amend	Considers the proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.2) requires district plans to include policies, rules or method to reduce the demand for water, including where practicable improving the efficiency of the end use of water.	Seeks a new policy to encourage water use efficiency and for development design to manage water demand
Tyers Stream Group	221.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-O1	Support	Supports THW-O1.	Retain THW-O1 (Protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-O1	Support	Supports THW-O1 (Protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems).	Retain THW-O1 (Protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-01	Not specified	<p>Considers "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to THW-01 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP.</p> <p>There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned.</p> <p>Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain.</p> <p>The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone.</p> <p>West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-01	Support	Support this objective as written. Protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems from the negative effects of development, and where possible ensuring subdivision contributes to overall improvement is very positive. This objective gives effect to clause 3.5 of NPS-FM 2020, particularly subclause (c) requiring local authorities to manage land use and development in an integrated and sustainable way to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of water bodies.	Retain THW-01 (Protecting water bodies and freshwater ecosystems) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-02	Support	Supports THW-02.	Retain THW-02 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-02	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to THW-02 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) to require that sufficient capacity be in place before and subdivision, use or development takes place.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-02	Support	Support the objective as it seeks to enable development in urban areas of the city where there is sufficient or planned Three Waters infrastructure capacity or, where this is not possible, development can be satisfactorily serviced by other means.	Retain THW-02 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) as notified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-02	Not specified	<p>Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to THW-02 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP.</p> <p>There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned.</p> <p>Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain.</p> <p>The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone.</p> <p>West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-02	Support	Supports provision for development where there is sufficient existing or planned infrastructure capacity or alternative servicing is available [Note, the submitter incorrectly references THW-02].	Retain THW-02 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-02	Support	Supportive of development occurring in places where three waters are already in place.	Retain THW-02 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.94	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-02	Support	Objective THW-02 is generally supported, particularly as it recognises alternative means of servicing development where existing infrastructure is at capacity.	Retain Objective THW-02 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-02	Amend	Considers the objective should also refer to Council's ability to fund infrastructure via development contributions.	Amend THW-02 (Infrastructure enabled urban development) to: Enable subdivision, use or development in urban areas where: 1. Sufficient existing or planned three waters infrastructure capacity and/or level of service is, or will be, available to service the use or development; or 2. <u>Development contributions are levied for infrastructure upgrades; or</u> 3. It can be satisfactorily serviced through an alternative means where existing three waters infrastructure capacity and/or level of service is insufficient.
Trelissick Park Group	168.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-03	Support	Supports that THW-03 (Hydraulic Neutrality) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain THW-03 (Hydraulic Neutrality) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-03	Support	Supports THW-03.	Retain THW-03 (Hydraulic neutrality) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.1	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-03	Oppose	Considers that the objective seeks that there is no increase in offsite stormwater peak flows and volumes as a result of new development. While this approach seeks to capture existing practice, particularly in respect of residential development where there are stormwater constraints, its universal applicability, and applicability to the City Centre zone is opposed. Policy THW-P5 supports this objective and is discussed below.	Amend THW-03 (Hydraulic neutrality) to support stormwater attenuation where there are infrastructure constraints.
Stratum Management Limited	249.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-03	Oppose	Considers that the objective seeks that there is no increase in offsite stormwater peak flows and volumes as a result of new development. While this approach seeks to capture existing practice, particularly in respect of residential development where there are stormwater constraints, its universal applicability, and applicability to the City Centre zone is opposed. Policy THW-P5 supports this objective and is discussed below.	Amend THW-03 (Hydraulic neutrality) to remove its applicability to the City Centre zone.
Stratum Management Limited	249.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-03	Oppose	Considers that the objective seeks that there is no increase in offsite stormwater peak flows and volumes as a result of new development. While this approach seeks to capture existing practice, particularly in respect of residential development where there are stormwater constraints, its universal applicability, and applicability to the City Centre zone is opposed. Policy THW-P5 supports this objective and is discussed below.	Amend THW-03 (Hydraulic neutrality) in line with the relief sought to Policy THW-P5.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-03	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to THW-03 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-03	Oppose in part	Opposes requiring hydraulic neutrality in all cases including where there is sufficient capacity in the downstream system and/or the effects of increased water flows can be managed effectively.	Delete THW-03 (Hydraulic neutrality) in its entirety as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-O3	Amend	Supports hydraulic neutrality but considers that the inclusion of 'in urban areas' is limiting/restrictive. Notes that THW-P5 (Hydraulic Neutrality) does not restrict to urban areas. Notes that a large development in rural areas may therefore be exempt from the objective.	Amend THW-O3 (Hydraulic Neutrality) as follows: There is no increase in offsite stormwater peak flows and volumes as a result of subdivision, use and development in urban areas . Add a definition for 'urban areas' to the interpretation section of the Plan.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.95	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-O3	Support	Objective THW-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective THW-O3 (Hydraulic neutrality) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-O3	Amend	Considers hydraulic neutrality should refer to the current disposition of a site.	Amend THW-O3 (Hydraulic neutrality) to: There is no increase in offsite stormwater peak flows and volumes <u>from current levels</u> as a result of subdivision, use and development in urban areas
Trelissick Park Group	168.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Support	Supports that THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Support	Supports THW-P1.	Retain THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Oppose	Considers that the policy introduces a universal requirement for the incorporation of water sensitive design methods. This requirement will impose additional development costs and does not specify what level of sufficiency is to be achieved in addressing the policy.	Remove THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) or appropriately qualify the policy.
Wellington City Council	266.62	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Considers change will integrate "first flush" measures into the policies in accordance with the adopted amendments by the Wellington City Council Planning and Environment Committee on 23 June 2022.	Amend THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) as follows: Water sensitive design methods are incorporated into new subdivision and development and they are designed, constructed and maintained to: 1. Improve the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems; 2. Avoid or mitigate off-site effects from surface water runoff; <u>3. Address effects of first flush;</u> 3. <u>4. Demonstrate best practice approach to the management of stormwater quality and quantity;</u> 4-5. <u>5. Reduce demand on water supplies; and</u> 5-6. <u>6. Reduce wastewater overflows.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the MRZ and HRZ policy and permeable surface rules are better suited to the Three Waters Chapter and support the amendments. GW Support the submitters requested changes to THW-P1 as this would have better regard to proposed RPS change 1.	Allow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to THW-P1 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Phillippa O'Connor	289.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Considers that in many instances in urban environments typical water sensitive design methods (swales, raingardens and other space-intensive activities) will not be able to be accommodated while fulfilling the other design requirements of the Plan and as such this amendment seeks to avoid conflict between policies in this regard.	Amend THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) as follows: Water sensitive design methods are incorporated into promoted in new subdivision and development and they are designed, constructed and maintained to: 1. Improve the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems; 2. Avoid or mitigate off-site effects from surface water runoff; 3. Demonstrate best practice approach to the management of stormwater quality and quantity; 4. Reduce demand on water supplies; and 5. Reduce wastewater overflows.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Support	Supports Water Sensitive Urban Design as an essential feature of neighbourhoods to manage and improve stormwater quality and run-off. The WSUD car parking along Evans Bay Parade by Kilbirnie Park should be the standard for on-street car parking, with appropriate accessible crossing places. This will have the huge added advantage of slowing cars down near the kerb. Assurance should be provided that the water system will be robust enough to support the community throughout the life of the District Plan.	Retain THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Oppose in part	Opposes aspects of this policy that are not linked to the effects of the particular development e.g. improving (as opposed to maintaining) the health and wellbeing of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems and reducing wastewater overflows which should not be the responsibility of new development, when existing issues have been caused by historic development.	Opposes THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Opposes aspects of this policy that are not linked to the effects of the particular development e.g. improving (as opposed to maintaining) the health and wellbeing of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems and reducing wastewater overflows which should not be the responsibility of new development, when existing issues have been caused by historic development.	Seeks amendment to THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) to remove parts of the policy that are not linked to the effects of the particular development.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.83	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Support in part	Supports the use of water sensitive design methods to achieve the matters listed in 1 to 5 of THW-P1.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.84	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Considers that to have regard to Policy FW.3 in Proposed RPS Change 1, this policy should go further to also achieve other amenity, recreational, climate, and cultural outcomes.	Amend THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) to include an additional sub-clause: 6. where feasible, provide for multiple uses including improving amenity, recreation, cultural, ecological and climate values.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.85	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Considers that clause 5 of THW-P1 to, 'reduce wastewater overflows,' should specify the extent of reduction sought, as the outcome of this policy will be integral to achieving outcomes sought by Te Mahere Wai and Te Whanganui-a-Tara Whaitua Implementation Programme, as well as Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy 42(r)) which seeks support for growth and consideration of different approaches to wastewater management to resolve overflows	Seeks for WCC to consider specifying the extent of reduction in wastewater overflows sought, including any necessary consequential amendments.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Support	The incorporation of water sensitive design for all new developments is generally supported, but an amendment is sought. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) with amendment.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Considers that the incorporation of water sensitive design for all new developments should be promoted rather than required in THW-P1. There are many instances in urban environments where typical water sensitive design methods (swales, raingardens and other space-intensive activities) will not be able to be accommodated while fulfilling the other design requirements of the Plan and as such this amendment seeks to avoid conflict between policies in this regard.	Amend THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) as follows: Water sensitive design methods are incorporated into promoted in new subdivision and development and they are designed, constructed and maintained to: 1. Improve the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems; 2. Avoid or mitigate off-site effects from surface water runoff; 3. Demonstrate best practice approach to the management of stormwater quality and quantity; 4. Reduce demand on water supplies; and 5. Reduce wastewater overflows.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Generally supportive but considers that point 5 is unclear in what it is trying to achieve. Unclear if it is trying to reduce wastewater overflows city wide or reduce wastewater overflows in comparison to the status quo. Considers that the wording of Point 5 should seek to avoid wastewater overflows. This would be in line with the objectives of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM).	Amend Point 5 of THW-P1 (Water Sensitive Design) as follows: ... 5. <u>Reduce Avoid wastewater overflows wherever practicable.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.215	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.215	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.96	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Support	THW-P1 is generally supported.	Retain THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Considers that as the definition of "water sensitive urban design" is concerned with managing stormwater at its source, it cannot be used to seek reductions in wastewater overflows in Council sewage networks.	Amend THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) to: Water sensitive design methods are incorporated into new subdivision and development and they are designed, constructed and maintained to: 1. Improve the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems; 2. Avoid or mitigate off-site effects from surface water runoff; 3. Demonstrate best practice approach to the management of stormwater quality and quantity; <u>and</u> 4. Reduce demand on water supplies; <u>and</u> 5. Reduce wastewater overflows
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Support in part	Supports the use of water sensitive urban design in the policy.	Retain THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) as notified subject to the amendments below.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Considers that THW-P1 needs strengthened to specify the reduction sought.	Amend THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) to: Water sensitive design methods are incorporated into new subdivision and development and they are designed, constructed and maintained to: 1. Improve the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems; 2. Avoid or mitigate off-site effects from surface water runoff; 3. Demonstrate best practice approach to the management of stormwater quality and quantity; 4. Reduce demand on water supplies; <u>and</u> 5. Reduce wastewater overflows <u>so that the objectives of Te Whanganui a Tara and Porirua Whaitua Implementation can be delivered.</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P1	Amend	Considers that a new clause is needed in THW-P1 to acknowledge the role that water sensitive urban design has contribution to lower catchment outcomes.	Amend THW-P1 (Water sensitive design) to include a new clause that acknowledges the role of Water Sensitive Urban Design in Wellington City to contribute positively to the Porirua Harbour lower catchment outcomes.
Tyers Stream Group	221.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P2	Support	Supports THW-P2.	Retain THW-P2 (Building materials) as notified.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P2	Amend	Considers that TW-P2 fails to acknowledge that where roof water is used as drinking water, the use of copper roofing and downpipes enhances its safety. While this will only matter where access to reticulated water is not guaranteed, the policy should acknowledge this.	Amend THW-P2 (Building materials) to acknowledge the use of copper roofing and downpipes enhances the safety of roof water when it is used as drinking water.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P2	Support	Supportive and the Policy gives effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-FM.	Retain THW-P2 (Building Materials) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.97	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P2	Support in part	THW-P2 is generally supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain THW-P2 (Building Materials) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.98	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P2	Amend	Considers that THW-P2 should be amended, as the use of avoid in the policy does not match the rule setting for non-compliance (restricted discretionary activity) and it may be appropriate to use these building materials in some instances where there are no impacts on the stormwater system.	Amend THW-P2 (Building Materials) as follows: The use of copper and zinc building materials is avoided or the effects of copper and zinc entering the stormwater system from the use as roofing and guttering materials are mitigated through the use of appropriate treatment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.76	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P2	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's suggested amendment to THW-P2 as it weakens the policy approach to this matter. The wording as notified has better regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. The issue raised by the submitter in relation to the applicable rule status is not significant as the policy has two arms, the first being avoid and the second being to manage effects.	Disallow / Seeks that THW-P2 is retained as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P3	Support	Supports THW-P3.	Retain THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) with amendment.
Tyers Stream Group	221.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P3	Amend	Considers that this would fit with the requirements of THW-P4.	Seeks that THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) be amended to require that sufficient capacity be in place before and subdivision, use or development takes place.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P3	Support	Supports the policy as it seeks to enable development in urban areas where there is sufficient existing or planned capacity to accommodate the development to meet growth demand in the short to medium term.	Retain THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P3	Support	Supports THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development).	Retain THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P3	Support in part	Considers that these policies overlap creating interpretation issues. Supports provision for development where there is sufficient existing or planned infrastructure capacity or alternative servicing is available.	Retain THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P3	Amend	Considers that these policies overlap creating interpretation issues. Supports provision for development where there is sufficient existing or planned infrastructure capacity or alternative servicing is available.	Amend THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) to remove overlap within THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) and ensure the policies provide for alternative servicing where there is not existing/planned capacity.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P3	Support	THW-P3 is supported for its intent of concentrating subdivision and development in areas where existing three waters infrastructure is in place. This aligns with the NPS-FM.	Retain THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.99	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P3	Support	THW-P3 is generally supported.	Retain THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P3	Amend	Considers that enabling infrastructure should also refer to Council's ability to fund development via Development Contributions	Amend THW-P3 (Infrastructure enabled urban development) to: New subdivision, use or development is enabled in urban areas that have existing or planned three waters infrastructure capacity, <u>including via development contributions</u> , to meet growth demand in the short to medium term
Tyers Stream Group	221.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support	Supports THW-P4.	Retain THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support in part	Supports the policy as it requires all new subdivision or development in urban areas to be serviced by Three Waters infrastructure which meets the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services, which makes references to the FENZ Code of Practice, has sufficient capacity to accommodate the development and is in place prior to the commencement of construction. FENZ is concerned regarding the development of new building hydrant systems being considered an alternative option to the requirement of standard infrastructure hydrant systems in the reticulated area. FENZ notes these systems are not maintained or designed to the level of standard hydrant systems and wishes to add explanatory text highlighting to developers that building hydrant systems cannot be considered an alternative option for the purposes of this provision.	Supports THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Amend	Supports the policy as it requires all new subdivision or development in urban areas to be serviced by Three Waters infrastructure which meets the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services, which makes references to the FENZ Code of Practice, has sufficient capacity to accommodate the development and is in place prior to the commencement of construction. FENZ is concerned regarding the development of new building hydrant systems being considered an alternative option to the requirement of standard infrastructure hydrant systems in the reticulated area. FENZ notes these systems are not maintained or designed to the level of standard hydrant systems and wishes to add explanatory text highlighting to developers that building hydrant systems cannot be considered an alternative option for the purposes of this provision.	Amend THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) as follows: <u>Note: Building hydrant systems cannot be considered a replacement of standard infrastructure hydrant systems.</u>
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support	Supports the policy THW-P4: Limit subdivision and development in urban areas where existing three waters capacity and/or level of service is insufficient to service further development.	Retain THW-P4 (Three Waters infrastructure servicing) as notified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to THW-P4 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Amend	Considers that TWH-P4 omits any mention of planned enhancements to bring the 3 waters infrastructure to a level that is adequate for Medium and High Density residential zones (e.g. by deferring some areas for 5 or 10 years until the required infrastructure is constructed) or even a programme of renewals to bring capacity up service permitted uses under the operative district plan.	Amend THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) to add a statement on upgrading infrastructure to meet the level of service required to meet the requirements of permitted uses.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support in part	Considers that these policies overlap creating interpretation issues. Supports provision for development where there is sufficient existing or planned infrastructure capacity or alternative servicing is available.	Retain THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) and seeks amendment to remove overlap within THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) and ensure the policies provide for alternative servicing where there is not existing/planned capacity.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Amend	Considers that these policies overlap creating interpretation issues. Supports provision for development where there is sufficient existing or planned infrastructure capacity or alternative servicing is available.	Seeks amendment to THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) to remove overlap within THW-P3 (Infrastructure-enabled urban development) and ensure the policies provide for alternative servicing where there is not existing/planned capacity.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.86	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support in part	Supports the need for sufficient infrastructure capacity prior to development, and this direction aligns with the Operative RPS.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Amend	THW-P4 is supported for its intent. Notes that the wording 'in urban areas' is not clear as to where the Policy applies and what is meant by urban areas. Concerned that the policy therefore will not apply outside of urban areas.	Amend THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) as follows: Subdivision or development in urban areas is serviced by three waters infrastructure that: 1. Meets the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services v3.0 December 2021; 2. Has sufficient capacity to accommodate the development; and 3. Is in position prior to the commencement of construction. Limit subdivision and development in urban areas where existing three waters capacity and/or level of service is insufficient to service further development unless: ...
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.100	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support in part	THW-P4 is generally supported, as it recognises and provides for alternative means servicing development where existing infrastructure is at capacity. An amendment is sought.	Retain THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.101	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Amend	Considers that THW-P4 should be amended, as it fails to recognise that development in urban areas may necessitate additional public investment in expansion of the three waters infrastructure. The appropriate response to this issue is to increase public investment where needed rather than to constrain otherwise appropriate development. The policy should recognise that development in urban areas may necessitate additional public investment in expansion of the three waters infrastructure.	Amend THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) as follows: ... Limit <u>Provide for</u> subdivision and development in urban areas where existing three waters capacity and/or level of service is insufficient to service further development, including and: 1. It can be demonstrated there is an alternative solution to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on the three waters infrastructure network and the health and wellbeing of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems; and or 2. <u>Additional public investment in three waters infrastructure is appropriate and possible to enable the planned urban built form of the underlying zone and achieve a compact urban form. The additional demand generated will not necessitate additional unplanned public investment in, or expansion of, the three waters infrastructure network or compromise its ability to service other activities permitted within the zone.</u>
Generation Zero	FS54.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support	Support proposed amendment to THW-04 to note that "increase public investment where needed rather than to constrain otherwise appropriate development" and further submit that: Poor infrastructure should not constrain development; Rather, it should be a signal for increased public investment; With appropriate cost recovery from new and existing users, infrastructure renewal and increasing of capacity should be cost neutral to water providers ; Historic underinvestment in infrastructure to keep rates artificially low should not be a reason to stop new development; More residential development can spread the high fixed cost of public infrastructure thus making its average cost more affordable for all.	Allow / Seeks that THW-04 is amended to note that "increase public investment where needed rather than constrain otherwise appropriate development".
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.40	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support	Stride supports recognising that intensification of existing urban areas provides benefits and it is appropriate to provide for additional public investment in three waters infrastructure to enable intensification.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.40	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support	Investore supports recognising that intensification of existing urban areas provides benefits and it is appropriate to provide for additional public investment in three waters infrastructure to enable intensification.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Amend	Considers this policy to be contrary to the NPS-UD Policy 2, as it seeks to limit development unless there is sufficient infrastructure capacity of an alternative solution. Considers this is contrary particularly in regard to Council's responsibility to ensure sufficient development capacity for the short term.	Amend THW-P4 (Three water infrastructure servicing) to: Subdivision or development in urban areas is serviced by three waters infrastructure that: 1. Meets the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services v3.0 December 2021; 2. Has sufficient capacity to accommodate the development; and 3. Is in position prior to the commencement of construction. Limit For subdivision and development in urban areas where existing three waters capacity and/or level of service is insufficient to service further development unless ensure : 1. It can be demonstrated there is an alternative solution to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on the three waters infrastructure network and the health and wellbeing of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems; and 2. The additional demand generated will not necessitate additional unplanned public investment in, or expansion of, the three waters infrastructure network or compromise its ability to service other activities permitted within the zone.
The Thorndon Society Inc	487.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Amend	Considers that in THW-P4, "Limit subdivision and development in urban areas where existing three waters capacity and/or level of service is insufficient to service further development:" should be changed. If the greatest urban space for further housing is Karori then capacity should be changed there to enable the capacity to be realised.	Amend THW-P4 (Three waters infrastructure servicing) to replace " Limit subdivision and development in urban areas where existing three waters capacity and/or level of service is insufficient to service further development: " with " <u>Where existing three waters capacity and/or level of service is insufficient to service further development then look at means of increasing capacity to enable subdivision and development in urban areas.</u> "
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.85	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support	Break down housing demand figures Infrastructure capacity insufficient – limit development Construction of buildings for business purposes should not be permitted in a residential area.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.76	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P4	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Rod Halliday	25.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Amend	Considers that THW-P5 does not recognise that there are some parts of the City that drain to the Stebbings Dam and Seton Nossiter Detention Structures which are intended to hold back/throttle flows from a modelled 100 year event. In Stebbings Valley this has been modelled as the RL92 and there are easements over private property to protect this ponding area and keep it free of buildings for the 100 year event. The GWRC designation W4 (Operative Plan) and WRC6 (Proposed Plan) also reflect this purpose for Stebbings and similar designations are in place in the operative (W2) and proposed plans (WRC2) for Seton Nossiter. Previous developments in these catchments, including Churton Park subdivisions over the last 5+ years, have had no requirement for stormwater neutrality.	Seeks that THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) is amended to note that some areas of the City can achieve the intent of this policy due to the presence of the Stebbings Dam and Seton Nossiter Detention Structures.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.1	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Oppose	<p>Submitter states that Rule R5 requiring hydrological neutrality for any new housing development should not apply to the Upper Stebbings Valley or Seton Nossiter catchments because both these catchments are protected by detention dams. Submitter argues that previous developments in these catchments, including Churton Park subdivisions over the last 5+ years, have had no requirement for stormwater neutrality - however climate change is accelerating and what was required in the past must change to reduce future negative flood impacts.</p> <p>Serious flooding has occurred in the past from these catchments including some events after the detention dams were constructed. Stebbings detention dam was completed in 1994 and is designed to hold back water arising from a one on one-hundred-year flood event, a target that is now unlikely to be met due to the accelerating effects of climate change.</p> <p>Furthermore, Glenside West catchment is not in the Stebbings Dam or Seton Nossiter catchment and there is no downstream floodwater protection therefore Council should be taking additional measure to reduce the impact of earthworks and housing development on the Glenside West water catchment.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledgement by Council that the Government's Policy Statement on Urban Development does not apply to areas such as Glenside West. - That any development in Glenside West takes place with a minimum of earthworks and that natural gullies are not filled in. - That the grey unbuilt area in Glenside West is unsuitable land for housing and that the whole area shown in mustard/yellow (Fig 1) is limited to Large Lot Residential. - Roading and housing doesn't extend into gullies, ephemeral streams, intermittent and perennial streams and is kept away from the ridgetop. - Furthermore no housing is built above the current Glenside-Churton park suburb boundary in order that the ridgeline is offered at least some degree of visual protection. - Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) on this site must be preserved and not impacted by development, if any development is to take place
Heidi Snelson	FS24.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Oppose	<p>Submitter is seeking to reduce mitigation requirements and responsibilities around hydraulic neutrality and permeable surface requirements in the case of storm water management at a unprecedented time of storm water damage in Wellington.</p> <p>Developments should undertake more mitigation not less in all areas given climate change. Especially those posing more risk, such as steep hillsides, abutting/above key infrastructure (roading, power, water, railway), and significant streams, such as at the sites of the current and planned developments in Churton Park and Glenside West.</p> <p>The Glenside West development area is downstream of both detention structures, on extremely steep hillsides, above Porirua Stream, directly above Middleton Road (State Highway 1 motorway detour route) and the North Island railway line (which runs alongside and over the Porirua Stream). This development area must be specifically required to achieve Hydraulic Neutrality. Be that through specific technological infrastructure in build design and water catchment, significant permeable surface requirements/planting. Through Large Lot Residential Only in Glenside West.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed to ensure strict adherence to hydraulic neutrality in Glenside West Development Area, and Stebbings Valley / Reedy Block Development Area. Seeks minimum standard of hydraulic neutrality required and corresponding requirement of high level of permeable surface mitigations.</p> <p>Seeks that Glenside West be designated Large Lot Residential only.</p>
Trelissick Park Group	168.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Support	Supports that THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Support	Supports THW-P5.	Retain THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Oppose	Considers that the policy states: "Require new subdivision and development to be designed, constructed and maintained to sustainably manage the volume and rate of discharge of stormwater to the receiving environment so that the rate of offsite stormwater discharge is reduced as far as practicable to be at or below the modelled peak flow and volume for each site in an undeveloped state." This approach ignores the existing environment and requires stormwater to be attenuated to account for a site in an undeveloped state. This brings with it additional costs in respect of the required modelling, increased costs in attaining the attenuation required, and represents a significant departure from existing practice.	Amend THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) to apply in situations of insufficient infrastructure capacity.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stratum Management Limited	249.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Oppose	Considers that the policy states: "Require new subdivision and development to be designed, constructed and maintained to sustainably manage the volume and rate of discharge of stormwater to the receiving environment so that the rate of offsite stormwater discharge is reduced as far as practicable to be at or below the modelled peak flow and volume for each site in an undeveloped state." This approach ignores the existing environment and requires stormwater to be attenuated to account for a site in an undeveloped state. This brings with it additional costs in respect of the required modelling, increased costs in attaining the attenuation required, and represents a significant departure from existing practice.	Amend THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) to continue to recognise the existing environment.
Stratum Management Limited	249.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Oppose	Considers that the policy states: "Require new subdivision and development to be designed, constructed and maintained to sustainably manage the volume and rate of discharge of stormwater to the receiving environment so that the rate of offsite stormwater discharge is reduced as far as practicable to be at or below the modelled peak flow and volume for each site in an undeveloped state." This approach ignores the existing environment and requires stormwater to be attenuated to account for a site in an undeveloped state. This brings with it additional costs in respect of the required modelling, increased costs in attaining the attenuation required, and represents a significant departure from existing practice.	Amend THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) to exclude the City Centre Zone.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to THW-P5 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Amend	Considers that 'undeveloped state' is too onerous. Identifies that the assessment criteria for THW-R6.2 uses pre-development as a reference point and considers this more appropriate.	Amend THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) as follows: Require new subdivision and development to be designed, constructed and maintained to sustainably manage the volume and rate of discharge of stormwater to the receiving environment so that the rate of offsite stormwater discharge is reduced as far as practicable to be at or below the modelled peak flow and volume for each site in an undeveloped <u>pre-developed</u> state.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Support in part	Supports the term "as far as practicable" in the policy, but considers that it remains unclear if hydraulic neutrality is required in all cases including where there is sufficient capacity in the downstream system and/or the effects of increased water flows can be managed effectively.	Retain THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Amend	Supports the term "as far as practicable" in the policy, but considers that it remains unclear if hydraulic neutrality is required in all cases including where there is sufficient capacity in the downstream system and/or the effects of increased water flows can be managed effectively.	Seeks amendment to THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) so that hydraulic neutrality is not required (but encouraged) where there is sufficient capacity in the downstream system and/or the effects of increased water flows can be managed effectively.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Amend	THW-P5 should be amended to remove reference to an 'undeveloped state' and replace with pre-developed state as the former is overly onerous. It is noted that the matters of discretion at Rule THW-R6.2 include an assessment against "the extent to which the development incorporates stormwater management techniques or controls to mitigate any increase in pre-development peak stormwater runoff" and as such it is considered that pre-development state is the appropriate baseline against which to assess effects in this regard.	Amend THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) as follows: Require new subdivision and development to be designed, constructed and maintained to sustainably manage the volume and rate of discharge of stormwater to the receiving environment so that the rate of offsite stormwater discharge is reduced as far as practicable to be at or below the modelled peak flow and volume for each site in an undeveloped state <u>pre-developed state</u> .

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Support	Stride supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Support	Investore supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Support	THW-P5 is strongly supported. Considers hydraulic neutrality should be the baseline for all new development. Requiring this will help avoid increased risks from stormwater from new development as well as improving existing areas as they are developed. The Policy also gives effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain THW-P5 (Hydraulic Neutrality) as notified.
Michelle Rush	436.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Support	THW-P5 is supported. Hydraulic neutrality should be the baseline for all new development of any scale. As urban areas densify, it is particularly important to require hydraulic neutrality to avoid increased stormwater risks from new development, as well as improve existing areas as they are re-developed. Finally, hydraulic neutrality will help contribute to keeping areas green and pleasant to be in, without excessive tracts of hard surfaces. This policy also supports the following sections of NPS-FM 2020: - Objective 2.1 (the Te Mana o Te Wai hierarchy) - Policy 3 - Policy 4 - Clause 3.5	Retain THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-P5	Amend	Considers hydraulic neutrality should refer to the current disposition of a site.	Amend THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) to: Require new subdivision and development to be designed, constructed and maintained to sustainably manage the volume and rate of discharge of stormwater to the receiving environment so that the rate of offsite stormwater discharge is reduced as far as practicable to be at or below the modelled peak flow and volume for each site in <u>its current an undeveloped state</u> .
Trelissick Park Group	168.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R1	Support	Supports that THW-R1 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – new residential buildings) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain THW-R1 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – new residential buildings) as notified, with amendments.
Trelissick Park Group	168.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend THW-R1.2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – new residential buildings) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of THW-R1.1 for <u>Wastewater and Water supply</u> cannot be achieved. ...
Tyers Stream Group	221.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R1	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain THW-R1 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – new residential buildings) with amendment.
Tyers Stream Group	221.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to THW-R1 (Connecting to existing three waters infrastructure - new residential buildings) to include compliance with the current status of the 3 waters infrastructure to be a permitted activity as per THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R1	Support in part	Supports the rule as it permits new residential schemes, outside of the general rural and large lot residential zones, providing compliance is achieved with the level of service in Chapter 6, Tables 6.1 and 6.2 of the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services v3.0 December 2021. While it is noted that the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services includes references to the New Zealand Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice, FENZ considers it important for THW-R1 and THW-R2 to directly reference the Code of Practice to ensure firefighting water supply provisions are visible and enforceable through Three Waters Infrastructure provisions.	Support THW-R1 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – new residential buildings) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R1	Amend	Supports the rule as it permits new residential schemes, outside of the general rural and large lot residential zones, providing compliance is achieved with the level of service in Chapter 6, Tables 6.1 and 6.2 of the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services v3.0 December 2021. While it is noted that the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services includes references to the New Zealand Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice, FENZ considers it important for THW-R1 and THW-R2 to directly reference the Code of Practice to ensure firefighting water supply provisions are visible and enforceable through Three Waters Infrastructure provisions.	Amend THW-R1 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – new residential buildings) to include provision of a firefighting water supply in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008 within the permitted activity standards and matters of discretion.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R1	Oppose	Considers that what is permissible needs more current analysis (given climate change pressures) and should be more localised.	Opposes THW-R1 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure) and seeks amendment.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R1	Support	THW-R1 is supported as it operationalises the relevant objectives and policies.	Retain THW-R1 (connection to existing three waters infrastructure - new residential buildings) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R1	Amend	Considers that this rule makes the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021 a permitted activity standard. Therefore considers that the document (or specific relevant provisions) should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan to allow submissions on the provisions, rather than being incorporated as a reference document. Considers that the consultation requirements of Schedule 1, Clause 34 of the RMA have therefore not been met. Considers that incorporating material by reference creates uncertainty for developers, as these documents can be amended by other entities (specifically Wellington Water) with no particular process. Notes that while there was some consultation, few issues were resolved. Notes that a District Plan change would be required to incorporate any new variations to the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021.	Remove reference to the Regional Standard for Water Services Add minimum requirements for new connections into the District Plan as required by the Regional Standard for Water Services.
Trelissick Park Group	168.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support	Supports that THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development) as notified, with amendments.
Trelissick Park Group	168.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend THW-R2.2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of THW-R2.1 for <u>Wastewater and Water supply</u> cannot be achieved. ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Avryl Bramley	202.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Amend	Considers that the Council may not retain ownership of water.	Amend THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...
Tyers Stream Group	221.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support in part	Supports the intent of the provision but is concerned that loose wording of matters of discretion such as 'site constraints' will mean that the intent will not be achieved given the prevalence of site constraints such as steep slopes across the city.	Not specified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support in part	Supports the rule as it permits new residential schemes, outside of the general rural and large lot residential zones, providing compliance is achieved with the level of service in Chapter 6, Tables 6.1 and 6.2 of the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services v3.0 December 2021. While it is noted that the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services includes references to the New Zealand Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice, FENZ considers it important for THW-R1 and THW-R2 to directly reference the Code of Practice to ensure firefighting water supply provisions are visible and enforceable through Three Waters Infrastructure provisions.	Support THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Amend	Supports the rule as it permits new residential schemes, outside of the general rural and large lot residential zones, providing compliance is achieved with the level of service in Chapter 6, Tables 6.1 and 6.2 of the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services v3.0 December 2021. While it is noted that the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services includes references to the New Zealand Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice, FENZ considers it important for THW-R1 and THW-R2 to directly reference the Code of Practice to ensure firefighting water supply provisions are visible and enforceable through Three Waters Infrastructure provisions.	Amend THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development) to include provision of a firefighting water supply in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008 within the permitted activity standards and matters of discretion.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Oppose	Considers that what is permissible needs more current analysis (given climate change pressures) and should be more localised.	Opposes THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support	Supports the inclusion of a rule that specifically provides for the connecting of multiunit housing, retirement villages, comprehensive development or non-residential buildings to existing three waters infrastructure as a permitted activity when all standards are met, or a restricted discretionary activity when they are not.	Retain THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support	THW-R2 is supported as it operationalises the relevant objectives and policies.	Retain THW-R2 (connection to existing three waters infrastructure - four or more residential units...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.102	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support	THW-R2 is generally supported.	Retain THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure...) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Amend	Considers that this rule only permits multi-unit housing where there is three waters infrastructure capacity. Considers that demonstrating compliance with this is problematic, as Wellington Water holds infrastructure capacity information, and it can take some time for developers to receive this information from Wellington Water. Considers that this rule is contrary to the NPS-UD Policy 2, particularly regarding Council's responsibility to ensure sufficient development capacity in the short term.	Amend THW-R2 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development) to: a. It involves the construction of multi-unit housing, retirement villages, comprehensive development or a non-residential building; b. There is capacity within the relevant part of the three waters network; and c. Compliance with the following is achieved... Add minimum requirements for new connections into the District Plan as required by the Regional Standard for Water Services.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Thorndon Society Inc	487.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Oppose in part	Considers that in THW-R2.1 the construction of a non-residential building should not be permitted in a residential area if it is being built for business purposes.	Amend THW-R2.1 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. It involves the construction of multi-unit housing, retirement villages, comprehensive development or a non-residential building ;
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.86	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support	Break down housing demand figures Infrastructure capacity insufficient – limit development Construction of buildings for business purposes should not be permitted in a residential area.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.77	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
The Thorndon Society Inc	487.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Amend	Considers that in THW-R2.1 the construction of a non-residential building should not be permitted in a residential area if it is being built for business purposes.	Amend THW-R2.1 (Connection to existing three waters infrastructure – four or more residential units and non-residential development) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. It involves the construction of multi-unit housing, retirement villages, comprehensive development or a non-residential building ;
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.87	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support	Break down housing demand figures Infrastructure capacity insufficient – limit development Construction of buildings for business purposes should not be permitted in a residential area.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.78	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R2	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Tyers Stream Group	221.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R3	Support in part	Supports the intent of the provision but is concerned that loose wording of matters of discretion such as 'site constraints' will mean that the intent will not be achieved given the prevalence of site constraints such as steep slopes across the city.	Not specified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R3	Support	THW-R3 is supported as it operationalises the relevant objectives and policies.	Retain THW-R3 (copper and zinc building materials - all residential and non-residential development) as notified.
Trelissick Park Group	168.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Support	Supports that THW-R4 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain THW-R4 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity) as notified, with amendments.
Trelissick Park Group	168.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Amend	Considers that the restricted discretionary activity status of THW-R4 should be deleted. It is considered essential that all building developments, including infill housing, mandate at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Delete THW-R4.2 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity) in its entirety.
Tyers Stream Group	221.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Support in part	Supports the intent of the provision but is concerned that loose wording of matters of discretion such as 'site constraints' will mean that the intent will not be achieved given the prevalence of site constraints such as steep slopes across the city.	Not specified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Oppose	Considers that any development of 4 or more units, or any non-residential building, will require resource consent under this rule as a restricted discretionary activity. The rule implements Policy THW-P1 (Water sensitive urban design) but is uncertain. There is no certainty as to what the rule, and underlying policy, are seeking to achieve. The rule references the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services and associated design guidelines.	Remove THW-R4 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity) in its entirety or amend the rule to exclude the City Centre Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stratum Management Limited	249.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Amend	Considers that any development of 4 or more units, or any non-residential building, will require resource consent under this rule as a restricted discretionary activity. The rule implements Policy THW-P1 (Water sensitive urban design) but is uncertain. There is no certainty as to what the rule, and underlying policy, are seeking to achieve. The rule references the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services and associated design guidelines.	Remove THW-R4 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity) in its entirety or amend the rule to exclude the City Centre Zone.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Oppose	Considers that the intent of THW-R4 can be managed through a permitted activity standard or controlled activity status instead of requiring a restricted discretionary resource consent.	Opposes the Restricted Discretionary activity status for rule THW-R4 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity).
Phillippa O'Connor	289.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Amend	Considers that the intent of THW-R4 can be managed through a permitted activity standard or controlled activity status instead of requiring a restricted discretionary resource consent.	Seeks that the activity status for THW-R4 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity) is changed to permitted activity rule or controlled activity.
The Sustainability Society	339.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Amend	Considers that design guidelines should address complexities with rainwater capture and storage and any required on-lot measures to prevent ongoing ecological impacts. Design Guidelines referenced in the Three Waters chapter for inner city development do not appropriately reflect the importance of design for realistic and robust stormwater management.	Seeks that Design Guidelines referenced in the 'Three Waters chapter' address complexities with rainwater capture and storage and any required on-lot measures to prevent ongoing ecological impacts.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Oppose	Considers that the incorporation of water sensitive design methods in retirement villages the rule should not require new development to remedy existing issues (see submission on THW-P1). Considers that such methods should only be used to address the effects of the development and where they are the best practicable option. Notes that THW-R4 is only applicable to activities with 'four or more residential units and non-residential activity', with no equivalent rule provided / applicable to those activities that do not fall into this category.	Delete THW-R4 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity) in its entirety as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.87	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Amend	Considers that the PDP should provide for approved alternative wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Septic tanks are excluded from this recommendation due to their known issues with leakage of untreated wastewater and nitrates, particularly when poorly maintained.	Seeks to include direction in the Three Waters chapter to provide for decentralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using alternative wastewater systems (but not septic tanks, due to their existing issues with contamination and leaching) anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. where connections are available and there is network capacity, a connection to the wastewater network would still be required.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.60	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission.	Allow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.60	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission.	Allow
Woolworths New Zealand	359.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Oppose	THW-R4 is opposed on the grounds that requiring restricted discretionary consent under rule THW-R4 for all non-residential developments introduces additional consenting requirements which could otherwise be dealt with via the introduction of a permitted activity standard, or a controlled activity consent framework. It is considered that this requirement could be more appropriately addressed by way of a permitted activity standard or controlled activity consent (noting that applications under THW-R4.1 are proposed to be considered without limited and public notification). It is considered that the intent of this rule could be incorporated into the provisions of THW-R6. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Delete THW-R4 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity) in its entirety.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Support	Stride supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	FS108.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Support	Investore supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Support	THW-R4 is supported as it operationalises the relevant objectives and policies.	Retain THW-R4 (incorporation of water sensitive urban design methods...) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R4	Amend	Considers that the requirement to incorporate water sensitive design is not necessary for developments of up to three dwellings. Considers that the rule as currently stated makes all multi-unit developments an RD activity to enable Council to require water sensitive design on all multi-unit developments. Considers that the rule requiring use of the Guideline is unsuitable because it is aimed at greenfield subdivisions rather than infill multi-unit development.	Amend the matters of discretion for THW-R4 (Incorporation of water sensitive design methods – four or more residential units and non-residential activity) to: Matters of discretion are: 1. The relevant sections of the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services, v2.0, – December 2021 and Wellington Water Limited's Water Sensitive Design for Stormwater: Treatment Device Design Guideline December 2019; 2. Design, location, efficiency and effectiveness of water sensitive design methods; 3. Adoption of best practicable option for stormwater retention and treatment; 4. Ownership, maintenance and operation arrangements; and 5. Any site constraints
Rod Halliday	25.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Amend	Considers that THW-P5 does not recognise that there are some parts of the City that drain to the Stebbings Dam and Seton Nossiter Detention Structures which are intended to hold back/throttle flows from a modelled 100 year event. In Stebbings Valley this has been modelled as the RL92 and there are easements over private property to protect this ponding area and keep it free of buildings for the 100 year event. The GWRC designation W4 (Operative Plan) and WRC6 (Proposed Plan) also reflect this purpose for Stebbings and similar designations are in place in the operative (W2) and proposed plans (WRC2) for Seton Nossiter. Previous developments in these catchments, including Churton Park subdivisions over the last 5+ years, have had no requirement for stormwater neutrality.	Seeks that THW-R5 (Hydraulic neutrality - 1-3 residential units) is amended to note or include an exemption that when 1-3 units are proposed in areas of the City situated within the catchments of the Stebbings and Seton Nossiter Detention structures, then THW-R5 will not apply.
Heidi Snelson	FS24.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Oppose	Submitter is seeking to reduce mitigation requirements and responsibilities around hydraulic neutrality and permeable surface requirements in the case of storm water management at a unprecedented time of storm water damage in Wellington. Developments should undertake more mitigation not less in all areas given climate change. Especially those posing more risk, such as steep hillsides, abutting/above key infrastructure (roading, power, water, railway), and significant streams, such as at the sites of the current and planned developments in Churton Park and Glenside West. The Glenside West development area is downstream of both detention structures, on extremely steep hillsides, above Porirua Stream, directly above Middleton Road (State Highway 1 motorway detour route) and the North Island railway line (which runs alongside and over the Porirua Stream). This development area must be specifically required to achieve Hydraulic Neutrality. Be that through specific technological infrastructure in build design and water catchment, significant permeable surface requirements/planting. Through Large Lot Residential Only in Glenside West.	Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed to ensure strict adherence to hydraulic neutrality in Glenside West Development Area, and Stebbings Valley / Reedy Block Development Area. Seeks minimum standard of hydraulic neutrality required and corresponding requirement of high level of permeable surface mitigations. Seeks that Glenside West be designated Large Lot Residential only.
Trelissick Park Group	168.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Support	Supports that THW-R5 (Hydraulic neutrality – 1-3 residential units) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain THW-R5 (Hydraulic neutrality – 1-3 residential units) as notified, with amendments below.
Trelissick Park Group	168.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Amend	Considers that the restricted discretionary activity status of THW-R5 should be deleted. It is considered essential that all building developments, including infill housing, mandate at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Delete THW-R5.2 (Hydraulic neutrality – 1-3 residential units) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Youth Council	201.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Support	Supports hydraulic neutrality as a consideration in developments and thinks that this should inform a future-proof water management approach.	Retain THW-R5 (Hydraulic Neutrality for 1 - 3 residential units) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Support in part	Supports the intent of the provision but is concerned that loose wording of matters of discretion such as 'site constraints' will mean that the intent will not be achieved given the prevalence of site constraints such as steep slopes across the city.	Not specified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Amend	Considers that it is unclear whether these standards apply to both the short-term site development and the subsequent long-term effects of that development. Considers that both matters need to be addressed if there is to be significant suburban intensification.	Seeks that the rule be clarified that it applies on an ongoing basis.
Stratum Management Limited	249.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Oppose	Considers that this rule requires that a "Wellington Water Limited approved solution" is implemented to achieve hydraulic neutrality for 1-3 units. A Wellington Water approved solution is open to ongoing change, therefore creating uncertainty.	Remove THW-R5 (Hydraulic neutrality - 1-3 units) in its entirety or re-draft the rule to provide appropriate certainty, including limiting the requirement to apply only where existing infrastructure is under-capacity.
Stratum Management Limited	249.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Amend	Considers that this rule requires that a "Wellington Water Limited approved solution" is implemented to achieve hydraulic neutrality for 1-3 units. A Wellington Water approved solution is open to ongoing change, therefore creating uncertainty.	Remove THW-R5 (Hydraulic neutrality - 1-3 units) in its entirety or re-draft the rule to provide appropriate certainty, including limiting the requirement to apply only where existing infrastructure is under-capacity.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Support	THW-R5 is supported as it operationalises the relevant objectives and policies.	Retain THW-R5 (Hydraulic neutrality...) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R5	Amend	Considers that a Permitted activity status should not be limited to two pre-approved detention systems, and that there are other solutions available that should be permitted.	Amend THW-R5 (Hydraulic neutrality – 1-3 residential units) to: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. It involves the construction of 1-3 residential units; and b. A Wellington Water Limited approved solution for managing volume and rate of stormwater runoff is installed as part of the development; or <u>c. Stormwater management measures are incorporated which achieve post development peak stormwater flows and volumes which are the same or less than the modelled peak flows and volumes for the site in its current state.</u>
Rod Halliday	25.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Amend	Considers that THW-P5 does not recognise that there are some parts of the City that drain to the Stebbings Dam and Seton Nossiter Detention Structures which are intended to hold back/throttle flows from a modelled 100 year event. In Stebbings Valley this has been modelled as the RL92 and there are easements over private property to protect this ponding area and keep it free of buildings for the 100 year event. The GWRC designation W4 (Operative Plan) and WRC6 (Proposed Plan) also reflect this purpose for Stebbings and similar designations are in place in the operative (W2) and proposed plans (WRC2) for Seton Nossiter. Previous developments in these catchments, including Churton Park subdivisions over the last 5+ years, have had no requirement for stormwater neutrality.	Seeks that THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality - four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) is amended to note or include an exemption that when three or more units are proposed in areas of the City situated within the natural catchments of the Stebbings and Seton Nossiter Detention structures, then THW-R6 will not apply.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Oppose	<p>Submitter states that Rule R5 requiring hydrological neutrality for any new housing development should not apply to the Upper Stebbings Valley or Seton Nossiter catchments because both these catchments are protected by detention dams. Submitter argues that previous developments in these catchments, including Churton Park subdivisions over the last 5+ years, have had no requirement for stormwater neutrality - however climate change is accelerating and what was required in the past must change to reduce future negative flood impacts.</p> <p>Serious flooding has occurred in the past from these catchments including some events after the detention dams were constructed. Stebbings detention dam was completed in 1994 and is designed to hold back water arising from a one on one-hundred-year flood event, a target that is now unlikely to be met due to the accelerating effects of climate change.</p> <p>Furthermore, Glenside West catchment is not in the Stebbings Dam or Seton Nossiter catchment and there is no downstream floodwater protection therefore Council should be taking additional measure to reduce the impact of earthworks and housing development on the Glenside West water catchment.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledgement by Council that the Government's Policy Statement on Urban Development does not apply to areas such as Glenside West. - That any development in Glenside West takes place with a minimum of earthworks and that natural gullies are not filled in. - That the grey unbuilt area in Glenside West is unsuitable land for housing and that the whole area shown in mustard/yellow (Fig 1) is limited to Large Lot Residential. - Roading and housing doesn't extend into gullies, ephemeral streams, intermittent and perennial streams and is kept away from the ridgetop. - Furthermore no housing is built above the current Glenside-Churton park suburb boundary in order that the ridgeline is offered at least some degree of visual protection. - Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) on this site must be preserved and not impacted by development, if any development is to take place
Heidi Snelson	FS24.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Oppose	<p>Submitter is seeking to reduce mitigation requirements and responsibilities around hydraulic neutrality and permeable surface requirements in the case of storm water management at a unprecedented time of storm water damage in Wellington.</p> <p>Developments should undertake more mitigation not less in all areas given climate change. Especially those posing more risk, such as steep hillsides, abutting/above key infrastructure (roading, power, water, railway), and significant streams, such as at the sites of the current and planned developments in Churton Park and Glenside West.</p> <p>The Glenside West development area is downstream of both detention structures, on extremely steep hillsides, above Porirua Stream, directly above Middleton Road (State Highway 1 motorway detour route) and the North Island railway line (which runs alongside and over the Porirua Stream). This development area must be specifically required to achieve Hydraulic Neutrality. Be that through specific technological infrastructure in build design and water catchment, significant permeable surface requirements/planting. Through Large Lot Residential Only in Glenside West.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed to ensure strict adherence to hydraulic neutrality in Glenside West Development Area, and Stebbings Valley / Reedy Block Development Area. Seeks minimum standard of hydraulic neutrality required and corresponding requirement of high level of permeable surface mitigations.</p> <p>Seeks that Glenside West be designated Large Lot Residential only.</p>
Trelissick Park Group	168.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Support	Supports that THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality – four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality – four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) as notified, with amendments below.
Trelissick Park Group	168.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Amend	Considers that the restricted discretionary activity status of THW-R6 should be deleted. It is considered essential that all building developments, including infill housing, mandate at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Amend THW-R6.2 (Hydraulic neutrality – four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) in its entirety.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Support	Supports hydraulic neutrality as a consideration in developments and thinks that this should inform a future-proof water management approach.	Retain THW-R6 (Hydraulic Neutrality for 4+ residential units) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Amend	<p>Considers that it is unclear whether these standards apply to both the short-term site development and the subsequent long-term effects of that development.</p> <p>Considers that both matters need to be addressed if there is to be significant suburban intensification.</p>	Seeks that the rule be clarified that it applies on an ongoing basis.
Stratum Management Limited	249.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Oppose	Considers that the rule requires developments of 4 or more units to incorporate stormwater management measures that achieve post development peak stormwater flows and volumes that are the same or less then the modelled peak flows and volumes for the site in an undeveloped state. The rule relates to policy THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) outlined above.	Remove THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality - 4+ units) in its entirety or amend the rule to exclude the City Centre Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stratum Management Limited	249.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Amend	Considers that the rule requires developments of 4 or more units to incorporate stormwater management measures that achieve post development peak stormwater flows and volumes that are the same or less than the modelled peak flows and volumes for the site in an undeveloped state. The rule relates to policy THW-P5 (Hydraulic neutrality) outlined above.	Remove THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality - 4+ units) in its entirety or amend the rule to exclude the City Centre Zone.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Amend	Considers that 'undeveloped state' is too onerous and considers that the 'pre-developed' state more appropriate of a level of hydraulic neutrality to achieve.	Amend THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality – four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. It involves the construction of multi-unit housing, retirement villages, comprehensive development or a non-residential building; and b. Stormwater management measures are incorporated which achieve post development peak stormwater flows and volumes which are the same or less than the modelled peak flows and volumes for the site in an undeveloped state , <u>pre-developed state</u> . Note: Guidance for calculating peak stormwater flows and volumes is contained in the Wellington Water Quick Reference Guide for Design Storm Hydrology; Standardised Parameters for Hydrological Modelling, April 2019. Guidance on which storm events are to be managed is contained in Chapter 4 of the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services v3.0 December 2021.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Support	Supports notification preclusions for THW-R6.2	Retain the notification preclusions for rule THW-R6.2 (Hydraulic neutrality – four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Support	Supports the inclusion of a rule that specifically provides for hydraulic neutrality in association with the construction of multi-unit housing, retirement villages, comprehensive development and non-residential buildings as a permitted activity, and restricted discretionary where standards are not met.	Retain THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality – four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of the preclusion of notification of applications made in respect of rule THW-R6.2.	Retain THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality – four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) with amendment.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Support	Stride supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Support	Investore supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow

Energy, Infrastructure and Transport - Infrastructure

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Amend	Considers that THW-R6 should be amended to replace 'undeveloped state' with 'pre-developed state' as this the former is overly onerous. The proposed reference within the hydraulic neutrality requirements (THW-R6) to demonstrate that stormwater flows are the same or less than the site in an "undeveloped state" is too onerous and instead the threshold should instead be compared against a pre-developed state. This amendment ensures consistency in the baseline that is applied between the permitted activity standard and the restricted discretionary activity.	Amend THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality – four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. It involves the construction of multi-unit housing, retirement villages, comprehensive development or a non-residential building; and b. Stormwater management measures are incorporated which achieve post development peak stormwater flows and volumes which are the same or less than the modelled peak flows and volumes for the site in an undeveloped state <u>pre-developed state</u> .
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Support	Stride supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Support	Investore supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Three Waters / THW-R6	Amend	Considers hydraulic neutrality should refer to the current disposition of a site.	Amend THW-R6 (Hydraulic neutrality – four or more residential units and non-residential buildings) to: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. It involves the construction of multi-unit housing, retirement villages, comprehensive development or a non-residential building; and b. Stormwater management measures are incorporated which achieve post development peak stormwater flows and volumes which are the same or less than the modelled peak flows and volumes for the site in <u>its current</u> an undeveloped state
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	The introduction to the INF chapter is supported. It provides clarity on how the infrastructure rules engage with the rest of the District Plan. No infrastructure specific rules should be included in the zone, earthworks or overlay chapters.	Retain introduction to INF chapter as notified.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	100.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Considers that in advance of any activity occurring within the new 'Air Traffic Control Overlay' for ACNZ3 and ACNZ4, Airways needs the opportunity to adjust its technology if required, to prevent planes being displaced.	Seeks that the planning maps are updated to show a new 'Air Traffic Control Information Overlay' for ACNZ3 and ACNZ4 which would require plan users to consult with Airways before undertaking an activity within the overlay.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.54	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of overlays that ensure that Airways air traffic control overlays are protected, thus ensuring the ongoing safety of aircraft on approach to and departure from Wellington International Airport.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.44	Part 2 / Energy / Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed 'air traffic control information' overlay as the overlay has the potential to constrain urban development and result in delays to development as a result of the require consultation.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	100.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Considers that in advance of any activity occurring within the new 'Air Traffic Control Overlay' for ACNZ3 and ACNZ4, Airways needs the opportunity to adjust its technology if required, to prevent planes being displaced.	If the new 'Air Traffic Control Information Overlay' for ACNZ3 and ACNZ4 does not require plan users to consult with Airways, alternatively: Seeks that the planning maps are updated to allow for a new 'Air Traffic Control Overlay' with associated changes to the plan provisions to include specific restrictions and/or consultation requirements for development and infrastructure within the overlay.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.45	Part 2 / Energy / Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed 'air traffic control' overlay as the overlay has the potential to constrain urban development and result in delays to development as a result of the require consultation.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	127.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Supports the introduction to the INF chapter is generally as it appropriately sets out the context for the INF Chapter.	Retain the introduction to the INF Chapter as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Considers that statement in the introduction that rules in the zone, earthworks and overlay chapters do not apply unless specifically stated within an infrastructure rule or standard provides clarity on how the infrastructure rules engage with the rest of the District Plan.	Retain the specific introductory statement and associated mechanism in the INF chapter for how the rules in the infrastructure chapter work. No infrastructure specific rules should be included in the zone, earthworks or overlay chapters.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support in part	Considers that the text in the introduction does not clarify that the objectives, policy and rules for renewable electricity generation activities (which are defined as a form of infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure) are contained in Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation. Plan navigation would be improved if this were clarified.	Retain the Introduction of the Infrastructure chapter with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Considers that the text in the introduction does not clarify that the objectives, policy and rules for renewable electricity generation activities (which are defined as a form of infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure) are contained in Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation. Plan navigation would be improved if this were clarified.	Amend the Introduction of the Infrastructure chapter by inserting the following (or similar) clarification note: <u>The objectives, policies and rules applicable to renewable electricity generation activities are contained in Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation. The provisions of Chapter INF Infrastructure do not apply to renewable electricity generation activities.</u>
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Considers that plan wide policy recognition of the benefits of quarry activities and the functional constraints associated with such activities is needed and suggests that the most logical place for some form of plan wide recognition of quarrying activities would be within the Infrastructure Chapter.	Seeks a plan wide policy recognition of the benefits of quarry activities and the functional constraints associated with such activities.
Tawa Community Board	294.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Not specified	Considers that developments should have sufficient infrastructure available to them; however, insufficient infrastructure shouldn't be an excuse to not enable development. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council prioritises infrastructure development in Tawa.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	The submitter queries the number of Infrastructure sub chapters, policies (62) and rules relating to Infrastructure and specifically the National Grid. Considers the myriad of provisions is confusing and creates the potential for contradiction between provisions. There are no National Grid specific policies within the Infrastructure sub-chapter. However, there are 18 policies within other sub chapters specific to managing the effects of the National Grid. Considers there are no National Grid specific policies in the plan that specifically recognise the benefits of the National Grid or management of the effects of subdivision, land use and development. Considers policies within other subchapters only relate to managing the effects of the National Grid. Considers that lack of recognition within the general infrastructure chapter does not give effect to the NPS-ET, and that given the national significance of the National Grid Transpower seeks a separate set of provisions within the infrastructure section. Considers that standalone policies are necessary separate to the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor, noting the Gas Corridor does not have higher order policy support of an NPS. Considers that multiple overlay provisions could be combined. Considers that the inclusion of rules relating to operation, maintenance and upgrade of existing assets is confusing and in some instances inconsistent with the NESETA [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks a separate suite of National Grid provisions (policies and rules) within a separate Infrastructure sub-chapter. [Refer to original submission, including Appendix F, for suggested provisions and further detail]. Alternatively, should this approach not be adopted, seeks the amendments as outlined in other submission points: - Seeks that in order to give effect to the NPSET, a separate policy framework be provided within the Infrastructure chapter for the National Grid which recognises and provides for the benefits of the National Grid, manages the effects of the development of National Grid, and the effects of other activities on the National Grid); - Policies relating to the National Grid are amended to give effect to the NPS-ET. - The National Grid be separated from the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor; - The number of National Grid specific policies and rules be condensed and reduced; and - Rules relating to existing National Grid assets be removed and instead the NES-ETA be relied on (as is the intent of the NES-ETA).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Not specified	Firstgas supports the intent of this submission which is seeking standalone policies in relation to the National Grid so that they are separate from those relating to the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor. While Firstgas don't oppose the intent of this submission, Firstgas consider that it is more appropriate for the infrastructure provisions to remain within one section, as the provisions are protecting both nationally and regionally significant infrastructure.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Largely supports the introduction to the INF chapter on the basis it articulates the importance of infrastructure and makes specific reference to the NPSET. In particular the submitter supports the clarity provided in the introduction as to the relationship of the Infrastructure chapter provisions to other chapters in the PDP.	Retain the introductory text to the Infrastructure (INF) chapter as notified.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that urban infrastructure take into account the needs of all age groups and abilities.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose in part	Considers the chapter appears to give the same policy support for infrastructure as it does for regionally significant infrastructure. Infrastructure is potentially much broader than RSI. F&B seeks that the scope of this chapter is clarified. The objectives, policies and rules of this chapter (including sub-chapters) should be as protective as possible, while still meeting the requirements of national direction. The need to protect biodiversity, natural character and natural landscapes remains, even where there is national direction in place	Clarify the scope of the Infrastructure chapter. Amend the direction of the Infrastructure chapter to be as protective of biodiversity, natural character, and natural landscapes as possible, while still meeting the requirements of national direction
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.23	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	WELL do not support this submission point as it seeks to change or significantly diminish the direction of the Infrastructure Chapter to that of biodiversity protection. WELL seek that the direction and integrity of the infrastructure section of the PDP is retained so as to preserve the balance of the planning document.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.17	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	Notwithstanding the scope of the infrastructure chapter, Transpower opposes any amendments to the chapter that are inconsistent within or do not give effect to the national direction within the NPSET.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.50	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	WIAL opposes the relief sought by the submitter, for reasons including (but not limited to): 1. It is appropriate for a different planning framework to apply for regionally significant infrastructure in recognition of the social, cultural and economic benefits it provides for the community and the operational and locational constraints of that infrastructure. 2. It is inappropriate to protect the aspects identified to the extent "possible". Almost anything is "possible", therefore using such language could result in the complete curtailment of regionally significant infrastructure, on the grounds it is "possible" to protect the aspects identified.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.24	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Meridian agrees there is merit in clarifying the scope of the chapter and its relationship to other chapters.	Allow / Seeks that the request is allowed to the extent that it is consistent with Meridian's own submission points on this chapter.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose in part	Considers the objectives are inadequate to provide for protection of indigenous biodiversity, natural character and landscapes, which are dealt with in later INF sub-chapters.	Amend the objectives of INF - Infrastructure to clarify that the objectives of relevant chapters, including Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Character, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Coastal Environment apply to all Infrastructure provisions. OR Add a comprehensive set of objectives to be included into the Infrastructure chapter to provide for these matters, mirroring the objectives of the aforementioned chapters.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.18	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	Notwithstanding the scope of the infrastructure chapter, Transpower opposes any amendments to the chapter that are inconsistent within or do not give effect to the national direction within the NPSET.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.51	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	WIAL opposes the relief sought by the submitter, for reasons including (but not limited to): 1. It is appropriate for a different planning framework to apply for regionally significant infrastructure in recognition of the social, cultural and economic benefits it provides for the community and the operational and locational constraints of that infrastructure. 2. It is inappropriate to protect the aspects identified to the extent "possible". Almost anything is "possible", therefore using such language could result in the complete curtailment of regionally significant infrastructure, on the grounds it is "possible" to protect the aspects identified.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.25	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Meridian agrees there is merit in clarifying the scope of the chapter and its relationship to other chapters. Meridian does not consider it is necessary to replicate the provisions of the other chapters within the Infrastructure chapter.	Allow / Seeks that the request is allowed to the extent that it is consistent with Meridian's own submission points on this chapter. Seeks that part of submission be disallowed to reject the request alternative relief (objectives mirroring objectives of other chapters).
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Considers that the provision of adequate infrastructure to support any increased residential development needs to be planned and funded to ensure that Wellington can continue to grow and prosper. It is therefore important that the District Plan supports a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure planning and a sequencing of development to align with the ongoing infrastructure supply. Wellingtonians' relationship with the land predetermines their relationship with water.	Seeks that provisions be made in the District Plan to provide adequate infrastructure planning and development. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.27	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	WELL support this submission point in principle as it aligns with WELL's submission that infrastructure capacity needs to be planned for in advance of development occurring.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.71	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	Opposes INF-Table 5: Minimum Sight Distances at Vehicle Crossings. The submitter seeks longer sight distances, especially for the higher speeds, in alignment with New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 5B – Accessway standards and guidelines, Table App5B/1. See Appendix B.	Amend to standards in alignment with New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 5B Accessway standards and guidelines, Section 5B/1 Sight distances. [see Appendix B of the original submission]
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Supports the infrastructure chapter in general, specifically the recognition of the critical role of this infrastructure, including that necessary for the effective, secure, and efficient transmission or distribution of fuel and the intent of the corresponding provisions which are generally enabling of infrastructure activities. Supports the zone and earthworks chapters not applying to infrastructure, unless specifically stated.	Retain the Infrastructure chapter as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support in part	Considers that the provision for waste facilities must be considered as an essential part of the services needed for a society to function. This chapter seeks to provide for the operation, maintenance and development of infrastructure within the City. Some amendments will be required to the wording of the objectives, policies and rules to ensure that waste facilities are suitably provided for.	Not specified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Considers that the provision for waste facilities must be considered as an essential part of the services needed for a society to function. This chapter seeks to provide for the operation, maintenance and development of infrastructure within the City. Some amendments will be required to the wording of the objectives, policies and rules to ensure that waste facilities are suitably provided for.	Seeks that the Infrastructure chapter be amended so that the wording of the objectives, policies and rules ensure that waste facilities are suitably provided for.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support in part	Generally supportive of management of three waters infrastructure and renewable energy [suggestions made later in submission and summarised below].	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' to include Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.118	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Greater Wellington support the inclusion and protection of SASM.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.103	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose in part	The submitter does not believe that public or limited notification is necessary.	Opposes in part and requests amendment so that all Rules in the Infrastructure chapter are to include a notification preclusion statement for activities under Restricted Discretionary
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	The provision of notification statements will assist with the application of the PDP. Given the specific technical and safety nature of the effects on the National Grid and the national significance of the National Grid, Transpower opposes the deletion of any notification clauses.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.52	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	WIAL supports the proposed notification clause for restricted discretionary activities. Special circumstances will still apply, notwithstanding this statement.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.17	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	Considers it necessary to be notified of infrastructure activities adjacent to the rail corridor to ensure KiwiRail has the opportunity to be included in the planning assessment process. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.26	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	Considers that the notification and preclusion required in the notified District Plan must be retained to give it teeth and make it effective.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.104	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Considers that all rules in the Infrastructure chapter should have a notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities. The technical nature of these breaches requires technical and/or engineering assessments, and public participation by way of limited or public notification will unlikely add anything to the consideration of the effects of these breaches.	Amend all Rules in the Infrastructure chapter to include a notification preclusion statement for activities under Restricted Discretionary as follows: <u>Notification:</u> <u>Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A or section 95B of the RMA.</u>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	WELL support this submission point as it appropriately seeks to have RDA non-notified. The submitted appropriately acknowledges that non-compliance is usually of a technical or operational nature, to which public or limited notification will have little to no ability in resolving.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	The provision of notification statements will assist with the application of the PDP. Given the specific technical and safety nature of the effects on the National Grid, the national significance of the National Grid, and that publicly notified applications have to be served on Transpower under clause 10 of the Resource Management Regulations 2003, Transpower opposes the deletion of any notification clauses.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.53	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	WIAL supports the proposed notification clause for restricted discretionary activities. Special circumstances will still apply, notwithstanding this statement.	Allow
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.27	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	Considers that the notification and preclusion required in the notified District Plan must be retained to give it teeth and make it effective.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.105	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose in part	Table 1 - 6 in the Infrastructure chapter are opposed. Transport related provisions are divided between the transport and infrastructure chapters. This is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Delete Table 1 - 6 from the Infrastructure chapter and move them to the Transport chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.18	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into different chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend / If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.106	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose in part	Figure 1 - 4 in the Infrastructure chapter are opposed. Transport related provisions are divided between the transport and infrastructure chapters. This is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Delete Figure 1 - 4 from the Infrastructure chapter and move them to the Transport chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.19	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into different chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend / If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.
CentrePort Limited	402.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.55	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	WIAL shares the concerns of CentrePort Limited, that there is a lot of duplication in the Proposed Plan, particularly as it relates to the natural hazard provisions that apply to (regionally significant) infrastructure.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.56	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	WIAL shares the concerns of CentrePort Limited, that there is a lot of duplication in the Proposed Plan, particularly as it relates to the natural hazard provisions that apply to (regionally significant) infrastructure.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.82	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Not specified	As noted in the Introduction, airports and airport related activities are captured by the RMA definition of "infrastructure". As such activities are generally provided for within the Airport Zone, there is potential for airport and airport related activities to be inadvertently captured by the provisions within this chapter, creating an inappropriate duplication of control. While submitter supports the general intent of the exemption described in the text of the Introduction, the exemption should only apply to airport and airport related activities (i.e. the methods in the Airport Zone. It remains appropriate for the Infrastructure chapter and associated provisions to otherwise apply to submitters activities that may occur outside of the Airport Zone or infrastructure that is not provided for by the Airport Zone provisions. It is also not clear whether the introductory text to this chapter also applies to the infrastructure specific overlay sub-chapters. For clarity, further amendments are proposed to the introductory text to ensure that the same exemption for Airport and Airport Related Activities applies to the sub-chapters.	Amend introduction to Infrastructure chapter as follows: ... Further, the Resource Management Act, and therefore the District Plan, share the same broad definition of 'infrastructure', which includes airport and port facilities. <u>Notwithstanding that, this the rules within the Infrastructure Chapter (including the infrastructure specific overlay sub-chapters) does not apply to activities that fall under the definition of airport-activities-purposes or airport related activities located within the Airport Zone (which are dealt with in the Airport Zone chapter), or the definition of port or operational port activities (which are dealt with in the Port Zone chapter). Any infrastructure in the airport or port areas that is inconsistent with those definitions is managed by the provisions in this Infrastructure Chapter.</u> ...
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.57	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.83	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose in part	[See original submission paragraphs 4.111 to 4.113 for full reason]	Opposes the 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' table in the Infrastructure Chapter introduction and seeks amendment.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.84	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose in part	[See original submission paragraphs 4.111 to 4.113 for full reason]	Amend Other relevant District Plan provisions table in the Infrastructure introduction as follows: Other relevant District Plan provisions ... • Designations – The Designation Chapter lists designations throughout the district and describes the purpose and conditions of any designation and will help determine if approval is required from the Requiring Authority under section 176 of the RMA. ...
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.85	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Notes that Wellington Airport has been excluded from the Infrastructure Chapter of the Proposed Plan. This exclusion is to ensure that the consent requirements within the Infrastructure Chapter do not inadvertently capture airport purpose or airport related activities within the Airport Zone Considers that the Airport still comprises “infrastructure” for the purposes of the section 2 of the Act and is a network utility under section 166 of the RMA. Furthermore, WIAL undertakes airport and airport related, albeit beyond the Airport Zone. Therefore, considers that the objectives and policies of the Infrastructure Chapter should apply to the Airport Chapter.	Seeks that the objectives and policies of the Infrastructure chapter apply to Airport and Airport Related Activities within the Airport Zone. Notes that it is only the methods of the Infrastructure Chapter that should not apply to the Airport and Airport related activities within the Airport Zone.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Not specified	Considers that many public spaces are cluttered by poles, signs, café tables, bike parking infrastructure and so on. It is vital that the DP ensures an adequate uncluttered width of footpath, rather than treating an unusable part of the footpath as contributing to provision.	Seeks that new infrastructure should not be located in footpath space.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.26	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	WELL do not agree with this submission point. Although not stated, the submission infers that no new infrastructure is to be placed within 'footpath space'. When possible this is undertaken by WELL as part of the design consideration; however, this is not possible in all circumstances.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	Considers that the minimum width of footpath on any road should be 2 x 1.8m and not 1.5m. Wider pedestrian spaces have major positive benefits. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Amend Table 1 - INF: Design of Roads - One Network Framework so that the minimum width of the footpath is 2 x 1.8m. If this cannot be achieved, the road should be a controlled or discretionary activity.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that vehicle accessories should be located on the road and not on the footpath.
Firstgas Limited	304.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	Considers that a new Rule should be added to the Infrastructure chapter. The NZ/AS2885 framework and international advice is considered, in respect of the New Zealand context. The separation distances sought, being a separation distance of 20m for living accommodation/residential activities from the pipeline and 30m from the above ground related infrastructure. This will provide a reasonably practicable solution to achieving the safe operation of the network and mitigation of risk for the wellbeing and health and safety of people and communities.	<p>Add a new rule to the Infrastructure chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>Residential activities, including the erection of buildings for residential activities, within 20m of the Gas Transmission Pipeline and/or within 30m of the above ground related infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. The extent to which the proposed activities are likely to compromise the stability and integrity of the gas transmission pipeline and/or above ground related infrastructure and the operation, maintenance and upgrading of the pipeline;</u> <u>2. The risk of hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage;</u> <u>3. Measures proposed to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects on the gas transmission pipeline and/or above ground related infrastructure;</u> <u>4. The outcome of any consultation with the owner and operator of the gas transmission pipeline;</u> <p><u>and</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>5. Whether the sensitive activity could be located a greater distance from the gas transmission pipeline and/or above ground related infrastructure.</u> <p><u>Notification status:</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule INF-R** is precluded from being publicly notified. Notice of any application for resource consent under this rule must be served on the owner and operator of the Gas Transmission Pipeline in accordance with Clause 10(2)(i) of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedures) Regulations 2003.</u></p> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <p><u>This rule also applies to the establishment of a residential activity in an existing building, or any change of land use to a residential activity. If a resource consent application is made under this rule, the owner and operator of the Gas Transmission Pipeline will be considered an affected person in accordance with section 95E of the Act and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided.</u></p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.62	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the changes sought. It is unclear where the spatial application of this rule will apply and as such a cost benefit analysis cannot be undertaken. Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the rule.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	Generally supports INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure). However, seeks that INF-P1 be amended to make reference to the benefits being “provided for” in addition to being “recognised” so that the Policy also reflects the wording in Policy 1 of the NPS-ET, and reflects INF-O1. Given the NPS-ET is specific to the National Grid, the submitter would prefer the provision of a new ‘benefits’ policy (as well as other policies) specific to the National Grid as opposed to amendment to INF-P1. (Option A)	<p>Add a new 'National Grid specific policy as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P1 Benefits of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>Recognise and provide for the benefits of the National Grid by enabling the operation, maintenance and upgrade of the existing National Grid and the establishment of new electricity transmission resources.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	Considers that given the national significance of the National Grid as recognised in the NPS-ET, the submitter seeks a general policy to give effect to the NPS-ET.	<p>Add a new National Grid specific policy as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P3 Maintenance, operation, upgrading and development of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>Enable the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid, recognising its operational, functional and technical constraints, the complexity of the interconnectedness of networks, and its role in servicing existing and planned development.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	<p>Considers that in order to give effects to the NPS-ET, the submitter seeks specific National Grid provisions. Supports in principle INF-P6, however considers it does not reflect or give effect to the NPS-ET and is not specific to the National Grid. Considers it also does not provide a 'seek to avoid' approach for the more sensitive environments and the policy framework in the INF sub chapters for new development of the National Grid within such environments also does not give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy approach within Policy 8 of the NPS-ET. Considers the provision of a National Grid specific policy provides a comprehensive policy approach that gives effect to the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Considers the development of the National Grid must be managed to ensure the potential for adverse effects is appropriately managed while recognising the significance of the National Grid and the constraints under which it operates. The NPS-ET requires the District Plan to include objectives and policies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow for the consideration of the technical constraints and operational requirements under which the National Grid operates, for example the linear nature of the transmission lines. - Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated through the route, site and method selection. - Ensure new planning and development seeks to avoid adverse effects on more sensitive areas. <p>Policies, plans and decision makers must take in to account the characteristics of the National Grid, its technical and operational constraints, and the route, site and method selection process when considering the adverse effects of new National Grid infrastructure on the environment.</p> <p>On this basis, the submitter supports a new policy specific to the development of the National Grid. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Option 1: Add new National Grid specific policy as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P6 Development of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>Provide for the development of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>1. In urban zoned areas, development should minimise adverse effects on urban amenity and should avoid material adverse effects on the Commercial and Mixed-Use zones, and areas of high recreational or amenity value and existing sensitive activities.</u></p> <p><u>2. Seek to avoid the adverse effects of the National Grid within areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, and SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, outside the coastal environment.</u></p> <p><u>3. Where the National Grid has a functional need or operational need to locate within the coastal environment, manage adverse effects by:</u></p> <p><u>a. Seeking to avoid adverse effects on areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, and the Coastal Margin.</u></p> <p><u>b. Where it is not practicable to avoid adverse effects on the values of the areas in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes; and the Coastal Margin because of the functional needs or operational needs of the National Grid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on those values.</u></p> <p><u>c. Seeking to avoid significant adverse effects on:</u></p> <p><u>i. other areas of natural character</u></p> <p><u>ii. natural attributes and character of other natural features and natural landscapes</u></p> <p><u>iii. indigenous biodiversity values that meet the criteria in Policy 11(b) of the NZCPS 2010 d. Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>e. Recognising there may be some areas within SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes; and the Coastal Margin, where avoidance of adverse effects is required to protect the identified values and characteristics.</u></p> <p><u>4. Remedy or mitigate any adverse effects from the operation, maintenance, upgrade, major upgrade or development of the National Grid which cannot be avoided, to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>5. When considering the adverse effects in respect of 1-3 above;</u></p> <p><u>a. Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection; and</u></p> <p><u>b. Consider the constraints arising from the operational needs or functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	<p>Considers that in order to give effect to the NPS-ET, the submitter seeks specific National Grid provisions. Supports in principle INF-P7, however considers it does not reflect or give effect to the NPS-ET. The primary concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considers policy title "Reverse sensitivity" only relates to one aspect of Policy 10 of the NPSET and fails to give effect to the second part of this policy - Considers the policy only applies to sensitive activities, ignoring other activities which may compromise the National Grid. Policy INF-P7 does not adequately address Policies 10 and 11 of the NPS-ET - Considers Clause 2. and 3. do not apply to the National Grid. - Considers Clause 1. of the policy is limited to subdivision, ignoring that land use and other development activities (such as earthworks) can compromise the National Grid. - Considers Clause 4. is general in nature and insufficiently directive to give effect the NPS-ET. There is no reference to sensitive activities, or to ensure the National Grid is not compromised. - Considers earthworks are not referenced in the policy, noting there are specific earthworks rules. - Considers given the national significance of the National Grid and non-complying activity status where standards are not complied with, a more directive policy framework is required. As proposed, the policy does not give effect to NPS-ET policies 10 and 11. Use of the word 'manage' within INF-P7 is not sufficiently directive. <p>On this basis Transpower seeks a separate policy framework for the National Grid. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks a new a National Grid specific policy as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P4 Adverse effects on the National Grid Protect the safe and efficient operation, maintenance and repair, upgrading, removal and development of National Grid from adverse effects by:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Avoiding land uses (including sensitive activities) and buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard that may directly affect or otherwise compromise the National Grid;</u> <u>2. Avoiding reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid.</u> <u>3. Only allowing subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor where it can be demonstrated that the National Grid will not be compromised taking into account:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. The impact of the subdivision layout and design on the operation, maintenance, and potential upgrade and development of the National Grid, including the ability for continued reasonable access to existing transmission assets for maintenance, inspections and upgrading;</u> <u>b. The ability of any potential future development to comply with NZECP 34.2001 New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safety Distances; c. The extent to which the design and layout of the subdivision demonstrates that a suitable building platform(s) for a principal building or dwelling can be provided outside of the National Grid Yard for each new lot;</u> <u>d. The risk to the structural integrity of the National Grid;</u> <u>e. The extent to which the subdivision design and consequential development will minimise the risk of injury and/or property damage from the National Grid and the potential reverse sensitivity on and amenity and nuisance effects of the National Grid assets;</u> <u>f. The nature and location of any proposed vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of the National Grid;</u> <u>g. The outcome of any consultation with, and technical advice from, Transpower.</u> <u>4. Only allowing earthworks within the National Grid Yard where it can be demonstrated that the safe and efficient functioning, operation, maintenance and repair, upgrading and development of the National Grid will not be compromised, taking into account:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. The extent to which the earthworks may compromise the safe access to and operation, maintenance and repair, upgrading and development of the National Grid;</u> <u>b. The stability of land within and adjacent to the National Grid;</u> <u>c. Risks relating to health or public safety, including the risk of property damage; and</u> <u>d. Technical advice provided by the owner and operator of the National Grid.</u> <p>Should a National Grid specific policy not be provided, Transpower seeks amendment to policy INF-P7 to give effect to the NPSET.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not clear why INF-NFL-P59 is within the NFL chapter given it relates to the CE and not NFL's. As with other INF-NFL policies, Transpower opposes INF-NFL-P59. Considers policy INF-NFL-P59 has implications for any new Cook Strait cables at Oteranga Bay, and other new National Grid assets within the CE. Considers the avoid directive within the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET, including Policy 8, noting that it applies to the entire coastal environment and not only the higher values areas. Considers the higher order policy support for the policy is not clear noting the NZCPS does not impose a blanket avoid requirement for the coastal environment, within Policy 6(1)(a) recognising the provision of infrastructure and the transmission of electricity. Seeks a new policy that provides a comprehensive policy approach that gives effect to and reconciles the NPS-ET and NZCPS. Considers given the comprehensive nature of the policy sought, it is proposed to be located in the INF chapter rather than sub chapters.</p>	<p>Add a new National Grid specific policy for Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Significant Amenity Landscapes in the Infrastructure (INF) chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P6 Development of the National Grid Provide for the development of the National Grid</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. In urban zoned areas, development should minimise adverse effects on urban amenity and should avoid material adverse effects on the Commercial and Mixed-Use zones, and areas of high recreational or amenity value and existing sensitive activities.</u> <u>2. Seek to avoid the adverse effects of the National Grid within areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, and SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, outside the coastal environment.</u> <u>3. where the National Grid has a functional need or operational need to locate within the coastal environment, manage adverse effects by:</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p><u>environment, manage adverse effects by:</u></p> <p><u>a. Seeking to avoid adverse effects on areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, and the Coastal Margin.</u></p> <p><u>b. where it is not practicable to avoid adverse effects on the values of the areas in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes; and the Coastal Margin because of the functional needs or operational needs of the National Grid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on those values.</u></p> <p><u>c. Seeking to avoid significant adverse effects on:</u></p> <p><u>i. other areas of natural character</u></p> <p><u>ii. natural attributes and character of other natural features and natural landscapes</u></p> <p><u>iii. indigenous biodiversity values that meet the criteria in Policy 11(b) of the NZCPS 2010</u></p> <p><u>d. Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>e. Recognising there may be some areas within SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes; and the Coastal Margin, where avoidance of adverse effects is required to protect the identified values and characteristics.</u></p> <p><u>4. Remedy or mitigate any adverse effects from the operation, maintenance, upgrade, major upgrade or development of the National Grid which cannot be avoided, to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>5. When considering the adverse effects in respect of 1-3 above:</u></p> <p><u>a. Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection; and</u></p> <p><u>b. Consider the constraints arising from the operational needs or functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	<p>Opposes INF-NFL-P60 and proposes an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid. Has specific concerns the policy does not give effect to the NPSET in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific to clause 1. 2. and 3., considers the NPSET does not require the activity to be of a scale that protects the identified values for ONFL's, not maintains or restores those for SAL's. It does not require the avoidance of visually obtrusive structures within ridgelines and hilltops. The ridgelines and hilltops cover a large extent of the city and given the linear nature of the transmission network and the visual element associated with its support structures, considers it would not be possible or practicable to 'avoid visually obtrusive structures. - In response to clause 4. considers the NPSET does not require significant adverse effects be avoided. - Considers Clause 5. is acceptable in so far as it relates to functional or operational need. Considers the reference to 'reasonably practical alternative locations' is not necessary given the definitions of operational and functional need. Has concerns with the term 'practical' as it is considered to introduce uncertainty. Considers the term 'practicable' is more readily understood. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new National Grid specific policy, in the Infrastructure (INF chapter), as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P6 Development of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>Provide for the development of the National Grid:</u></p> <p><u>1. In urban zoned areas, development should minimise adverse effects on urban amenity and should avoid material adverse effects on the Commercial and Mixed-Use zones, and areas of high recreational or amenity value and existing sensitive activities.</u></p> <p><u>2. Seek to avoid the adverse effects of the National Grid within areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, and SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, outside the coastal environment.</u></p> <p><u>3. where the National Grid has a functional need or operational need to locate within the coastal environment, manage adverse effects by:</u></p> <p><u>a. Seeking to avoid adverse effects on areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, and the Coastal Margin.</u></p> <p><u>b. where it is not practicable to avoid adverse effects on the values of the areas in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes; and the Coastal Margin because of the functional needs or operational needs of the National Grid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on those values.</u></p> <p><u>c. Seeking to avoid significant adverse effects on:</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p><u>i. other areas of natural character</u></p> <p><u>ii. natural attributes and character of other natural features and natural landscapes</u></p> <p><u>iii. indigenous biodiversity values that meet the criteria in Policy 11(b) of the NZCPS 2010</u></p> <p><u>d. Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>e. Recognising there may be some areas within SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, and the Coastal Margin, where avoidance of adverse effects is required to protect the identified values and characteristics.</u></p> <p><u>4. Remedy or mitigate any adverse effects from the operation, maintenance, upgrade, major upgrade or development of the National Grid which cannot be avoided, to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>5. When considering the adverse effects in respect of 1-3 above;</u></p> <p><u>a. Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection; and</u></p> <p><u>b. Consider the constraints arising from the operational needs or functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects.</u></p>
oOh!Media Street Furniture New Zealand Limited	316.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	<p>Considers that a specific rule is required to provide for ‘transport network’ and ‘ancillary transport network infrastructure’ as a permitted activity. There are no rules which relate to the construction or operation of ‘ancillary transport network infrastructure’ or the ‘transport network’, or any other rules or standards which relate to such activities. However there are rules for other forms of infrastructure and road-based utilities.</p> <p>In the absence of a specific rule for an activity, Rule INF-R15 provides for “Infrastructure buildings and structures not provided for by any other rule in this table” as a permitted activity in all zones, but will result in impractical outcomes for small-scale structures within the road reserve, and will result in a resource consent process being required for all new transport shelters within the road reserve, which is inconsistent with enabling the efficient operation of the transport network.</p> <p>The lack of specific provisions for ‘transport network’ and ‘ancillary transport network infrastructure’ does not efficiently or effectively implement the objectives and policies of the Infrastructure Chapter, namely INF-05 and INF-P9. The provisions, as they are proposed, would result in a requirement for all shelters to obtain resource consent, which is inconsistent with enabling the efficient operation of the transport network.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new rule in the Infrastructure chapter as follows:</p> <p>INF-R Transport network activities and ancillary transport network structures in the road reserve.</p> <p>All Zones</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.88	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	<p>Considers that the proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies CC.1 and CC.3) seeks District Plans enable infrastructure that supports the uptake of zero and low carbon multi-modal transport that contributes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. To have regard to this policy, a new policy and rule should be inserted into the PDP to enable the development of this infrastructure such as public EV charging stations.</p>	<p>Seeks to Add a new policy to enable the development of infrastructure required to support zero and low carbon transport and public transport.</p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.57	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	<p>WIAL has filed as submission with respect to PC1 of the Proposed RPS and the target to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. It would be premature to impose such requirements on the Proposed Plan, when those provisions have yet to go through the hearings and decision making process.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.89	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	<p>Considers that the proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies CC.1 and CC.3) seeks District Plans enable infrastructure that supports the uptake of zero and low carbon multi-modal transport that contributes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. To have regard to this policy, a new policy and rule should be inserted into the PDP to enable the development of this infrastructure such as public EV charging stations.</p>	<p>Seeks to Add a new rule to enable the development of infrastructure required to support zero and low carbon transport and public transport.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.58	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	WIAL has filed as submission with respect to PC1 of the Proposed RPS and the target to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. It would be premature to impose such requirements on the Proposed Plan, when those provisions have yet to go through the hearings and decision making process.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	New types of infrastructure will be needed to support NZ's conversion to Electric vehicles.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.90	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	Considers that the PDP should encourage greenhouse gas emission reductions and ensure decision making contributes towards achieving future greenhouse emissions targets. Part of this would be the consideration of how new or altered transport infrastructure will operate in a manner which assists in achieving those targets and requiring whole of life carbon emissions assessments. A new policy that encourages consideration of whole of life carbon emissions assessment would have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (policy CC.11).	Seeks to include a new policy that encourages an assessment of whole of life carbon emissions for any new or altered transport infrastructure and how new or altered transport infrastructure would assist in meeting reduction targets.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.59	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / General INF	Oppose	WIAL has filed as submission with respect to PC1 of the Proposed RPS and the target to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. It would be premature to impose such requirements on the Proposed Plan, when those provisions have yet to go through the hearings and decision making process.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.72	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	<p>The submitter notes that INF-R3 provides for the “upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure” as a permitted activity where INF-S1, INF-S3, INF-S4 and INF-S12 are met.</p> <p>It is considered that this rule could be interpreted as applying to the operation, maintenance and repair of the transport network, however: INF-S1 is specific to radiofrequency so it is irrelevant. INF-S3 is specific to earthworks so is relevant.</p> <p>INF-S4 is specific to utilities so is irrelevant.</p> <p>INF-S12 is specific to buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard so is irrelevant.</p> <p>INF-S13, S15, S16, S17 are specific to roads and transport but are not applicable.</p> <p>INF-S18 applies to bus shelters but is not applicable. “Infrastructure” and “Transport Network” are both defined in the interpretation section, but there are no rules specific to the upgrade of the transport network.</p> <p>INF-O5 specifically recognises the benefits of the transport network, which would include the benefits from upgrades.</p> <p>INF-P9 specifically enables upgrading of the transport network, but there is not specific corresponding rule.</p> <p>Accordingly, the submitter notes that it could be interpreted that the upgrading of the transport network is not covered by INF-R3 and a resource consent application would not be assessed against the appropriate standards.</p>	<p>Add a rule in the Infrastructure chapter for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of the transport network:</p> <p><u>INF-RX Operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of the transport network.</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where compliance is achieved with INF-S3 and INF-S18.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.20	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	<p>Supports a new rule which specifically provides for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of the transport network in the infrastructure chapter.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.73	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	<p>The submitter notes that INF-R3 provides for the “upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure” as a permitted activity where INF-S1, INF-S3, INF-S4 and INF-S12 are met.</p> <p>It is considered that this rule could be interpreted as applying to the operation, maintenance and repair of the transport network, however: INF-S1 is specific to radiofrequency so it is irrelevant. INF-S3 is specific to earthworks so is relevant.</p> <p>INF-S4 is specific to utilities so is irrelevant.</p> <p>INF-S12 is specific to buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard so is irrelevant.</p> <p>INF-S13, S15, S16, S17 are specific to roads and transport but are not applicable.</p> <p>INF-S18 applies to bus shelters but is not applicable. “Infrastructure” and “Transport Network” are both defined in the interpretation section, but there are no rules specific to the upgrade of the transport network.</p> <p>INF-O5 specifically recognises the benefits of the transport network, which would include the benefits from upgrades.</p> <p>INF-P9 specifically enables upgrading of the transport network, but there is not specific corresponding rule.</p> <p>Accordingly, the submitter notes that it could be interpreted that the upgrading of the transport network is not covered by INF-R3 and a resource consent application would not be assessed against the appropriate standards.</p>	<p>Add a rule in the Infrastructure chapter for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of the transport network:</p> <p><u>INF-RX Operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of the transport network.</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: restricted discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where compliance with the requirements of INF-S3 and INFS18 cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>The matters set out in INF-P1 and INF-P3.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.21	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	<p>Supports a new rule which specifically provides for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of the transport network in the infrastructure chapter.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.86	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	<p>Considers that it is important that the Proposed District Plan adequately recognises and provides for the establishment of new and the ongoing operation, maintenance, replacement and upgrade of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>New objective is required to ensure there is a clear objective that policies such as Policy INF-P1 give effect to.</p> <p>Note this objective should sit beneath INF-02 so the plan flows in a logical order (i.e. recognise and provide for infrastructure, enable infrastructure, manage adverse effects of infrastructure).</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15 for further detail.]</p>	<p>Add new objective to Infrastructure chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-07</u></p> <p><u>Development, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, renewal and upgrading of infrastructure is enabled.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.22	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	<p>Supports the objective to enable infrastructure.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	Provides a clear objective to be given effect to by lower order provisions.	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	Support the insertion of new Infrastructure Objective INF-07 to enable the development, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, renewal and upgrading of infrastructure.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.61	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.87	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Amend	Considers that it is imperative that infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use activities, including reverse sensitivity effects. [See original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15 and 4.56 to 4.69 for full reason]	Add new Policy to INF chapter as follows: <u>INF-P14</u> <u>Avoid where practicable, or otherwise remedy or mitigate adverse effects on infrastructure from subdivision, use and development, including reverse sensitivity effects, which may compromise the operation and capacity of existing, consented and planned infrastructure.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.23	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	Supports a policy to protect infrastructure from adverse effects of land use activities. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.120	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the addition of the proposed policy which is considered a duplication of INF-P6.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	The effect to be controlled is the potential future adverse effect on residents from existing infrastructure. It is appropriate to mitigate that effect when development comes to the nuisance effect (noise from infrastructure).	Allow / Seeks that the that the submission be allowed, but be reworded to focus on the need to mitigate adverse effects on residents locating close to existing infrastructure.
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.10	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	Support the insertion of new Infrastructure Policy INF-P14 to protect infrastructure from incompatible land use activities, including reverse sensitivity effects.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.62	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / New INF	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	INF-01 is supported as it sets out a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-01 as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	Considers that these objectives (INF-01, INF-02 and INF-04) set out a workable and appropriate framework for gas infrastructure.	Retain Objective INF-01 (The benefits of Infrastructure) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Firstgas Limited	304.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	INF-01 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to infrastructure.	Retain INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	Supports INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) in that specific to the National Grid, the objective gives effect to Policy 1 of the NPSET, noting that the objective as proposed is not confined to the National Grid. However, considers that given the national significance of the National Grid and that this significance is recognised in the NPSET, seeks a separate set of provisions for the national grid.	Retain Objective INF-01 (the benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	Supports INF-01 for its intent to recognise and protect the City's electricity distribution network.	Retain INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.74	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	Support these objectives as they refer to infrastructure more broadly and all roads form part of the infrastructure definition, manage adverse effects on infrastructure, provide for infrastructure availability and support transport network	Retain Objective INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.107	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	Objective INF-01 is generally supported.	Retain Objective INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support in part	Supports INF-01 in part.	Retain INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as notified, with amendments.
Ministry of Education	400.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Amend	Seeks that INF-01 includes reference to 'additional infrastructure', as it includes educational facilities within the definition. The definition of 'infrastructure' does not include educational facilities. The submitter considers that educational facilities are a crucial form of social infrastructure that is needed to support development. The submitter considers that the proposed amendment will allow the importance of educational facilities to be recognised and provided for in Wellington [see original submission for full reason].	Amend INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as follows: The national, regional and local benefits of infrastructure <u>and additional infrastructure</u> are recognised and provided for.
CentrePort Limited	402.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.88	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15.]	Retain INF-01 (Benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.63	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	Supports that the objective recognises and provides for the benefits of infrastructure.	Retain INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-01	Support	Considers that recognising and providing for the national, regional and local benefits of infrastructure, including NZDF facilities, in the District Plan policy framework is important and appropriate.	Retain INF-01 (The benefits of infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	INF-02 is supported as it sets out a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-02 as notified
Powerco Limited	127.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	Considers that these objectives (INF-01, INF-02 and INF-04) set out a workable and appropriate framework for gas infrastructure.	Retain Objective INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	INF-02 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to infrastructure.	Retain INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	Supports the directive within the objective that effects be managed, while recognising functional and operational needs and positive effects.	Retain Objective INF-02 (Adverse effect of infrastructure) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	Supports INF-02 for its intent to manage the adverse effects of infrastructure in the context of positive effects as well as functional need.	Retain INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.75	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	Support these objectives as they refer to infrastructure more broadly and all roads form part of the infrastructure definition, manage adverse effects on infrastructure, provide for infrastructure availability and support transport network	Retain Objective INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.108	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support in part	Objective INF-02 is partially supported.	Retain Objective INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.109	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Amend	Considers that INF-02 should be amended to mitigate and manage any adverse effects from infrastructure on the environment and ensure effects are reduced over time.	Amend Objective INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as follows: The adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment are <u>mitigated and</u> managed, while recognising: ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.10	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Oppose	WELL do not support the sought amendment to Objective INF-02 as it is considered unnecessary. WELL supported the retention of the Objective as drafted, and consider adding the word 'mitigated' does not materially benefit the high-level purpose and intent of the objective.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Oppose	Mitigation in this context is part of the toolkit to manage adverse effects. It is not necessary to include it separately.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support in part	Considers that the use of the word managed in the objective is open to interpretation and is of limited assistance to decision makers. In addition the term functional and operational need of infrastructure is not in alignment with the terminology of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that utilises the terms functional need and operational requirement.	Retain INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Amend	Considers that the use of the word managed in the objective is open to interpretation and is of limited assistance to decision makers. In addition the term functional and operational need of infrastructure is not in alignment with the terminology of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that utilises the terms functional need and operational requirement.	Amend INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as follows: The adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment are managed <u>avoided, remedied and mitigated</u> , while recognising: 1. The functional <u>needs</u> and operational <u>need requirements</u> of infrastructure; and 2. That positive effects of infrastructure may be realised locally, regionally or nationally.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.89	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15.]	Retain INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.64	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	Supports the objective to recognise the functional and operational need of infrastructure, while managing adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment.	Retain INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-02	Support	Considers that it is important to recognise the functional and operational need of infrastructure along with the positive effects of infrastructure on the City, while acknowledging that infrastructure can have adverse effects on the environment which need to be managed.	Retain INF-02 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	INF-03 is supported in regard to the intent of managing adverse effects on the function and operation of infrastructure.	Retain INF-03 as notified

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose in part	The intent of INF-03 in regard to managing adverse effects on the function and operation of infrastructure is supported. However, a typographical error requires correction.	Amend Objective INF-03 as follows: Manage the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects of <u>of</u> subdivision use and development on the function and operation of infrastructure.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.24	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Supports correction to ensure the objective reads correctly. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.26	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Meridian agrees the spelling error ('or') should be amended (to read 'of').	Allow
Powerco Limited	127.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose in part	Considers that the intent of the objective in regard to managing adverse effects on the function and operation of infrastructure is supported. However a typographical error requires connection.	Amend INF-03 (Adverse effect on infrastructure) as follows: Manage the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects of <u>of</u> subdivision use and development on the function and operation of infrastructure.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.27	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Meridian agrees the spelling error ('or') should be amended (to read 'of').	Allow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to INF-03 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Firstgas Limited	304.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	INF-03 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to infrastructure.	Retain INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support in part	Supports the provision but seeks a minor grammatical amendment.	Retain INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure), with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Amend	Supports the provision but seeks a minor grammatical amendment.	Amend Objective INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as follows: INF-03 Adverse effects on infrastructure Manage the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, of subdivision use and development on the function and operation of infrastructure.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Supports INF-03 as it importantly recognises the need to protect the electricity distribution network against the actual and potential effects of reverse sensitivity.	Retain Objective INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.76	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Support these objectives as they refer to infrastructure more broadly and all roads form part of the infrastructure definition, manage adverse effects on infrastructure, provide for infrastructure availability and support transport network	Retain Objective INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.110	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support in part	Objective INF-03 is partially supported. management of adverse effects on the function and operation of the infrastructure network is supported, however reverse sensitivity effects should be deleted.	Retain Objective INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.111	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Amend	Considers that INF-03 should be amended to delete reverse sensitivity effects to prevent a single effect from being singled out.	Amend Objective INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as follows: Manage the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, of subdivision use and development on the function and operation of infrastructure.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.11	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose	WELL oppose this submission point for the reasons stated in the original submission. WELL consider that explicit recognition to reverse sensitivity effects is appropriate from an objectives perspective as it provides clear direction to plan users and administrators.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose	Transpower supports the objective as notified, noting that Policy 10 of the NPSET makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects. On that basis, the relief sought by the submitter is opposed	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.25	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of reverse sensitivity effects. KiwiRail considers it is important to list reverse sensitivity effects within the objection as well as adverse effects. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.29	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose	Meridian supports retention of the reference to 'reverse sensitivity' (which is a valid potential adverse effect of concern) but agrees the word 'or' should be 'of'.	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose	It is appropriate for the policy direction of the Proposed Plan to manage the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity, subdivision, use or development on infrastructure.	Disallow / Reject submitter's relief and retain Objective INF-03 as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support in part	Support with amendment. There is a typographical error.	Retain INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Amend	There is a typographical error.	Amend INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as follows: Manage the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects or of subdivision use and development on the function and operation of infrastructure.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.28	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Meridian agrees the spelling error ('or') should be amended (to read 'of').	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.90	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose	Considers that it is important that infrastructure is protected from reverse sensitivity effects. [See original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15 for further detail.]	Opposes INF-03 and seeks amendment.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.65	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.91	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose	Considers that it is important that infrastructure is protected from reverse sensitivity effects. [See original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15 for further detail.]	Amend INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as follows: ... Manage the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects or subdivision use and development on the function and operation of infrastructure. <u>Infrastructure is protected from incompatible subdivision, use and development, including reverse sensitivity effects.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.121	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment as adverse effects can be managed so infrastructure development, function and operation is not constrained. Use of the term 'incompatible' does not provide sufficient clarity for Plan users and may unnecessarily constrain development opportunities.	Disallow / Kāinga Ora seeks that INF-03 is retained and amended as per their original submission
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Support amendment to the objective to adopt a more directive policy intent to protecting infrastructure from incompatible subdivision, use and development, including reverse sensitivity effects	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.66	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.92	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Oppose	Considers that it is important that infrastructure is protected from reverse sensitivity effects. [See original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15 for further detail.]	Delete INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure).
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.67	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Supports that the objective protects infrastructure from adverse effects of subdivision, use and development, including reverse sensitivity.	Retain INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-03	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to provide for the management of reverse sensitivity effects from development on the function and operation of infrastructure.	Retain INF-03 (Adverse effects on infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	INF-04 is supported as it sets out a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-04 as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Powerco Limited	127.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	Considers that these objectives (INF-01, INF-02 and INF-04) set out a workable and appropriate framework for gas infrastructure.	Retain Objective INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	Supports the objective as it promotes the provision of safe, effective and resilient infrastructure for subdivision, use and development.	Retain INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as notified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Not specified	<p>Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to INF-04 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP.</p> <p>There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned.</p> <p>Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain.</p> <p>The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone.</p> <p>West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
Firstgas Limited	304.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	INF-04 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to infrastructure.	Retain INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	Supports INF-04 as it clearly expresses the need for safe effective and resilient infrastructure for both existing and planned development.	Retain Objective INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.77	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	Support these objectives as they refer to infrastructure more broadly and all roads form part of the infrastructure definition, manage adverse effects on infrastructure, provide for infrastructure availability and support transport network	Retain Objective INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.112	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	Objective INF-04 is generally supported.	Retain Objective INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support in part	Supports INF-04 in part.	Retain INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as notified, with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Amend	Seeks that INF-04 includes reference to 'additional infrastructure', as it includes educational facilities within the definition. The definition of 'infrastructure' does not include educational facilities. The submitter notes that under the NPS-UD Council has an obligation to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes educational facilities) is provided in development and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available [see original submission for full reason].	Amend INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as follows: Safe, effective and resilient infrastructure <u>and additional infrastructure</u> is available for, and integrated with, existing and planned subdivision, use and development.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	Supports the objective to integrate safe, effective and resilient infrastructure will existing and planned use and development.	Retain INF-04 (Infrastructure availability) as notified.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.47	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-04	Support	Supports the submission that public safety at level crossings is crucial, and protection of sightlines is a key means of ensuring this.	Allow / Seeks to incorporate sightline rule changes as outlined by the submitter.
Tawa Business Group	107.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Not specified	Considers that currently there is no clear plan for the upgrading of the existing transport network and ongoing transport planning is needed in order to ensure the traffic congestion of Main Road is not worsened as a result of increased density within both Tawa and the locality.	Seeks that an integrated transport strategy enables improved accessibility to public transport and provision of shared paths to encourage walking, cycling, scooters etc.
Tawa Business Group	107.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Amend	Considers that INF-05 should be clarified to better understand Council's role in the active upgrading and development of the existing transport network. Considers that currently there is no clear plan for this upgrading and ongoing transport planning is needed in order to ensure the traffic congestion of Main Road is not worsened as a result of increased density within both Tawa and the locality.	Seeks that INF-05 (Transport Network) should go further to clarify Council's role in the active upgrading and development of the existing transport network.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to INF-05 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Support	INF-05 is supported as it provides infrastructure that enables people of all ages and abilities to cycle aligns with CW's objectives.	Retain Objective INF-05 (Transport network) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.78	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Support	Support these objectives as they refer to infrastructure more broadly and all roads form part of the infrastructure definition, manage adverse effects on infrastructure, provide for infrastructure availability and support transport network	Retain Objective INF-05 (Transport network) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-05 (Transport network) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.113	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Oppose in part	Objective INF-05 is opposed as it divides transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters. This is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Delete Objective INF-05 (Transport network) and move the objective to the Transport chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.26	P+E1399art 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into different chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend
Ministry of Education	400.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Support	Supports INF-05. The submitter considers that INF-05 will enable a well-functioning and connected city while recognising the need for the transport network to support additional infrastructure.	Retain INF-05 (Transport network) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-05	Support	Supports a transport network that improves connectivity, supports the health and well-being of people and supports development infrastructure.	Retain INF-05 (Transport network) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-06	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-06 (Amateur radio configurations) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	INF-P1 is supported as it provides a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	Considers that these policies (INF-P1 to INF-P6, INF-P12 and INF-P13) provide a workable and appropriate framework for gas distribution infrastructure.	Retain Policy INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	Supports the policy as it seeks to enable the effective and efficient operation of existing infrastructure whilst also providing for upgrades to, and the development of new infrastructure in appropriate locations. The policy also recognises the importance of infrastructure lifeline utilities during an emergency, which for FENZ the road network and reticulated water network.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	INF-P1 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes they seek related to infrastructure.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support in part	Generally supports INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure). However, seeks that INF-P1 be amended to make reference to the benefits being "provided for" in addition to being "recognised" so that the Policy also reflects the wording in Policy 1 of the NPS-ET, and reflects INF-O1. Given the NPS-ET is specific to the National Grid, the submitter would prefer the provision of a new 'benefits' policy (as well as other policies) specific to the National Grid as opposed to amendment to INF-P1.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure), with either an amendment or a new policy specific to the National Grid.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.61	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Amend	Generally supports INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure). However, seeks that INF-P1 be amended to make reference to the benefits being "provided for" in addition to being "recognised" so that the Policy also reflects the wording in Policy 1 of the NPS-ET, and reflects INF-O1. Given the NPS-ET is specific to the National Grid, the submitter would prefer the provision of a new 'benefits' policy (as well as other policies) specific to the National Grid as opposed to amendment to INF-P1. (Option B)	Seeks that should a National Grid specific policy not be provided, policy INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) should be amended to give effect to the NPS-ET.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	Supports INF-P1 as it broadly meets the requirements for the submitter in providing electricity distribution and supply functions across the City.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.79	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	Support policies as worded as they provide for infrastructure, the coordination of infrastructure with land use, subdivision and development growth, any technological advances and undergrounding of infrastructure in urban areas where feasible.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.114	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	INF-P1 is generally supported.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support in part	Supports INF-P1 in part.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure), with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Amend	Seeks that INF-P1 includes reference to 'additional infrastructure', as it includes educational facilities within the definition. The submitter notes that educational facilities are a crucial form of infrastructure to allow communities to meet their social and economic wellbeing. The proposed amendment will allow the importance of educational facilities to be recognised and provided for in Wellington [see original submission for full reason].	Amend INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure), as follows: Recognise the benefits of infrastructure by: ... 3. Providing for significant upgrades to, and the development of new infrastructure <u>and additional infrastructure</u> ; and ...
CentrePort Limited	402.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.93	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15.]	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	Supports recognising and providing for infrastructure in policy. KiwiRail support provision for operation, maintenance, repair, removal of infrastructure as well as upgrades to, and new infrastructure.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P1	Support	Considers that it is important for the District Plan policy framework to recognise the benefits of infrastructure, including providing for the functions and responsibilities of infrastructure as lifeline utilities during an emergency.	Retain INF-P1 (Recognising and providing for infrastructure) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	INF-P2 is supported as it provides a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.
Tawa Business Group	107.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Amend	Considers that INF-P2 should be clarified to better understand Council's role in the active upgrading and development of the existing transport network. Considers that currently there is no clear plan for this upgrading and ongoing transport planning is needed in order to ensure the traffic congestion of Main Road is not worsened as a result of increased density within both Tawa and the locality.	Seeks that INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) should go further to clarify Council's role in the active upgrading and development of the existing transport network.
Powerco Limited	127.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	Considers that these policies (INF-P1 to INF-P6, INF-P12 and INF-P13) provide a workable and appropriate framework for gas distribution infrastructure.	Retain Policy INF-P2 Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it seeks the coordination of infrastructure planning and delivery with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth. Feedback points on the necessity for specific rules and standards to provide the necessary connections to three waters infrastructure where subdivision consent is not expressly required is set out in each relevant zone	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	INF-P2 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes they seek related to infrastructure.	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.
Bruce Rae	334.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	INF-P2 is supported, as it considers transport networks as one of the components of infrastructure and matches the intensity of land use to the public transport infrastructure serving them. The draft plan did this on a fairly consistent basis for all the stations within WCC boundaries served by Wellington's electrified train network.	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support in part	Supports INF-P2 for its intent as it reflects the previous feedback to Council under the preliminary consultation phase of the PDP. This Policy is supported as it ensures that development will be appropriately coordinated with the upgrading of development of the electricity supply network so service current and future development needs. However, it is considered that the Policy could be slightly improved.	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Amend	Considers that INF-P2 could be slightly improved so as to also include infrastructure renewal and replacement –i.e., brownfields as well as greenfields where practical.	Amend INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as follows: Enable the efficient coordination, integration and alignment of infrastructure planning and delivery with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth so that <u>existing and</u> future land use and infrastructure is integrated, efficient and aligned.
Waka Kotahi	370.80	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	Support policies as worded as they provide for infrastructure, the coordination of infrastructure with land use, subdivision and development growth, any technological advances and undergrounding of infrastructure in urban areas where feasible.	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.115	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	INF-P2 is generally supported.	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support in part	Supports INF-P2 in part.	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth), with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Amend	Seeks that INF-P2 includes reference to 'additional infrastructure', as it includes educational facilities within the definition. The submitter notes that the NPS-UD requires local authorities to engage with providers of development infrastructure and additional infrastructure to achieve integrated land use and infrastructure planning. The submitter considers that additional infrastructure, including educational facilities, need to be carefully planned and coordinated to meet the demand of growing communities [see original submission for full reason].	Amend INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth), as follows: Enable the efficient coordination, integration and alignment of infrastructure <u>and additional infrastructure</u> planning and delivery with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth so that future land use and infrastructure is integrated, efficient and aligned.
CentrePort Limited	402.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P2	Support	Supports coordination of infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth.	Retain INF-P2 (Coordinating infrastructure with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	INF-P3 is supported as it provides a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	Considers that these policies (INF-P1 to INF-P6, INF-P12 and INF-P13) provide a workable and appropriate framework for gas distribution infrastructure.	Retain Policy INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.62	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	Supports INF-P1 as it correctly acknowledges that technical advances in the supply and use of electricity will be experienced throughout the life of the PDP. As New Zealand advances toward a more decarbonised society, the use of technology (i.e., EV and associated infrastructure) will change and thus have an impact on the services provided by the electricity distribution network. It is agreed that in order to adapt to new technologies the PDP should contain appropriate flexibility – with such flexibility being reflected throughout the rule and standards sections of the PDP.	Retain INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.81	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	Support policies as worded as they provide for infrastructure, the coordination of infrastructure with land use, subdivision and development growth, any technological advances and undergrounding of infrastructure in urban areas where feasible.	Retain INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.116	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	INF-P3 is generally supported.	Retain INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.94	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15.]	Retain INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P3	Support	Supports policy that recognises the benefits that new technologies can bring to rail in terms of efficiency of the operation and safety and resilience of the network.	Retain INF-P3 (Technological advances) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P4	Support	INF-P4 is supported as it provides a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-P4 (Undergrounding of infrastructures) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P4	Support	Considers that these policies (INF-P1 to INF-P6, INF-P12 and INF-P13) provide a workable and appropriate framework for gas distribution infrastructure.	Retain Policy INF-P4 (Undergrounding of infrastructure) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P4	Support	INF-P4 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes they seek related to infrastructure.	Retain INF-P4 (Undergrounding of infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.63	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P4	Support	Supports the policy, and specifically the use of the word 'encourage', and references to where 'practicable' and 'technically feasible'.	Retain INF-P4 (Undergrounding of infrastructure) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P4	Support in part	Supports INF-P4 as the wording allows for overhead infrastructure where undergrounding assets is not practicable or technically feasible. However, the provision should include a reference to economic and technical feasibility.	Retain INF-P4 (Undergrounding of infrastructure) with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P4	Amend	Considers that INF-P4 should be amended to reference to economic and technical feasibility. Underground infrastructure can be as unfeasible from a technical perspective, as well as being cost prohibitive to construct. Notwithstanding the above, it is also noted that some underground infrastructure depends on some above ground cabinets or additional overhead supports to facilitate a new underground section.	Amend INF-P4 (Undergrounding of infrastructure) as follows: Encourage the undergrounding of new infrastructure in urban areas where it is practicable, financially and technically feasible.
Waka Kotahi	370.82	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P4	Support	Support policies as worded as they provide for infrastructure, the coordination of infrastructure with land use, subdivision and development growth, any technological advances and undergrounding of infrastructure in urban areas where feasible.	Retain INF-P4 (Undergrounding of infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P4 (Undergrounding of infrastructure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.117	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P4	Support	INF-P4 is generally supported.	Retain INF-P4 (Undergrounding of infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	INF-P5 is supported as it provides a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	Considers that these policies (INF-P1 to INF-P6, INF-P12 and INF-P13) provide a workable and appropriate framework for gas distribution infrastructure.	Retain Policy INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Firstgas Limited	304.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	INF-P5 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes they seek related to infrastructure.	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.64	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	Considers that given the general nature of INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure), the submitter is supportive of the policy. In particular the use of the word 'manage' is supported. However, as highlighted in other points, in order to give effect to the NPS-ET, a specific National Grid provision is sought.	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified, notwithstanding that the submitter has sought a specific suite of National Grid provisions.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.65	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support in part	<p>Considers that in order to give effects to the NPS-ET, the submitter seeks specific National Grid provisions. Supports in principle INF-P6, however considers it does not reflect or give effect to the NPS-ET and is not specific to the National Grid. Considers it also does not provide a 'seek to avoid' approach for the more sensitive environments and the policy framework in the INF sub chapters for new development of the National Grid within such environments also does not give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy approach within Policy 8 of the NPS-ET. Considers the provision of a National Grid specific policy provides a comprehensive policy approach that gives effect to the NPS-ET. Considers the development of the National Grid must be managed to ensure the potential for adverse effects is appropriately managed while recognising the significance of the National Grid and the constraints under which it operates. The NPS-ET requires the District Plan to include objectives and policies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow for the consideration of the technical constraints and operational requirements under which the National Grid operates, for example the linear nature of the transmission lines. - Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated through the route, site and method selection. - Ensure new planning and development seeks to avoid adverse effects on more sensitive areas. <p>Policies, plans and decision makers must take in to account the characteristics of the National Grid, its technical and operational constraints, and the route, site and method selection process when considering the adverse effects of new National Grid infrastructure on the environment.</p> <p>On this basis, the submitter supports a new policy specific to the development of the National Grid. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) with either an amendment or a new policy specific to the National Grid.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.66	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Amend	<p>Considers that in order to give effects to the NPS-ET, the submitter seeks specific National Grid provisions. Supports in principle INF-P6, however considers it does not reflect or give effect to the NPS-ET and is not specific to the National Grid. Considers it also does not provide a 'seek to avoid' approach for the more sensitive environments and the policy framework in the INF sub chapters for new development of the National Grid within such environments also does not give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy approach within Policy 8 of the NPS-ET. Considers the provision of a National Grid specific policy provides a comprehensive policy approach that gives effect to the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Considers the development of the National Grid must be managed to ensure the potential for adverse effects is appropriately managed while recognising the significance of the National Grid and the constraints under which it operates. The NPS-ET requires the District Plan to include objectives and policies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow for the consideration of the technical constraints and operational requirements under which the National Grid operates, for example the linear nature of the transmission lines. - Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated through the route, site and method selection. - Ensure new planning and development seeks to avoid adverse effects on more sensitive areas. <p>Policies, plans and decision makers must take in to account the characteristics of the National Grid, its technical and operational constraints, and the route, site and method selection process when considering the adverse effects of new National Grid infrastructure on the environment.</p> <p>On this basis, the submitter supports a new policy specific to the development of the National Grid. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Option 2: Seeks that should a National Grid specific policy not be provided, INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) is amended to give effect to the NPS-ET.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Oppose in part	Considers the policy should also apply to the operation, maintenance, repair and removal of infrastructure. It also needs amendment to include direction that effects are not only to be managed, but that certain areas, including overlays, need to be protected. This includes values in the coastal environment. Remove reference to 'identified' values	<p>Amend INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - also apply to operation, maintenance, repair, and removal of infrastructure; and - include direction that effects are not only to be managed, but that in certain areas needs to be protected; and - remove reference to "identified" values.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.19	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Oppose	Notwithstanding the relief sought in the Transpower submission for a National Grid specific policy, Transpower opposes the relief sought in the submission on the basis it ignores the operating nature of existing infrastructure and would result in uncertainty in the application of the policy. In the absence of specific wording, the implications of the sought wording are unclear.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.60	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Oppose	WIAL submits that first two bullet points are addressed by provisions located elsewhere within the Infrastructure subchapters. It is therefore inappropriate to duplicate / replicate them here. With respect to values, it is appropriate to focus the management response on the values, as the purpose of the overlay is to identify the specific values of an area / feature. Without this reference, erroneous management of effects may be required – for example, the air noise overlay could trigger consideration of effects management for unrelated matters.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.27	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Oppose	Rejects the submission and seeks that the policy applies to upgrades and development of new infrastructure where there may be adverse effects as notified in the Plan.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.30	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	Meridian agrees the policy should apply to the establishment, operation (including maintenance and repair) and removal of infrastructure. Meridian considers it is important that the policy refers to 'identified values' so that Plan users have certainty about how to manage activities in overlays.	<p>Allow / Seeks that the specification of the 'operation (including maintenance and repair) and removal of infrastructure' be allowed.</p> <p>Seeks that part of submission requesting the deletion of 'identified values' of overlays be disallowed.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.83	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	Support policies as worded as they provide for infrastructure, the coordination of infrastructure with land use, subdivision and development growth, any technological advances and undergrounding of infrastructure in urban areas where feasible.	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.118	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	INF-P5 is generally supported.	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support in part	Considers that the use of the word managed in the policy is open to interpretation and is of limited assistance to decision makers.	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Amend	Considers that the use of the word managed in the policy is open to interpretation and is of limited assistance to decision makers.	Amend INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as follows: Manage <u>Avoid, remedy or mitigate</u> the adverse effects of upgrades to, or the development of new infrastructure, including effects on:
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.95	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15.]	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	Supports policy for managing the adverse effects of upgrades to, or development of new infrastructure.	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P5	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to acknowledge that new or upgraded infrastructure can have adverse effects, including on the natural and physical environment, amenity values and the health safety and wellbeing of people and communities, which may need to be managed.	Retain INF-P5 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Support	INF-P6 is supported as it provides a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Support	Considers that these policies (INF-P1 to INF-P6, INF-P12 and INF-P13) provide a workable and appropriate framework for gas distribution infrastructure.	Retain Policy INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Support	INF-P6 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes they seek related to infrastructure.	Retain INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Oppose	Considers the policy conflicts with the policies in the Infrastructure sub-chapters and should be deleted.	Delete INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.28	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Oppose	<p>Considers that this policy is important as it outlines matters to have regard to when considering the adverse effects of infrastructure. There may be instances where adverse effects cannot be avoided, and this policy provides helpful direction for the assessment of these instances.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Support	Supports INF-P6 as it appropriately balances the functional need of infrastructure, and that by its very nature not all adverse effects can be avoided. Replacement infrastructure which is larger to facilitate growth may be considered adverse, however necessary to meet the City's growth needs as envisioned under the PDP.	Retain INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.84	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Support	Support policies as worded as they provide for infrastructure, the coordination of infrastructure with land use, subdivision and development growth, any technological advances and undergrounding of infrastructure in urban areas where feasible. INF-P6 manages the effects of upgrades or development of new infrastructure on sensitive activities.	Retain INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.119	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Support	INF-P6 is generally supported.	Retain INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.96	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not always possible or practicable for infrastructure to avoid, remedy or mitigate all environmental effects.</p> <p>Considers that it is not appropriate for the policy framework to require that all adverse effects, irrespective of their significance, be avoided, remedied or mitigated. This is particularly relevant in the context of regionally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15 for further detail.]</p>	<p>Amend INF-P6 (Consideration of adverse effects of infrastructure) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>When considering the adverse effects of infrastructure on the environment recognise that there may be situations where all adverse effects, including construction effects, cannot be avoided, <u>remedied or mitigated</u> and as such must be remedied or mitigated through having regard to the following:</p> <p>...</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.97	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not always possible or practicable for infrastructure to avoid, remedy or mitigate all environmental effects.</p> <p>Considers that it is not appropriate for the policy framework to require that all adverse effects, irrespective of their significance, be avoided, remedied or mitigated. This is particularly relevant in the context of regionally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15 for further detail.]</p>	Delete INF-P6 (Consideration of adverse effects of infrastructure)

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P6	Support	Supports that effects of infrastructure cannot always be avoided and the inclusion of a policy framework for the consideration of adverse effects of infrastructure, and remediation or mitigation of these effects. In particular, KiwiRail support recognition of the functional and operational need of the infrastructure in this assessment.	Retain INF-P6 (Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support	INF-P7 is supported as it provides a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Oppose in part	Considers that the provision protecting infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects of land disturbance and sensitive activities locating in close proximity to network utilities (other than electricity transmission and gas transmission) is unclear. Further clarity is needed to ensure that such infrastructure is protected from reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend Clause 4 of Policy INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) as follows: 4. Managing <u>land disturbance and the activities sensitive to others network utilities</u> through set-backs and design controls where it is necessary to achieve appropriate protection of infrastructure
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support	In addition to seeking more explicit reference to the Gas Transmission Network within Provision INF-P7, Firstgas supports the intent of this submission which seeks for more clarity within Clause 4 of Policy INF-P7. This is essential so that it is clear that those activities sensitive to network utilities are appropriately managed.	Allow
Firstgas Limited	304.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support in part	INF-P7 is generally supported but more explicit reference to the Gas Transmission Network within the policy is requested.	Retain INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) with amendment.
Firstgas Limited	304.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Amend	INF-P7 is generally supported but more explicit reference to the Gas Transmission Network within the policy is requested.	Seeks that INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) is amended as follows: ... 2. Managing land disturbance and activities sensitive to gas transmission to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects of, and on, <u>the Gas Transmission Network gas transmission pipelines</u> ; 3. Requiring subdivision of sites containing <u>the Gas Transmission Network a gas transmission pipeline</u> to retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the <u>Gas Transmission Network the gas transmission pipeline</u> ; and...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.67	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Amend	<p>Considers that in order to give effect to the NPS-ET, the submitter seeks specific National Grid provisions. Supports in principle INF-P7, however considers it does not reflect or give effect to the NPSET. The primary concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considers policy title "Reverse sensitivity" only relates to one aspect of Policy 10 of the NPSET and fails to give effect to the second part of this policy - Considers the policy only applies to sensitive activities, ignoring other activities which may compromise the National Grid. Policy INF-P7 does not adequately address Policies 10 and 11 of the NPS-ET - Considers Clause 2. and 3. do not apply to the National Grid. - Considers Clause 1. of the policy is limited to subdivision, ignoring that land use and other development activities (such as earthworks) can compromise the National Grid. - Considers Clause 4. is general in nature and insufficiently directive to give effect the NPS-ET. There is no reference to sensitive activities, or to ensure the National Grid is not compromised. - Considers earthworks are not referenced in the policy, noting there are specific earthworks rules. - Considers given the national significance of the National Grid and non-complying activity status where standards are not complied with, a more directive policy framework is required. As proposed, the policy does not give effect to NPS-ET policies 10 and 11. Use of the word 'manage' within INF-P7 is not sufficiently directive. <p>On this basis Transpower seeks a separate policy framework for the National Grid. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that should a National Grid specific policy not be provided, INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) should be amended to give effect to the NPS-ET.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support in part	Supports INF-P7 in part, but seeks amendment to include new requirements for scaffolding that encroach and breach prescribed electrical safety distances.	Retain INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Amend	Considers that INF-P7 should be amended to include industry Codes of Practice. Council (and the PDP) should be aware of not only building setbacks from infrastructure, but also to include new requirements for scaffolding which encroaches and breaches prescribed electrical safety distances.	<p>Amend INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) as follows:</p> <p>Manage the establishment or alteration of sensitive activities near existing lawfully established infrastructure, including by:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. Managing the activities of others through set-backs and design controls and industry Codes of Practice where it is necessary to achieve appropriate protection of infrastructure.</p>
Waka Kotahi	370.85	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support	Support policies as worded as they provide for infrastructure, the coordination of infrastructure with land use, subdivision and development growth, any technological advances and undergrounding of infrastructure in urban areas where feasible. INF-P7 deals with the adverse effects of new activities on the existing infrastructure.	Retain INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.120	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Oppose	INF-P7 is opposed and removal is sought. Is considered that the objective of INF-P7 is readily captured by Objective 2 and Policy 6 of the Infrastructure chapter. Deletion and consequential changes to the PDP are sought.	Delete INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) in its entirety.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.12	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Oppose	The submitter seeks the removal of Policy INF-P7 – to which WELL are opposed. WELL supported this Policy in its original submission as it clearly recognized the adverse effects on infrastructure of reverse sensitivity. WELL seek the retention of the Policy as drafted as it provides a clear understanding to plan users and administrators for the importance of avoiding reverse sensitivity.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Oppose	Transpower opposes the deletion of the policy in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission. Policy INF-P7 relates to the effects <u>on</u> infrastructure whereas Policy INF-P7 relates to the adverse effect <u>of</u> infrastructure. As such, the policies are not interchangeable.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.29	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Oppose	Considers it appropriate to have specific policy direction for the management of sensitive activities near lawfully established infrastructure. The rail corridor is vulnerable to reverse sensitivity effects when incompatible activities are located near the rail corridor without appropriate controls in place. KiwiRail seeks the retention of INF-P7, particular clause 4. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Amend	Considers that there is no specific recognition in the policy of discouraging new noise sensitive activities from establishing within the Port Noise Boundary. The same could be applied to the Air Noise Boundary.	Amend INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) as follows: ... 3. Requiring subdivision of sites containing a gas transmission pipeline to retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the gas transmission pipeline; and 4. Managing the activities of others through set-backs and design controls where it is necessary to achieve appropriate protection of infrastructure; and <u>5. Discouraging new noise sensitive uses without mitigation within the Port Noise and Airport Noise Boundaries.</u>
CentrePort Limited	402.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support in part	Considers that there is no specific recognition in the policy of discouraging new noise sensitive activities from establishing within the Port Noise Boundary. The same could be applied to the Air Noise Boundary.	Retain INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity), with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.61	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Oppose	WIAL supports this submission and agrees that a new policy is required to address the potential reverse sensitivity effects arising on both the port and the airport.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.98	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Oppose	Considers that it is imperative that infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use activities, including reverse sensitivity effects. [See original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15 and 4.56 to 4.69 for full reason]	Opposes INF-P7 (Reverse Sensitivity) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.99	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Amend	Considers that it is imperative that infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use activities, including reverse sensitivity effects. [See original submission paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10, 4.11 to 4.15 and 4.56 to 4.69 for full reason]	Amend INF-P7 (Reverse Sensitivity) as follows: INF-P7 Reverse Sensitivity <u>regarding the National Grid and gas transmission</u>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.41	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support	Transpower supports the addition of wording which would make it clear the policy applies to the National Grid and gas transmission only. However, it is noted that clause 4. is not specific to National Grid and gas transmission and could arguably apply to activities such as structures near railway level crossings (INF-R26). As such the appropriateness of the text sought by the submitter requires consideration.	Allow / Seeks that the submission be accepted in part.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.30	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Oppose	Rejects narrowing the scope of this policy to the National grid and gas transmission. Other infrastructure networks are susceptible to reverse sensitivity effects. Clause 4 is interpreted to be applied to all infrastructure, including the rail network and KiwiRail supports this. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support	Firstgas supports this submission which seeks to amend INF-P7 so that it only applies to the National Grid and Gas Transmission. However, while acknowledging the intent of the submission Firstgas is seeking for this policy to remain as notified, with an amendment so that it specifically makes reference to the Gas Transmission Network.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P7	Support	Supports the management of reverse sensitivity effects from the establishment or alteration of sensitive activities near infrastructure. In particular, KiwiRail support clause 4 of this policy regarding the management of adverse effects on infrastructure through setbacks and design controls.	Retain INF-P7 (Reverse sensitivity) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P8 (Amateur radio configurations) as notified.
Tawa Business Group	107.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Amend	Considers that INF-P2 should be clarified to better understand Council's role in the active upgrading and development of the existing transport network. Considers that currently there is no clear plan for this upgrading and ongoing transport planning is needed in order to ensure the traffic congestion of Main Road is not worsened as a result of increased density within both Tawa and the locality.	Seeks that INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) should go further to clarify Council's role in the active upgrading and development of the existing transport network.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to ensure that the upgrading and development of the transport network does not compromise the safe and effective functioning of the existing network. Therefore considers it is critical that any new or upgrade works to the existing network do not hinder the ability of the submitter to respond to emergencies effectively and efficiently. An additional policy criterion was therefore requested to ensure that this is given sufficient consideration in proposals affecting the transport network. This also links with the road specifications set out within Table 1 of this chapter which make specific reference to achieving road widths which provide unobstructed access for fire appliances.	Supports INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to ensure that the upgrading and development of the transport network does not compromise the safe and effective functioning of the existing network. Therefore considers it is critical that any new or upgrade works to the existing network do not hinder the ability of the submitter to respond to emergencies effectively and efficiently. An additional policy criterion was therefore requested to ensure that this is given sufficient consideration in proposals affecting the transport network. This also links with the road specifications set out within Table 1 of this chapter which make specific reference to achieving road widths which provide unobstructed access for fire appliances.	Amend INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) as follows: ... <u>7. Does not hinder the ability for emergency vehicles, including fire appliances, to utilise the transport network to respond to emergency call outs.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Support	INF-P9 is supported as it specifically seeks to provide for cycling safety and improve accessibility including to public transport. The allocation of adequate space in transport corridors for cycling is a key component of improving cycling uptake and safety.	Retain INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.86	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Support	INF-P9 is supported.	Retain INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.121	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Support in part	INF-P9 is generally supported but the division of transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Retain INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Support	Supports the policy to enable the upgrading and development of the transport network.	Retain INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P9	Amend	Considers that INF-P9 definition of upgraded transport network could be taken to mean increase the vehicle carrying capacity of roads and should instead support sustainable active modes.	Seeks that INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) support sustainable active modes rather than upgrades that increase the vehicle carrying capacity of roads. [Inferred decision requested].
Waka Kotahi	370.87	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P10	Support	Support the policies wording as INF-P10 refers to Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency's One Network Framework.	Retain INF-P10 (Classification of roads) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P10 (Classification of roads) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.122	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P10	Support in part	INF-P10 is generally supported but the division of transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Retain INF-P10 (Classification of roads) with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.88	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P11	Support	INF-P11 enables safe and effective connections between sites and the transport network	Retain INF-P11 (Connections to roads) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P11	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P11 (Connections to roads) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.123	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P11	Support in part	INF-P11 is generally supported but the division of transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Retain INF-P11 (Connection to roads) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P11	Support	Supports policy that enables the safe functioning of the transport network. Enabling safe and effective connections between sites and the transport network is important to KiwiRail, particularly where vehicle crossings are located near rail level crossings.	Retain INF-P11 (Connections to roads) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P12	Support	INF-P12 is supported as it provides a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-P12 (Infrastructure within roads) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P12	Support	Considers that these policies (INF-P1 to INF-P6, INF-P12 and INF-P13) provide a workable and appropriate framework for gas distribution infrastructure.	Retain Policy INF-P12 (Infrastructure within roads) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P12	Support	Supports INF-P12 as it references the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors 2019 for electricity infrastructure contained or constructed within road reserve.	Retain INF-P12 (Infrastructure within roads) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.89	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P12	Support	Support this policy as this is common for other infrastructure to be included in state highway road reserves.	Retain INF-12 (Infrastructure within roads) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P12	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P12 (Infrastructure within roads) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P13	Support	INF-P13 is supported as it provides a workable and appropriate framework for telecommunications infrastructure.	Retain INF-P13 (Infrastructure within riparian margins) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P13	Support	Considers that these policies (INF-P1 to INF-P6, INF-P12 and INF-P13) provide a workable and appropriate framework for gas distribution infrastructure.	Retain Policy INF-P13 (Infrastructure within riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P13	Support in part	Considers the policy needs amendment to require protection and maintenance of natural character as noted in paragraph 1.	Amend INF-P13 (Infrastructure within riparian margins): Delete paragraph 2 of the policy. OR Require adverse effects to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with the requirements of other chapters regarding natural character in the Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.31	2 Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P13	Oppose	Considers that it will not be practicable to avoid all adverse effects on natural character in all situations (neither is it required in all situations). Meridian supports the alternative relief wording (avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on natural character in accordance with the requirements of other chapters) but does not consider it needs stating in this policy (because the other policies are applicable in any event).	Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of clause (2).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P13	Oppose	The policy directs a balance between providing for infrastructure and maintaining natural character. That balance is considered to be appropriate.	Disallow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-P13 (Infrastructure within riparian margins) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-P13	Support	Supports policy to provide for infrastructure within riparian margins where natural character is maintained.	Retain INF-P13 (Infrastructure within riparian margins) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Oppose in part	INF-R1 requires compliance with Standard INF-S2 which relates to installing underground infrastructure. This clause should be deleted.	Delete clause 1(c)(i) of Rule INF-R1 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal of existing above and underground infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks).
Powerco Limited	127.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Oppose in part	Considers that the rule relates to the removal of above ground redundant infrastructure. However, Clause 1(c)(i) requires compliance with Standard INF-S2 which relates to installing underground infrastructure.	Delete clause 1(c)(i) of Rule INF-R1 (Operation, maintenance and repair or removal of existing above and underground infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks) as follows: ... Where: a. All above ground structures that are no longer required for the operation of the infrastructure are removed within twelve months of being replaced or becoming redundant; and b. Compliance is achieved with INF-S1, and c. Compliance is achieved with the following standards: In relation to existing underground infrastructure, INF-S2, INF-S3, and INF-S12.
Avryl Bramley	202.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Amend	Considers that large companies acquire the right to trespass without notification.	Amend INF-R1 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal of existing above and underground infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory to relevant home owners for upgrading an infrastructure.
Powerco Limited	FS61.24	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
Firstgas Limited	304.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Support	INF-R1 is generally supported as it relates to the operation, maintenance and repair, or removal of existing above and underground infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks.	Retain INF-R1 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal of existing above and underground infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.68	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Support	Considers that specific to the National Grid, the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 (“NESETA”) provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid, and on this basis, INF-R1 for existing National Grid structures captured by the NESETA is of limited relevance to Transpower in respect of rule application. It is noted the NESETA provides a Discretionary activity status under Regulations 39 of the NESETA for those activities subject to the NESETA but not otherwise captured under other regulations in the NESETA.	Retain INF-R1 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal of existing above ground infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Support	INF-R1 is supported as it enables the operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing above ground and underground infrastructure, and provision of new underground infrastructure, as permitted activities subject to compliance with standards.	Retain INF-R1 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal of existing above and underground infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.100	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of rules listed as they create an appropriate consenting pathway for infrastructure. Considers that some of the conditions included in these rules will require consequential changes to account for the proposed new objectives and policies identified by the submitter. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Supports INF-R1 (Operation, maintenance and repair) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.101	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Amend	Supports the inclusion of rules listed as they create an appropriate consenting pathway for infrastructure. Considers that some of the conditions included in these rules will require consequential changes to account for the proposed new objectives and policies identified by the submitter. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Seeks that INF-R1 (Operation, maintenance and repair) is amended to include reference to submitters proposed new objectives and policies within the relevant matters of discretion. [Inferred decision requested]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R1	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of the operation, maintenance, repair, and removal of existing rail infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks, subject to standards.	Retain INF-R1 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal of existing above and underground infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R2	Support	INF-R2 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R2 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and upgrading of existing underground infrastructure) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R2	Oppose	Considers that while a gas lateral customer connection from an adjacent distribution network is primarily laid to the customer underground, there is an above ground component to connect it to the customer premises. This needs to be addressed in rule INF-R2, or alternatively in the above ground customer connection rule INF-R5. [Refer to image in original submission]	Seeks that Rule INF-R2 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and upgrading of existing underground infrastructure), as alternative relief to the changes sought to Rule INF-R5 (New aboveground customer connection line), as necessary such that the above ground component of an underground gas customer connection to facilitate connection to a customer premises is a permitted activity. Standard INF-S5(2) could be applied, which applies to the diameter of pipes in regard to above ground customer connections.
Avryl Bramley	202.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R2	Amend	Considers that large companies acquire the right to trespass without notification.	Amend INF-R2 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and upgrading of existing underground infrastructure) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory to relevant home owners for upgrading an infrastructure.
Powerco Limited	F561.25	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R2	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Firstgas Limited	304.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R2	Support	INF-R2 is generally supported.	Retain INF-R2 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and upgrading of existing underground infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.69	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R2	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R2 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and upgrading of existing underground infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R2	Support	INF-R2 is supported as it enables the operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing above ground and underground infrastructure, and provision of new underground infrastructure, as permitted activities subject to compliance with standards.	Retain INF-R2 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and upgrading of existing underground infrastructure) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R2	Support	Supports the ability to install new, and upgrade existing underground infrastructure as a permitted activity, subject to standards.	Retain INF-R2 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and upgrading of existing underground infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Support	INF-R3 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R3 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Support	Considers that these rules (INF-R3, INF-R4, INF-R6 and INF-R8) appear to be satisfactory for gas distribution networks.	Retain Rule INF-R3 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Amend	Considers that large companies acquire the right to trespass without notification.	Amend INF-R3 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory to relevant home owners for upgrading an infrastructure.
Powerco Limited	FS61.26	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Oppose	Firstgas opposes this submission which seeks to amend INF-R3 so that the upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure is not Permitted and seeks that notification is mandatory to relevant homeowners for upgrading infrastructure. Firstgas seek for this activity to remain Permitted to allow Firstgas to undertake upgrades where the permitted standards are achieved. In relation to notifying homeowners, this is a legal matter that is dealt with outside of the District Plan/planning framework. Where an activity is Permitted within the District Plan, it does not specifically allow for access over private land.	Disallow
Firstgas Limited	304.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Support	INF-R3 is generally supported.	Retain INF-R3 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.70	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R3 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R3 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.102	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of rules listed as they create an appropriate consenting pathway for infrastructure. Considers that some of the conditions included in these rules will require consequential changes to account for the proposed new objectives and policies identified by the submitter. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Supports INF-R3 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.103	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Amend	Supports the inclusion of rules listed as they create an appropriate consenting pathway for infrastructure. Considers that some of the conditions included in these rules will require consequential changes to account for the proposed new objectives and policies identified by the submitter. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Seeks that INF-R3 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure) is amended to include reference to submitters proposed new objectives and policies within the relevant matters of discretion. [Inferred decision requested]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R3	Support	Supports the ability to upgrade existing aboveground infrastructure as a permitted activity, subject to standards. The rail network requires ongoing maintenance and upgrade to continue to operate safely and efficiently.	Retain INF-R3 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R4	Support	INF-R4 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R4 (New vehicle access tracks for infrastructure) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R4	Support	Considers that these rules (INF-R3, INF-R4, INF-R6 and INF-R8) appear to be satisfactory for gas distribution networks.	Retain Rule INF-R4 (New vehicle access tracks for infrastructure) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R4	Amend	Considers that large companies acquire the right to trespass without notification.	Amend INF-R4 (New vehicle access tracks for infrastructure) to make notification mandatory to relevant home owners for upgrading an infrastructure.
Powerco Limited	FS61.27	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R4	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
Firstgas Limited	304.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R4	Support	INF-R4 is generally supported.	Retain INF-R4 (New vehicle access tracks for infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.71	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R4	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R4 (New vehicle access tracks for infrastructure) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R4 (New vehicle access tracks for infrastructure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.124	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R4	Oppose in part	INF-R4 is opposed as it divides transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters. This is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Delete INF-R4 (New vehicle access tracks for infrastructure) and move the Rule to the Transport chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R4	Support	Supports the ability to construct and extend vehicle access tracks, as a permitted activity in all zones. Vehicle access to the rail corridor is required to undertake inspections and carry out regular maintenance of the rail network, as well as any upgrade works.	Retain INF-R4 (New vehicle access tracks for infrastructure) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R5	Support	INF-R5 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R5 (New aboveground customer connection line) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R5	Oppose	Considers that while a gas lateral customer connection from an adjacent distribution network is primarily laid to the customer underground, there is an above ground component to connect it to the customer premises. This needs to be addressed in rule INF-R5, or alternatively in the underground customer connection rule INF-R2.	Amend Rule INF-R5 (New aboveground customer connection line) as necessary such that the above ground component of an underground gas customer connection to facilitate connection to a customer premises is a permitted activity. The rule currently only applies to lines. Standard INF-S5 (New aboveground customer connections) already applies which limits the diameter of customer connection pipes to 30mm. Alternatively, this could be addressed as an amendment to INF-R2 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections, and upgrading of existing underground infrastructure) as per the separate submission point on that rule.
Avryl Bramley	202.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R5	Amend	Considers that large companies acquire the right to trespass without notification.	Amend INF-R5 (New aboveground customer connection line) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory to relevant home owners for upgrading an infrastructure.
Powerco Limited	FS61.28	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R5	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R5 (New aboveground customer connection line) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R6	Support	INF-R6 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R6 (Temporary infrastructure) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R6	Support	Considers that these rules (INF-R3, INF-R4, INF-R6 and INF-R8) appear to be satisfactory for gas distribution networks.	Retain Rule INF-R6 (Temporary infrastructure) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R6	Amend	Considers that large companies acquire the right to trespass without notification.	Amend INF-R6 (Temporary infrastructure) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory to relevant home owners for upgrading an infrastructure.
Powerco Limited	FS61.29	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R6	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.72	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R6	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R6 (Temporary infrastructure) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R6	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R6 (Temporary infrastructure) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.104	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R6	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of rules listed as they create an appropriate consenting pathway for infrastructure. Considers that some of the conditions included in these rules will require consequential changes to account for the proposed new objectives and policies identified by the submitter. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Supports INF-R6 (Temporary infrastructure) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.105	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R6	Amend	Supports the inclusion of rules listed as they create an appropriate consenting pathway for infrastructure. Considers that some of the conditions included in these rules will require consequential changes to account for the proposed new objectives and policies identified by the submitter. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Seeks that INF-R6 (Temporary infrastructure) is amended to include reference to submitters proposed new objectives and policies within the relevant matters of discretion. [Inferred decision requested]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R6	Support	Supports the ability to install, operate and remove temporary infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Retain INF-R6 (Temporary infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Support	INF-R7.5 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R7.5 (Structures associated with infrastructure including: Communications kiosks) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Oppose	Considers that the reference to the term “gas regulation valve” is confusing and could capture typical regulation equipment on customer conditions such as a shut off valve which could be within 2m of a residential boundary. Further, this equipment may be located within a road underground within 2m of an adjacent residential property.	Amend Rule INF-R7 (structures associated with infrastructure) as follows: ... b. Any substation, gas regulation valve and/or takeoff station or energy storage batteries are set back at least 2m from a residential site boundary;
Avryl Bramley	202.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Amend	Considers that large companies acquire the right to trespass without notification.	Amend INF-R7 (Structures associated with infrastructure) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory to relevant home owners for upgrading an infrastructure.
Powerco Limited	FS61.30	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Oppose	Firstgas opposes this submission which seeks to amend INF-R7 so that structures associated with infrastructure are not Permitted and that notification is mandatory to relevant homeowners when installing structures associated with infrastructure. Firstgas seek for this activity to remain Permitted to allow Firstgas to install structures associated with gas transmission where permitted standards are achieved. In relation to notifying homeowners, this is a legal matter that is dealt with outside of the District Plan/planning framework. Where an activity is Permitted within the District Plan, it does not specifically allow for access over private land.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.63	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Amend	Considers the rule needs to make it clear that bus shelters are a permitted activity under this rule.	Amend INF-R7 (Structures associated with infrastructure...) as follows: Structures associated with infrastructure including: 1. Substations (including switching stations); 2. Transformers; 3. Gas transmission and distribution structures; 4. Energy storage batteries not enclosed by a building; and 5. Communications kiosks; <u>and</u> 6. <u>Bus shelters</u> .
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.73	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Support	Supports the provision of a rule specific to new substations, and the provision of a restricted discretionary activity status (noting Standard INF-S1 would be complied with).	Retain INF-R7 (Structures associated with infrastructure...) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Support	Supports the provision of structures associated with infrastructure (including transformers) as a permitted activity when all standards are met, or a restricted discretionary activity when they are not.	Retain INF+D5868:J5874-R7 (Structures associated with infrastructure including...) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Support in part	Supports INF-R7 in part and seeks amendment.	Retain INF-P12 (Structures associated with infrastructure including: 1. Substations (including switching stations); 2. Transformers; 3. Gas transmission and distribution structures; 4. Energy storage batteries not enclosed by a building; and 5. Communications kiosks), with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Amend	Considers that INF-R7 should be amended so that equipment located within the road reserve is included and so that front boundaries be exempt from the 2m setback. It is considered that the 2m residential boundary setback will not easily be achieved for batteries, transformers, pillars or switchgear that is contained within cabinets (i.e., common road reserve equipment), especially in from boundaries. Furthermore, the rule should clearly include associated equipment (i.e., transformers or energy storage batteries) that may be pole-mounted or otherwise contained within the road reserve. To keep electricity prices as low as possible while achieving the above; consequently, the WCC should work with infrastructure providers to ensure an efficient long term strategy and network capacity forecasts are implemented. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-R7.1 (Structures associated with infrastructure including: ...) as follows: Structures <u>and equipment</u> associated with infrastructure including: ... 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. In the Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle or General Industrial Zones, the maximum building and structure height standard for that Zone is complied with. In all other zones INF-S6 must be complied with; b. Any substation, gas regulation valve and/or takeoff station or energy storage batteries are set back at least 2m from a residential site <u>side or rear</u> boundary; c. Compliance is achieved with INF-S7 and INF-S15; and d. Compliance is achieved with INF-S1.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R7 (Structures associated with infrastructure) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.106	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Oppose in part	Submitter is concerned that the use of the term "including" in this rule means that it may not be exhaustive and could inadvertently capture airport structures located outside of the Airport Zone. To be enforceable, the rule must be clear and concise in its application.	Opposes INF-R7 (Structures associated with infrastructure) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.107	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Amend	Submitter is concerned that the use of the term "including" in this rule means that it may not be exhaustive and could inadvertently capture airport structures located outside of the Airport Zone. To be enforceable, the rule must be clear and concise in its application.	Amend INF-R7 (Structures associated with infrastructure) as follows: INF-R7 Structures associated with infrastructure including :
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of structures associated with infrastructure, subject to standards.	Retain INF-R7 (Structures associated with infrastructure including: Substations (including switching stations); Transformers; Gas transmission and distribution structures; Energy storage batteries not enclosed by a building; and Communications kiosks) as notified.
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.10	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R7	Support	Firstgas supports this submission which seeks to retain INF – R7 as notified which provides for structures associated with infrastructure (including gas transmission and distribution structures) as a Permitted Activity subject to achieving relevant standards.	Allow
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R8	Support	INF-R8 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R8 (New infrastructure contained within existing buildings) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R8	Support	Considers that these rules (INF-R3, INF-R4, INF-R6 and INF-R8) appear to be satisfactory for gas distribution networks.	Retain Rule INF-R8 (New infrastructure contained within existing buildings) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R8 (New infrastructure contained within existing buildings) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R9	Amend	Considers that large companies acquire the right to trespass without notification.	Amend INF-R9 (Navigational aids, sensing and environmental monitoring equipment) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory to relevant home owners for upgrading an infrastructure.
Powerco Limited	FS61.31	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R9	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R9	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R9 (Navigational aids, sensing and environmental monitoring equipment (including air quality and meteorological)) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R10	Oppose	INF-R10 should be amended to also provide for above ground telecommunications lines.	Amend the title of INF-R10 (New overhead lines and associated support structures that convey electricity below 110kV) as follows: New overhead lines and associated support structures that <u>either</u> convey electricity below 110kV <u>or are for telecommunications</u> .
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.74	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R10	Support	Supports the provision of a rule specific to new overhead lines and associated support structures that convey electricity below 110kV, and the provision of a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity status.	Retain INF-R10 (New overhead lines and associated support structures that convey electricity below 110kV) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R10	Support in part	Supports INF-R10 in part, but considers this should include associated equipment in its title.	Retain INF-R10 (New overhead lines and associated support structures that convey electricity below 110kV) with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R10	Amend	Considers that the wording in the title of Rule INF-R10 should be amended to include associated equipment identified with overhead networks. This is to ensure provision of additional pole-mounted transformers and or battery storage cabinets are contained within the PDP.	Amend the title of INF-R10 (New overhead lines and associated support structures that convey electricity below 110kV) as follows: INF-R10 (New overhead lines and associated support structures <u>and equipment</u> that convey electricity below 110kV)
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R10 (New overhead lines and associated support structures that convey electricity below 110kV) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R11	Support	INF-R11 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R11 (Telecommunications or radiocommunication activities (not otherwise provided for by another rule in this table and not regulated by the NESTF)) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R11	Amend	Considers that large companies acquire the right to trespass without notification.	Amend INF-R11 (Telecommunications or radiocommunication activities) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory to relevant home owners for upgrading an infrastructure.
Powerco Limited	FS61.32	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R11	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R11	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R11 (Telecommunications or radiocommunication activities (not otherwise provided for by another rule in this table and not regulated by the NESTF)) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R12	Support	INF-R12 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R12 (New telecommunications poles and new antennas (regulated by the NESTF that do not meet the permitted activity standards in those Regulations)) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R12	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R12 (New telecommunications poles and new antennas (regulated by the NESTF that do not meet the permitted activity standards in those Regulations)) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R13	Support	INF-R13 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R13 (New antenna attached to a building (regulated by the NESTF that do not meet the permitted standards in the NESTF)) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R13 (New antenna attached to a building (regulated by the NESTF that do not meet the permitted standards in the NESTF)) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R14	Support	INF-R14 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R14 (New telecommunications cabinets (regulated by the NESTF that do not meet the permitted standards of the NESTF)) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R14	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R14 (New telecommunications cabinets (regulated by the NESTF that do not meet the permitted standards of the NESTF)) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R15	Support	INF-R15 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R15 (Infrastructure buildings and structures not provided for by any other rule in this table) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.75	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R15	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R15 (Infrastructure buildings and structures not provided for by any other rule in this table) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R15	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R15 (Infrastructure buildings and structures not provided for by any other rule in this table) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.108	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R15	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of rules listed as they create an appropriate consenting pathway for infrastructure. Considers that some of the conditions included in these rules will require consequential changes to account for the proposed new objectives and policies identified by the submitter. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Supports INF-R15 (Infrastructure, buildings and structures not provided for by any other rule) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.109	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R15	Amend	Supports the inclusion of rules listed as they create an appropriate consenting pathway for infrastructure. Considers that some of the conditions included in these rules will require consequential changes to account for the proposed new objectives and policies identified by the submitter. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Seeks that INF-R15 (Infrastructure, buildings and structures not provided for by any other rule) is amended to include reference to submitters proposed new objectives and policies within the relevant matters of discretion. [Inferred decision requested]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R15	Support	Supports infrastructure buildings and structures being a permitted activity subject to standards.	Retain INF-R15 (Infrastructure buildings and structures not provided for by any other rule in this table) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.76	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R16	Support	Supports the default rule and provided restricted discretionary activity status. Considers the rule and activity status give effect to the NPS-ET and in particular Policies 1 and 2. Considers the cross references to policies would need to be updated on the basis a separate suite of National Grid policies is provided.	Retain Rule INF-R16 (New electricity lines and associated support structures (including poles and towers) that convey electricity of 110kV or above) as notified. [But amend the policy cross references to reference the proposed National Grid specific policies]
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.77	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R16	Amend	Supports the default rule and provided restricted discretionary activity status. Considers the rule and activity status give effect to the NPS-ET and in particular Policies 1 and 2. Considers the cross references to policies would need to be updated on the basis a separate suite of National Grid policies is provided.	Retain Rule INF-R16 (New electricity lines and associated support structures (including poles and towers) that convey electricity of 110kV or above) as notified. [But amend the policy cross references to reference the proposed National Grid specific policies]
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R16	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R16 (New electricity lines and associated support structures (including poles and towers) that convey electricity of 110kV or above) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R17	Oppose in part	Considers that this rule applies to above ground pipelines and the submitter is opposed only insofar as its potential to apply to the above ground portion of an underground customer connection.	Amend the rules for customer connections (either INF-R2 (New underground infrastructure) or INF-R5 (New aboveground customer connection line)) such that INF-R17 does not apply to the above ground component of a gas customer connection. Provided this is addressed in other rules then no amendment to INF-R17 is required.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R17	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R17 (New aboveground pipelines) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R18	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R18 (New water, wastewater and stormwater pump stations) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.61	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R19	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R19 (New water treatment plants) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.62	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R20	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R20 (New wastewater treatment plants) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.63	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R21	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R21 (Amateur radio configuration) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Support	INF-R22 is supported as it appears to be satisfactory for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-R22 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.78	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Amend	Considers that, on the basis that the National Grid is a qualifying matter, rule INF-R22 should be included as part of the ISPP process.	Seeks that, subject to other amendments sought by the submitter to INF-R22 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard), the rule be included within the IPI and made subject to the ISPP process.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.79	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Support in part	<p>Supports INF-R22 on the basis that it gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPSET.</p> <p>Considers activities established in close proximity to lines and structures can generate reverse sensitivity effects on existing infrastructure. Considers that the provisions sought in relation to the National Grid Yard are intended to allow for the reasonable use of land inside the transmission line corridor. Specific to the 10-12 m 'National Grid Yard', the submitter considers that there are some activities within the National Grid Yard that will not compromise the operation, maintenance or any upgrade of the network, due to their nature and small scale. Conversely, considers that there are examples of development that should be avoided in the National Grid Yard. Considers that of particular relevance in terms of the effects of activities on the National Grid are NPS-ET Policies 10 and 11.</p> <p>Considers that notwithstanding support for the rule, amendments are sought as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insertion of a list of non-complying activities to make it clear to Plan users those activities that are not permitted. This will assist with plan interpretation and application and given the national significance of the National Grid and non-complying activity status for those activities which are not appropriate in the National Grid Yard, will provide certainty for plan users. - On the basis of the sought non-complying activity clause b., permitted activities a. and b. relating to sensitive activities and hazardous substances can be removed as they are more appropriately addressed and framed as non-complying activities. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Supports INF-R22 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.80	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Amend	<p>Supports INF-R22 on the basis that it gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Considers activities established in close proximity to lines and structures can generate reverse sensitivity effects on existing infrastructure. Considers that the provisions sought in relation to the National Grid Yard are intended to allow for the reasonable use of land inside the transmission line corridor. Specific to the 10-12 m 'National Grid Yard', the submitter considers that there are some activities within the National Grid Yard that will not compromise the operation, maintenance or any upgrade of the network, due to their nature and small scale. Conversely, considers that there are examples of development that should be avoided in the National Grid Yard. Considers that of particular relevance in terms of the effects of activities on the National Grid are NPS-ET Policies 10 and 11.</p> <p>Considers that notwithstanding support for the rule, amendments are sought as follows: - Insertion of a list of non-complying activities to make it clear to plan users those activities that are not permitted. This will assist with plan interpretation and application and given the national significance of the National Grid and non-complying activity status for those activities which are not appropriate in the National Grid Yard, will provide certainty for plan users. - On the basis of the sought non-complying activity clause b., permitted activities a. and b. relating to sensitive activities and hazardous substances can be removed as they are more appropriately addressed and framed as non-complying activities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend INF-R22 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) as follows:</p> <p>INF-R22 Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard All Zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is not a sensitive activity; b. The building or structure is not used for the handling or storage of hazardous substances— (Hazardous Substances (Hazard Classification) Notice 2020) with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties (except this does not apply to the accessory use and storage of hazardous substances in domestic scale quantities); and— ... All Zones 2. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. Compliance with INF-R22.1 cannot be achieved. <u>b. The following activity, building or structure:</u> <u>i. A change of use to a sensitive activity within existing buildings or structures;</u> <u>ii. The establishment of a sensitive activity;</u> <u>iii. Used for the handling or storage of hazardous substances (Hazardous Substances (Hazard Classification) Notice 2020) with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties (except this does not apply to the accessory use and storage of hazardous substances in domestic-scale quantities);</u> <u>v. Wintering barns, Commercial greenhouses, Immoveable protective canopies, Produce packing facilities, or Milking Sheds; or</u> <u>vi. Any building or structure not otherwise provided for under INF-R22.1.</u> ... </p>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.64	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R22 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.125	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Support in part	INF-R22 is partially supported but an amendment is sought to remove the establishment of new sensitive activities from the National Grid Yard as a permitted activity.	Retain INF-R22 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Oppose	The intent of the relief sought is not clear. In its submission Transpower sought amendment to R22 to make it clear that sensitive activities are a non-complying activity within the National Grid Yard. The relief sought by Kainga Ora is opposed if the intent is to permit such activities.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.126	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Amend	Considers that INF-R22.1 should be amended to remove the establishment of new sensitive activities from the National Grid Yard as a permitted activity. The rule is considered to appropriately cover the alteration and addition to existing sensitive activities.	Amend INF-R22.1 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is not a sensitive activity; b. a. The building or structure is not for the handling or storage of sus with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties (except this does not apply to the accessory use and storage of hazardous substances in domestic scale quantities); and c. The structure is a fence not exceeding 2.5m in height; d. The building is an uninhabited farm or horticultural structure or building (but not commercial greenhouses, protective canopies, wintering barns, produce packing facilities, or milking/dairy sheds (excluding ancillary stockyards and platforms)); e. Alterations and additions to an existing building or structure for a sensitive activity , which does not involve an increase in the building height or building footprint; or f. An accessory building associated with an existing residential activity that is less than 10m2 in footprint and 2.5m in height; g. Infrastructure undertaken by a network utility operator as defined in the Resource Management Act 1991 or any part of electricity infrastructure that connects to the National Grid; and h. Compliance is achieved with INF-S12
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.10	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Oppose	The intent of the relief sought is not clear. In its submission Transpower sought amendment to R22 to make it clear that sensitive activities are a non-complying activity within the National Grid Yard. The relief sought by Kainga Ora is opposed if the intent is to permit such activities.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.127	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Amend	Considers that INF-R22.2 should be amended to remove the requirement that all applications for resource consent under INF-R22 require the written approval of Transpower New Zealand.	Amend INF-R22.2 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) as follows: 2. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. Compliance with INF-R22.1 cannot be achieved. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule INF-R22.2 is precluded from being publicly <u>or limited</u> notified. Notice of any application for resource consent under this rule must be served on Transpower New Zealand Limited in accordance with Clause 10(2)(i) of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedures) Regulations 2003.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.11	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R22	Oppose	The NPSET recognises the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid to be of national significance. Any development within the National Grid Yard can have implications for both the grid itself as well as the public. Given the technical aspects of the National Grid rule (including NZECP34) it is important Transpower is able to be involved in the resource consent process.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Firstgas Limited	304.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R23	Amend	Considers that INF-R23 should be amended to implement a separation distance of 60m from the gas transmission network, so as to provide a reasonably practicable solution to achieving the safe operation of the network and mitigation of risk for the wellbeing and health and safety of people and communities. The NZ/AS2885 framework and international advice in respect of the New Zealand context should be considered. Consideration has been given to sensitive activities (excluding residential activities) where the consequences of a pipeline failure may be increased because it is developed for use by sectors of the community who may be unable to protect themselves. Sensitive activities have a higher population density than residential activities and therefore greater separation distances are sought.	Amend INF-R23 (Sensitive activities, including the erection of buildings for sensitive activities, within the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor) as follows: Sensitive activities (excluding residential activities), including the erection of buildings for sensitive activities, <u>within 60m of the Gas Transmission Network</u> . Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the proposed activities are likely to compromise the stability and integrity of the gas transmission pipeline network and the operation, maintenance and upgrading of the <u>Gas Transmission Network</u> pipeline network ; 2. The risk of hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage; 3. Measures proposed to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects on the Gas Transmission pipeline Network ; 4. The outcome of any consultation with the owner and operator of the Gas Transmission pipeline Network and Gas Transmission Pipeline Network ; and Whether the sensitive activity could be located a greater distance from the Gas Transmission pipeline Network Gas Transmission Pipeline Network Notice of any application for resource consent under this rule must be served on the owner and operator of the Gas Transmission Pipeline Network in accordance with Clause 10(2)(i) of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedures) Regulations 2003. Note: This rule also applies to the establishment of a sensitive activity in an existing building, or any change of land use to a sensitive activity. If a resource consent application is made under this rule, the owner and operator of the Gas Transmission Network Pipeline will be considered an affected person in accordance with section 95E of the Act and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.63	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R23	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the changes sought. It is unclear where the spatial application of this rule will apply and as such a cost benefit analysis cannot be undertaken. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendments and introduction of the rule.	Disallow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.65	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R23	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R23 (Sensitive activities, including the erection of buildings for sensitive activities, within the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor) as notified.
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.11	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R23	Support	Firstgas supports this submission which seeks to retain Rule INF – R23 as notified. Rule INF – R23 provides for sensitive activities, including the erection of buildings for sensitive activities, within the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. The requirement for consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity allows for the proposed activity to be assessed against the relevant matters of discretion. This ensures that the activity is appropriately managed in relation to the potential effects associated with the Gas Transmission Pipeline. Firstgas as the owner and operator of the Gas Transmission Pipeline will be notified of an application under this rule where written approval has not been provided.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.64	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R24	Amend	Considers that Rule INF-R24.2 (Connections to roads) states that the matters of discretion are “The matters in INF-P13.” However, INF-P13 relates to Infrastructure within riparian margins. This should instead reference (INF-P11 Connections to roads).	Amend matters of discretion under INF-R24.2 (Connections to roads) as follows: a. The matters in INF- P13 <u>P11</u> .

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R24	Support in part	Supports the rule as it requires connections to roads to comply with a list of standards. Considers it necessary to ensure that connections to roads accommodate access for fire appliances in situations where the site is located in an unreticulated area, or the length of the driveway exceeds hose run distances. Therefore supports INF-R24, subject to the relief sought under INF-S16.	Retain INF-R24 (Connections to roads) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.66	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R24	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R24 (Connections to roads) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.128	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R24	Oppose in part	INF-R24 is opposed as it divides transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters. This is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Delete INF-R24 (Connections to roads) and move the Rule to the Transport chapter.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R24	Oppose	The transport network is a type of infrastructure. There are matters that are common to transport and other types of infrastructure and there are matters specific to transport. It is sensible and appropriate to group them as drafted in the proposed plan.	Disallow
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R24	Amend	Considers there may be a reference error in this rule - it refers to INF-S16 and INF-S17, but should instead refer to INF-15 and INF-16.	Amend INF-R24 (Connections to roads) to: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The connection provides site access for sites with no driveway, on-site parking or loading; and b. Compliance is achieved with INF-S16 INF-S15; Or c. The connection provides site access to an Urban Road (except a Transit Corridor) or a Rural Road (except National Highway) as identified in mapped in the road classification overlay; and d. Compliance is achieved with INF-S17 INF-S16.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R25	Support in part	Supports the rule subject to amendments sought under INF-S13 and related Table 1. Amendments sought to INF-S13 includes the need to provide for unhindered vehicle access, including fire appliance access, on all roads. Considers it is necessary to ensure that controlled and discretionary activities under this rule require compliance with INF-S13, subject to the relief sought. In turn, a matter of control should include the consideration of fire access for activities which infringe this rule and associated standards. Considers it will give better effect to policy INF-P1 which seeks to provide for the functions and responsibilities of infrastructure as lifeline utilities during an emergency, as well as the relief sought under INF-P9.	Retain INF-R25 (New roads) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.67	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R25	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R25 (New roads) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.129	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R25	Oppose in part	INF-R25 is opposed as it divides transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters. This is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Delete INF-R25 (New roads) and move the Rule to the Transport chapter.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.68	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R26	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-R26 (Structures near railway level crossings) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-R26	Amend	Considers that public safety at level crossings is crucial, and protection of sightlines is a key means of ensuring this. KiwiRail therefore support the inclusion of a rule and standard for sight triangles for railway level crossings. KiwiRail seek amendment to this rule to ensure it applies to all potential visual obstructions, not just structures, as listed in INF-S14.	Amend INF-R26 (Structures near railway level crossings) as follows: Structures near Sightlines at railway level crossings 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with INF-S14.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S1	Support	INF-S1 is supported as it is considered to be workable for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-S1 (Health and safety) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.81	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S1	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-S1 (Health and safety) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S2	Support	INF-S2 is supported as it is considered to be workable for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-S2 (Underground infrastructure) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S2	Support	Considers that these standards (INF-S2, INF-S3, INF-S4, INF-S5, INF-S6 and INF-S7) are all workable for gas distribution networks.	Retain standard INF-S2 (Underground infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.82	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S2	Support in part	Supports INF-S2, noting that where used in INF-R1, it has been clarified the standard applies to existing underground infrastructure.	Retain INF-S2 (Underground infrastructure), with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.83	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S2	Support in part	Supports INF-S2, noting that where used in INF-R1, it has been clarified the standard applies to existing underground infrastructure.	Amend INF-S2 (Underground infrastructure) to include the clarification in INF-R1 that specifies that the standard applies to existing underground infrastructure (refer to INF-R1.1.c.i).
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S2	Support	Supports INF-S2 as it allows for electricity conductors to be placed beneath a natural waterbody.	Retain INF-S2 (Underground infrastructure) as notified.
Rod Halliday	25.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S3	Amend	INF-S3.3 is too restrictive as it is unrealistic to restrict trenching to 120m at any one time. This length is arbitrary and unworkable. Trenches are critical short term works necessary to enable infrastructure to be put in the ground and in our experience do not lead to significant erosion and sediment control issues.	Amend INF-S3 (Earthworks) as follows (Delete point 3.): 1. Earthworks must not create a dust nuisance; 2. As soon as practical, but not later than three months after the completion of earthworks or stages of earthworks, the earthworks area must be stabilised with vegetation or sealed, paved, metalled or built over; 3. Trenching must be progressively closed and stabilised such that no more than 120m of continuous trench is exposed to erosion at any one time; ...
Heidi Snelson	FS24.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S3	Oppose	Submitter seeks to undertake extensive earthworks without defined limits as specified by PDP in relation to depth or width or extent (across and beyond development).	Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed in part to limit prescribed/allowed earthworks to build areas only and check this is the case.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S3	Support	INF-S3 is supported as it is considered to be workable for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-S3 (Earthworks) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S3	Support	Considers that these standards (INF-S2, INF-S3, INF-S4, INF-S5, INF-S6 and INF-S7) are all workable for gas distribution networks.	Retain standard INF-S3 (earthworks) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.84	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S3	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-S3 (Earthworks) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S4	Oppose	INF-S4 relates to upgrading above ground infrastructure. Whilst it enables the upgrade of telecommunications poles to the greater of the existing height or standards in INF-S8, it does not include any provision for replacement of antennas, or making changes to the width of an antenna support headframe (only the support pole itself). Changes to address this are requested.	Amend Standard INF-S4 (Upgrading of aboveground infrastructure) as follows: ... 4. The diameter or width of a replacement pole or telecommunications pole or <u>telecommunications pole antenna support headframe</u> : a. Must not exceed twice that of the replaced pole at its widest point; or b. Where a single pole is replaced with a pi pole, the width of the pi pole structure must not exceed 4.2m; <u>4.A. The size of any antenna attached to a telecommunications pole shall not exceed the standards in INF-S9.</u>
Powerco Limited	127.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S4	Support	Considers that these standards (INF-S2, INF-S3, INF-S4, INF-S5, INF-S6 and INF-S7) are all workable for gas distribution networks.	Retain standard INF-S4 (Upgrading of aboveground infrastructure) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.85	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S4	Support	Considers that specific to the National Grid, the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 ("NESETA") provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid. On this basis, considers INF-S4 is of limited relevance to Transpower, but as notified, is supported.	Retain INF-S4 (Upgrading of aboveground infrastructure) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S5	Support	INF-S5 is supported as it is considered to be workable for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-S5 (New aboveground customer connections) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S5	Support	Considers that these standards (INF-S2, INF-S3, INF-S4, INF-S5, INF-S6 and INF-S7) are all workable for gas distribution networks.	Retain standard INF-S5 (New aboveground customer connections) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S5	Support in part	Supports INF-S5 in general, but considers the provision should specify conductor diameter.	Retain INF-S5 (New aboveground customer connections) with amendment,
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S5	Amend	Considers that INF-S5 should be amended to have the specification for the conductor diameter increased to 43mm to reflect technical considerations.	Amend INF-S5 (New aboveground customer connections) as follows: 1. The connection must not exceed three additional poles; and 2. The diameter of conductors, lines, pipes or cables must not exceed 30mm, <u>and 43mm for conductors.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S6	Support	INF-S6 is supported as it is considered to be workable for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-S6 (Structures) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S6	Support	Considers that these standards (INF-S2, INF-S3, INF-S4, INF-S5, INF-S6 and INF-S7) are all workable for gas distribution networks.	Retain standard INF-S6 (Structures) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.86	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S6	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-S6 (Structures) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S7	Support	INF-S7 is supported as it is considered to be workable for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-S7 (Riparian setbacks) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S7	Support	Considers that these standards (INF-S2, INF-S3, INF-S4, INF-S5, INF-S6 and INF-S7) are all workable for gas distribution networks.	Retain standard INF-S7 (Riparian setbacks) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.87	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S7	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-S7 (Riparian setbacks) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S7	Support in part	Supports INF-S7 in part, but seeks amendment to ensure consistency with INF-S2 that the riparian setbacks do not apply to infrastructure beneath the waterbody's bed.	Retain INF-S7 (Riparian setbacks), with amendment.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.2	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S7	Support	Removing unnecessary regulations from underground infrastructure in riparian margins associated with waterway crossings is supported.	Allow
Powerco Limited	FS61.2	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S7	Support	Removing unnecessary regulations from underground infrastructure in riparian margins associated with waterway crossings is supported.	Allow
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S7	Amend	Considers that INF-S7 should be amended to ensure consistency with INF-S2, which states that the riparian setbacks do not apply to infrastructure beneath the waterbody's bed.	Amend INF-S7 (Riparian setbacks) as follows: 1. No infrastructure shall be located on or in land within 10 metres of the bed of any river. This setback does not apply to infrastructure that is located within formed legal road or crosses a river along a bridge or beneath the bed of the river.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S8	Support	INF-S8 is supported as it is considered to be workable for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-S8 (Height of telecommunication poles and associated antennas, lines and single pole support structures and meteorological masts) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S8	Support in part	Supports INF-S8 in part, but seeks amendment to clarify the standard.	Retain INF-S8 (Height of telecommunication poles and associated antennas, lines and single pole support structures and meteorological masts) with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S8	Amend	Considers that INF-S8 should be clarified so that it applies to electricity infrastructure. As currently worded an interpretation could be made that the standards only apply to Telecommunication poles.	Amend the title of INF-S8 (Height of telecommunication poles and associated antennas, lines and single pole support structures and meteorological masts) as follows: Height of <u>electricity and</u> telecommunication poles and associated antennas, lines and single pole support structures and meteorological masts.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S9	Support	INF-S9 is supported as it is considered to be workable for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-S9 (Antenna size) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S10	Support	INF-S10 is supported as it is considered to be workable for telecommunications networks.	Retain INF-S10 (Height of antenna attached to buildings) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.88	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S12	Amend	Considers that, on the basis that the National Grid is a qualifying matter, INF-S12 should be included part of the ISPP process.	Seeks that, subject to other amendments sought by the submitter to INF-S12 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard), the standard be included within the IPI and made subject to the ISPP process.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.89	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S12	Support in part	<p>Supports standard INF-S12 which supports INF-R22 on the basis it gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Seeks amendment to the standard as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replacement of clause 1 and 2 with a reference to general compliance with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001). Considers This ensures all the safety distances are complied with for all activities (and not just clearance distances). - Insertion of a new clause 2. relating to ensuring vehicular access is maintained to support structures. Considers access is an important component of the electricity transmission network and planning framework. Considers physical access to transmission lines achieves NPS-ET policies 2 and 10. Considers the rule is appropriate in the district plan as while Transpower has the legal right under the Electricity Act 1992 to access the lines, the physical ability to access the lines also needs to be protected and ensure the NPS-ET is given effect to, and the line is able to be operated and maintained. Resource consent at the land use stage is an appropriate time and mechanism in which to manage the effects - Renumbering of clause 3.c. to make it a subset of the exemption within clause 3.b. Considers this means that compliance with clause 2.4.1 of NZECP as an exception, only applies to artificial crop and support structures as opposed to fences or any other activity. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Supports Standard INF-S12 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard), with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.90	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S12	Amend	<p>Supports standard INF-S12 which supports INF-R22 on the basis it gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Seeks amendment to the standard as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replacement of clause 1 and 2 with a reference to general compliance with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001). Considers This ensures all the safety distances are complied with for all activities (and not just clearance distances). - Insertion of a new clause 2. relating to ensuring vehicular access is maintained to support structures. Considers access is an important component of the electricity transmission network and planning framework. Considers physical access to transmission lines achieves NPS-ET policies 2 and 10. Considers the rule is appropriate in the district plan as while Transpower has the legal right under the Electricity Act 1992 to access the lines, the physical ability to access the lines also needs to be protected and ensure the NPS-ET is given effect to, and the line is able to be operated and maintained. Resource consent at the land use stage is an appropriate time and mechanism in which to manage the effects - Renumbering of clause 3.c. to make it a subset of the exemption within clause 3.b. Considers this means that compliance with clause 2.4.1 of NZECP as an exception, only applies to artificial crop and support structures as opposed to fences or any other activity. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend Standard INF-S12 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) as follows:</p> <p>INF-S12 Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard All Zones</p> <p>1. <u>All buildings and structures in the National Grid Yard must comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001) ISSN 01140663 under all transmission line and building operating conditions. The building or structure must have a minimum vertical clearance of 10m below the lowest point of a conductor under all transmission line and building operating conditions; or</u></p> <p>2. Must not result in the loss of vehicular access to a National Grid support structure. Must meet the safe electrical clearance distances required by New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001) ISSN 01140663 under all transmission line and building operating conditions.</p> <p>3. ...</p> <p>e. <u>iii.</u> Meets the requirements of clause 2.4.1 of New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001) ISSN 01140663.</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.130	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S12	Oppose in part	INF-S12 is opposed as it provides specific requirements regarding the National Grid and amendments to the package of the provisions is sought.	Opposes INF-S12 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) and seeks amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.12	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S12	Oppose	<p>The submission is not clear as to why INF-S12 is opposed and the reasoning for the amendments sought.</p> <p>Subject to amendment as sought in its submission, Transpower supports INF-S12 on the basis it gives effect to policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Avryl Bramley	202.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Amend	Considers that cycles have different speeds and should be classified differently.	Amend Table 1 of the Infrastructure chapter (Design of roads) to remove requirements for Footpath and Cycles until further work is undertaken to classify different types of cycles.
Powerco Limited	FS61.33	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Support in part	Supports the standard insofar as it requires minimum road widths to be constructed in accordance with Table 1, to provide unhindered vehicle access including fire appliance access. Notwithstanding, the minimum requirements for Local Street M5 P3 are insufficient for fire appliances. Therefore considers it is appropriate to ensure that criterion 3 of this standard ensures that the minimum width of roads provides for fire appliance access, as well as the other considerations listed.	Support INF-S13 (Design of roads) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Amend	Supports the standard insofar as it requires minimum road widths to be constructed in accordance with Table 1, to provide unhindered vehicle access including fire appliance access. Notwithstanding, the minimum requirements for Local Street M5 P3 are insufficient for fire appliances. Therefore considers it is appropriate to ensure that criterion 3 of this standard ensures that the minimum width of roads provides for fire appliance access, as well as the other considerations listed.	Amend INF-S13 (Design of roads) as follows: ... 3. Roads must have at least the minimum widths in accordance with Table 1 – INF: Design of Roads –One Network Framework: a. Minimum total, legal width; and b. Minimum width to provide for: ... vi. Infrastructure, and vii. Street trees, and viii. Fire appliance access
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Support in part	Notes that a fire appliance requires, as a minimum, access which is 4 metres in width and 4 metres in height clearance, with a maximum gradient of 1 in 5 (and accompanying transition ramps). Within urban areas, Table 1 states that roads classified as 'Local Street M5 P3' are only required to have a minimum of one lane with a traffic width of 3.5m which would be insufficient for fire appliances. Local Street M5 P3 applies to roads with no vehicle access to frontage and may result in the full length of a single lane road being used for parking (with no breaks usually achieved with vehicle accesses). Street design, including beautification features such as street trees and furniture, can further hinder the ability for FENZ to efficiently and effectively respond to emergency call outs.	Supports Table 1 - INF: Design of Roads - One Network Framework, with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Amend	Notes that a fire appliance requires, as a minimum, access which is 4 metres in width and 4 metres in height clearance, with a maximum gradient of 1 in 5 (and accompanying transition ramps). Within urban areas, Table 1 states that roads classified as 'Local Street M5 P3' are only required to have a minimum of one lane with a traffic width of 3.5m which would be insufficient for fire appliances. Local Street M5 P3 applies to roads with no vehicle access to frontage and may result in the full length of a single lane road being used for parking (with no breaks usually achieved with vehicle accesses). Street design, including beautification features such as street trees and furniture, can further hinder the ability for FENZ to efficiently and effectively respond to emergency call outs.	Amend Table 1 - INF: Design of Roads - One Network Framework: Local Street M5 P3: 1 x 3.5 1 x 4
Waka Kotahi	370.90	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Amend	Definition of target speed has been removed from this chapter but Table 1 still has target speed.	Seeks to remove target speed from table 1 of INF-13 (Design of roads).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.91	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Amend	Considers that roads should be designed to suit the desired form and function (under the One Network Framework), with the posted speed limit being an output of that process, rather than an input and aligned with the current speed management review.	Seeks for the policy to align existing posted speed limits with the One Network Framework and current speed management review.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.131	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Oppose in part	INF-S13 is opposed as it divides transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters. This is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.	Delete INF-S13 (Design of roads) from the Infrastructure Chapter and move the Standard to the Transport chapter.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Amend	Supports the use of native Wellington species as street trees.	Seeks that Table 3 - INF: Street Tree Species List is amended to have more native Wellington tree species used as street trees. [Inferred decision requested]
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S13	Not specified	Considers that vehicle space should be limited on all roads to support the desired mode shift. Additional vehicle lane width or numbers have negative effects. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that vehicle space is limited on all roads.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S14	Amend	Seeks amendment to INF-S14 to ensure the standard captures all visual obstructions, including structures and planting, and to provide protection for the sightlines in the event of any new level crossing being established. KiwiRail note that there are no Stop or Give Way Controlled public level crossings in Wellington City at the present time. While KiwiRail typically do not support the creation of new level crossings given the safety risks associated with this, the potential for Stop of Give Way Controlled level crossings being established over the expected life of the District Plan cannot be eliminated, noting Let's Get Wellington Moving light rail proposals.	Amend INF-S14 (Sight Triangles for Railway Level Crossings) as follows: Buildings, structures, planting or other visual obstructions must not be located within the restart or approach sightline areas of railway level crossings as shown in the shaded areas of Figure 1 – INF: Restart Sightlines and Figure 2 – INF: Approach Sightlines below
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S14	Amend	Seeks amendment to INF-S14 to ensure the standard captures all visual obstructions, including structures and planting, and to provide protection for the sightlines in the event of any new level crossing being established. KiwiRail note that there are no Stop or Give Way Controlled public level crossings in Wellington City at the present time. While KiwiRail typically do not support the creation of new level crossings given the safety risks associated with this, the potential for Stop of Give Way Controlled level crossings being established over the expected life of the District Plan cannot be eliminated, noting Let's Get Wellington Moving light rail proposals.	Add new figure being Figure 2 – INF: Approach Sightlines to INF-S14 (Sight Triangles for Railway Level Crossings). [Refer to original submission for figure that is sought to be added]
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S15	Amend	Considers that a 1.5m minimum pedestrian access width is more appropriate than the proposed 1.8m.	Amend INF-S15 (Connection to roads - sites with pedestrian, cycling and micromobility site access only) to: 1) For sites with frontage to a road: a) The direct legal road frontage must have a width of at least 1.8m <u>1.5m</u> . 2) For sites with no frontage to a road: a) Access must be provided to a road via an access easement with a width of at least 1.8m <u>1.5m</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Support in part	Considers a 3m driveways are insufficient where driveway lengths are such that fire appliances could not tackle property or vegetation fires from an accessible, legal road. A fire appliance requires, as a minimum, access which is 4 metres in width and 4m in height clearance, with a required to provide access for fire appliances, which may need to include access to on-site firefighting water supply maximum gradient of 15% (and accompanying transition ramps). It is considered therefore that an exclusion to maximum driveway access widths, for the full length of any driveway, ought to be included for driveways which are required to provide access for fire appliances, which may need to include access to on-site firefighting water supply.	Amend INF-S16 (Connection to roads - driveways), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.25	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Support	Support the Fire Service access requirements and note that this is relevant to health and safety issues raised in their September 2022 submission as Qualifying Matters relating to Hay Street and the 'Hay Street Extension'. The narrowness of Hay St and the Hay St Extension in particular make high density intensification inappropriate.	Allow
Don MacKay	FS94.25	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Support	Supports the Fire Service access requirements and note that this is relevant to health and safety issues raised above as Qualifying Matters relating to Wilkinson Street. The steepness and narrowness of Wilkinson Street make high density intensification inappropriate.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Amend	Considers a 3m driveways are insufficient where driveway lengths are such that fire appliances could not tackle property or vegetation fires from an accessible, legal road. A fire appliance requires, as a minimum, access which is 4 metres in width and 4m in height clearance, with a required to provide access for fire appliances, which may need to include access to on-site firefighting water supply maximum gradient of 15% (and accompanying transition ramps). It is considered therefore that an exclusion to maximum driveway access widths, for the full length of any driveway, ought to be included for driveways which are required to provide access for fire appliances, which may need to include access to on-site firefighting water supply.	Amend INF-S16 (connections to roads - driveways) as follows: ... <u>10. Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u> <u>a. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>b. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>c. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>d. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>e. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>f. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.33	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Pan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.33	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Pan.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Amend	<p>Considers that INF-S16 should be amended due to the following reasons:</p> <p>At 1, The section does not allow for ROW from another site creating what is apparently a second vehicle crossing for a site.</p> <p>At 2, The section requiring a 99th percentile vehicle is in not consistent with the TR-S6 requirement that the minimum design vehicle for driveways must be a 4.91m x 1.87m vehicle (85th percentile vehicle).</p> <p>At 3, level 1, 2 and 3 Driveways listed are described in the transport section at Table 8- TR (setting out the vehicle movements each category allows for) and Table 9- TR (setting out the design requirements for each of the categories. A link or reference would have been useful the requirements of Table 9 -TR mean that a driveway may need to approach the carriageway at an angle rather than perpendicularly. The proposed wording at d. addresses this.</p> <p>There is also no mention of the TR-R3 1b) requirement that 'the access is not to a state highway.'</p> <p>Apart from this, it is common for houses to have a double garage or double carport facing the street. this situation should also be allowed for. The proposed wording at c. addresses this.</p>	<p>Amend INF-S16 (Connection to roads - driveways) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The number of vehicle crossings per site must not exceed one. <u>Where a vehicle crossing serves a right of way from another site it shall be assigned to that site and not to the site where the crossing is located.</u> The minimum design vehicle for a vehicle crossing is a <u>4.51m x 1.87m vehicle (85th percentile vehicle)</u>. 5.20m x 1.94m vehicle (99th percentile vehicle) For Urban Roads, the length of a vehicle crossing parallel to the road must be no more than: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3m for driveways level 1 6m for driveways level 2 and 4 <u>6m for a crossing leading to a double garage or double carport within 5m of the street boundary d. where meeting the requirements of Table 9-TR means a driveway perpendicular to the carriageway is not possible, the maximum vehicle crossing length increases to 6m for driveways level 1 and 9m for driveways level 2 and 3</u> For Rural Roads: <p>....</p> <p>(See Table 8 -TR for the classification of driveways and Table 9 - TR for the design of driveways)</p>
Waka Kotahi	370.92	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Amend	<p>Considers that longer setback for driveways on local roads that intersect with a state highway, in accordance with New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 5B – Accessway standards and guidelines, Table App5B/3. [See original submission Appendix A]</p>	<p>Amend to include a standard requiring that roads intersecting a state highway intersection comply with the New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 5B – Accessway standards and guidelines, Table App5B/3 – Guidelines for minimum accessway spacing requirements</p> <p>[see original submission Appendix A].</p>
Waka Kotahi	370.93	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Amend	<p>Considers that longer sight distances, especially for the higher speeds, in alignment with New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 5B – Accessway standards and guidelines, Table App5B/1. [See original submission Appendix B.]</p>	<p>Amend to standards in alignment with New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 5B Accessway standards and guidelines, Section 5B/1 Sight distances.</p> <p>[see original submission Appendix B].</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.132	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Oppose in part	<p>INF-S16 is opposed as it divides transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters. This is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.</p>	<p>Delete INF-S16 (Connection to roads - driveways) from the Infrastructure Chapter and move the Standard to the Transport chapter.</p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S16	Support	<p>Supports the requirement for vehicle crossings to be setback a minimum of 30m from a railway level crossing as specified in clause 8.</p>	<p>Retain INF-S16 (Connection to roads - driveways) as notified.</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.133	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure / INF-S17	Oppose in part	<p>INF-S17 is opposed as it divides transport related provisions between the transport and infrastructure chapters. This is inconsistent with best practice and makes navigation of the plan difficult for users.</p>	<p>Delete INF-S17 (Intersections) from the Infrastructure Chapter and move the Standard to the Transport chapter.</p>
Meridian Energy Limited	228.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Oppose in part	<p>Considers the expression 'infrastructure' potentially captures regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities. Meridian understood the intention of the Plan to be that the rules for renewable electricity generation activities, structures and buildings would be wholly contained in the REG chapter.</p> <p>Considers the note in the preamble is not entirely helpful in clarifying this in relation to regionally significant infrastructure such as renewable electricity generation activities. The standards listed for general infrastructure activities in the coastal environment are entirely inappropriate for renewable electricity generation activities and structures and should not be construed as a 'permitted baseline' for renewable electricity generation activities there, and particularly not for existing wind farms.</p>	<p>Amend the Introduction to Chapter INF-CE Infrastructure Coastal Environment Rules, by inserting the following (or similar) clarification note:</p> <p><u>The rules applicable to renewable electricity generation activities in the coastal environment, including in areas of high and very high coastal natural character, are contained in Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation. The rules in Chapter INF-CE Infrastructure Coastal Environment do not apply to renewable electricity generation activities in the coastal environment, including in areas of high and very high coastal natural character in the coastal environment.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Amend	<p>Considers the expression 'infrastructure' potentially captures regionally significant infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation activities. Meridian understood the intention of the Plan to be that the rules for renewable electricity generation activities, structures and buildings would be wholly contained in the REG chapter.</p> <p>Considers the note in the preamble is not entirely helpful in clarifying this in relation to regionally significant infrastructure such as renewable electricity generation activities. The standards listed for general infrastructure activities in the coastal environment are entirely inappropriate for renewable electricity generation activities and structures and should not be construed as a 'permitted baseline' for renewable electricity generation activities there, and particularly not for existing wind farms.</p>	<p>Amend the Introduction to the Infrastructure Coastal Environment Rules chapter, by inserting the following (or similar) clarification note:</p> <p><u>The rules applicable to renewable electricity generation activities in the coastal environment, including in areas of high and very high coastal natural character, are contained in Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation. The rules in Chapter INF-CE Infrastructure Coastal Environment do not apply to renewable electricity generation activities in the coastal environment, including in areas of high and very high coastal natural character in the coastal environment.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.91	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Amend	<p>The submitter has existing assets within the coastal environment, including the Kaiwharawhara Supply Point substation (designation TPR6) and underground cable, Oteranga Bay (designation TPR4) and associated lines, and Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station (designation TPR5) and associated lines. Both the Oteranga Bay (designation TPR4) and Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station (designation TPR5) are within areas of "High Coastal Natural Character" noting there are no existing assets within the identified "High Coastal Natural Character" outside the designations.</p> <p>Transpower has no existing assets in area of "Very High Coastal Natural Character".</p> <p>Supports the introductory text but seeks clarification that the National Grid is subject to specific policies and rules within the sub-chapter and the general sub-chapter provisions do not apply.</p> <p>[see original submission for images supplied]</p>	<p>Amend the introduction to the Infrastructure Coastal Environment (INF-CE) chapter as follows:</p> <p>This sub-chapter applies to infrastructure within the Coastal Environment. It applies in addition to the principal Infrastructure Chapter.</p> <p><u>Included within the sub-chapter are provisions specific to the National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipelines Corridor (GTPC). For the avoidance of doubt, other sub-chapter policies and rules within this sub-chapter do not apply to the National Grid.</u></p> <p>Note: The objectives of the Infrastructure Chapter apply.</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Support in part	<p>Considers the provisions should be no less protective than those in the Coastal Environment chapter. The provisions in this chapter should mirror the Coastal Environment provisions, with the amendments made as sought by F&B in respect of that chapter. We also repeat the submissions made in respect of the Coastal Environment chapter. Provisions that only protect areas of high natural character, and do not also protect other areas of natural character in the coastal environment, do not give effects to policy 13 Zipser therefore seek that any provisions in this chapter that apply to high natural character apply to all areas of natural character in the coastal environment.</p>	<p>Amend the INF-CE chapter to be as protective as the Coastal Environment chapter and align with direction set out in Policy 13 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.20	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Oppose	<p>Given the general nature of the relief sought, Transpower opposes the submission point.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.</p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.62	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Oppose	<p>WIAL submits that there are numerous provisions within the NZCPS that need to be considered and balanced within the Proposed Plan, not just Policy 13. Furthermore, the Coastal Environment has been broadly defined in the Proposed Plan, meaning that broadly drafted provisions could have perverse outcomes for existing, built up, urban areas of the District.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.32	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Oppose	<p>Considers that the RMA, NZCPS and RPS do not require that all of the natural character of the coastal environment (which includes modified natural character) is to be protected.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Oppose	NZCPS Policy 13 stipulates that the coastal environment be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Waka Kotahi considers that the INF-CE chapter is clear on what grounds infrastructure is appropriate for that environment.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Support in part	Considers that the rules of the INF-CE chapter be amended to give effect to submission points on INF-CE policies above, and also to mirror the rules (as amendment by F&B submissions) in the CE chapters. Rules should be as protective as those sought by F&B in the CE chapter.	Amend the rules of the INF-CE chapter to align with feedback provided on previous submission points on this chapter.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.21	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Oppose	Given the general nature of the relief sought, Transpower opposes the submission point.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.63	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Oppose	WIAL submits that there are numerous provisions within the NZCPS that need to be considered and balanced within the Proposed Plan, not just Policy 13. Furthermore, the Coastal Environment has been broadly defined in the Proposed Plan, meaning that broadly drafted provisions could have perverse outcomes for existing, built up, urban areas of the District.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.33	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Oppose	Meridian does not agree that the rules in the CE chapter should be replicated in this INF-CE chapter, for the reasons explained in its own submission point 228.25. The CE chapter rules are not tailored for or appropriate for large scale renewable electricity generation facilities.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' to include Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.119	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Support	Greater Wellington support the inclusion and protection of SASM.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.110	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE	Amend	Considers that many infrastructure providers have a functional or operational requirement to locate in a certain area, even if that area is subject to natural hazard risk. Such infrastructure providers natural hazard tolerance is therefore inherently different to those without the same operational and functional need to locate in such areas. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that infrastructure located within the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlay, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, is exempt from the provisions relating to the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlay.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / New INF-CE	Oppose	Considers that the INF-CE chapter is unclear and should have a new rule clarifying if customer connections are regulated by this chapter. If they are it is assumed that the rules that apply to new infrastructure would then apply which may inappropriately constrain provision of customer connections to existing activities within the Coastal Environment.	Add a new rule to the Infrastructure Coastal Environment chapter providing for customer connections in the Coastal Environment as a permitted activity, provided any underground connection complies with INF-S3, and any overhead connection is only permitted where it is from existing overhead network reticulation.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.1	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / New INF-CE	Support	WELL support the submission point as the new rule will similarly enable customer connections to the electricity supply network without inadvertently requiring land use consent. WELL agree with the submitter that customer connections in the Coastal Environment should be clearly identified as a permitted activity, yet subject to the connection being underground and compliant with INF-S3. Accepting this submission point will assist in clarifying WELL's activities in the Coastal Environment.	Allow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.92	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / New INF-CE	Amend	<p>Considers that Transpower has existing assets within the coastal environment, including the Kaiwharawhara Supply Point substation (designation TPR6) and underground cable, Oteranga Bay (designation TPR4) and associated lines, and Te Hikohenua Shore Electrode Station (designation TPR5) and associated lines.</p> <p>Considers the existing assets are regulated by the designations and the NESETA, noting that s43D RMA prescribes the relationship between designations and the NESETA. Policy P26 relates to existing National Grid assets within the Coastal Environment, and recognises the existing assets. The policy approach within P26 is supported and gives effect to Policies 2 and 5 of the NPS-ET. A minor amendment is sought to include "minor upgrade", in recognition of the existing assets. A minor upgrade may be something like increasing the height of a pole support structure, or moving the same dimensioned pole within 5m of its existing location, or adding on an additional insulator.</p>	<p>Option 2: Add new National Grid specific policy as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P2 Operation, and maintenance and minor upgrade of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>Provide for the operation, maintenance and minor upgrade of the National Grid while managing the adverse effects of these activities.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.93	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / New INF-CE	Amend	<p>Opposes INF-CE-P32 and proposes an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid.</p> <p>Considers that the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET (noting the NPS-ET also applies to the coastal environment) in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The directive wording "only allow" within the policy does not reflect the enabling wording used in the NPS-ET. - The NPS-ET does not require that natural character be maintained or restored. Rather Policy 8 of the NPS-ET requires a 'seek to avoid' approach with policies 3 and 4 prescribing the matters to consider and have regard to. - The NPS-ET does not require significant adverse effects be avoided, rather policy 8 prescribes a seek to avoid approach. <p>It is also noted that although the National Grid is recognised of national significance within the NPS-ET (being a higher order policy document) it is afforded the exact same policy framework as other infrastructure (as provided in INF-CE P25). This further reinforces Transpower's concerns the PDP does not give effect to the NPS-ET.</p>	<p>Add a new National Grid specific in the Infrastructure Coastal Environment chapter policy as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P6 Development of the National Grid Provide for the development of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>1. In urban zoned areas, development should minimise adverse effects on urban amenity and should avoid material adverse effects on the Commercial and Mixed-Use zones, and areas of high recreational or amenity value and existing sensitive activities.</u></p> <p><u>2. Seek to avoid the adverse effects of the National Grid within areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, and SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, outside the coastal environment.</u></p> <p><u>3. where the National Grid has a functional need or operational need to locate within the coastal environment, manage adverse effects by:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Seeking to avoid adverse effects on areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, and the Coastal Margin.</u> b. <u>where it is not practicable to avoid adverse effects on the values of the areas in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes; and the Coastal Margin because of the functional needs or operational needs of the National Grid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on those values.</u> c. <u>Seeking to avoid significant adverse effects on:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>other areas of natural character</u> ii. <u>natural attributes and character of other natural features and natural landscapes</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p><u>iii. indigenous biodiversity values that meet the criteria in Policy 11(b) of the NZCPS 2010</u></p> <p><u>d. Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>e. Recognising there may be some areas within SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes; and the Coastal Margin, where avoidance of adverse effects is required to protect the identified values and characteristics.</u></p> <p><u>4. Remedy or mitigate any adverse effects from the operation, maintenance, upgrade, major upgrade or development of the National Grid which cannot be avoided, to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>5. When considering the adverse effects in respect of 1-3 above;</u></p> <p><u>a. Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection; and</u></p> <p><u>b. Consider the constraints arising from the operational needs or functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects</u></p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P14	Oppose	Considers the policy does not give effect to Policy 13 of NZCPS. Considers it is not appropriate to apply an 'allow' direction to activities in the coastal environment, particularly not for upgrading, which can cause significant adverse effects	Amend INF-CE-P14 (Operation, maintenance, and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) to not "allow" for infrastructure activities in the coastal environment.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.34	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P14	Oppose	Considers that policy INF-P14 applies to existing lawfully established facilities. It is appropriate to allow upgrading of existing facilities, which potentially has substantially lesser environmental effects that having to establish new or expanded renewable electricity generation facilities elsewhere (including in the coastal environment).	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.94	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P14	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P14 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and - Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P14	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P14 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins.)	Retain policy INF-CE-P14 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P14	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-P14 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.111	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P14	Oppose	Opposes this policy insofar as it encourages the duplication of controls within the coastal environment that can otherwise be managed by the general infrastructure provisions. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.46 to 4.49 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-CE-P14 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure with the coastal environment) in its entirety.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P14	Support	Supports providing for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of existing infrastructure, and new infrastructure within the coastal environment. Parts of the rail network in Wellington City are within the coastal environment area.	Retain INF-CE-P14 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P15	Support in part	Considers the policy needs to be extended to apply to any area of natural character in the coastal environment.	Amend INF-CE-P15 (Operation, maintenance, and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) to apply to any area of natural character in the coastal environment.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P15	Oppose	No revised policy wording has been proposed to determine the impact of any change. We reserve our position on any amendments to this policy pending ensuring any revised wording does not seek a threshold more restrictive than avoiding significant adverse effects in areas in the coastal environment given that no areas of outstanding natural character have been included in the Proposed District Plan.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.64	Part 2/ Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE-P15	Oppose	WIAL submits that there are numerous provisions within the NZCPS that need to be considered and balanced within the Proposed Plan. Furthermore, the Coastal Environment has been broadly defined in the Proposed Plan, meaning that broadly drafted provisions could have perverse outcomes for existing, built up, urban areas of the District.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P15	Oppose	No revised policy wording has been proposed to determine the impact of any change. We reserve our position on any amendments to this policy pending ensuring any revised wording does not seek a threshold more restrictive than avoiding significant adverse effects in areas in the coastal environment given that no areas of outstanding natural character have been included in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.31	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P15	Oppose	Rejects broadening the application of this policy and considers reference to the overlays as notified should be retained. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.35	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P15	Oppose	Considers that the RMA, NZCPS and RPS do not require that all of the natural character of the coastal environment (which includes modified natural character) is to be managed in the way the submitter proposes.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.95	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P15	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P15 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P15	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P15 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas).	Retain policy INF-CE-P15 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Amend	Considers INF-CE-P16 should be amended to include the maintenance and restoration of the natural character and avoid any significant adverse effects on the natural character in the same way as INF-CE-P19.	Amend INF-CE-P16 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones) as follows: - Within coastal and riparian margins. Allow for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within areas of coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones- <u>where:</u> <u>1. Related earthworks are of a scale that consider the maintenance and restoration the natural character; and</u> <u>2. Any significant adverse effects on the natural character are avoided and any other adverse effects on the natural character are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u> <u>3. Any significant adverse effects on the natvral character are avoided and any adverse effects on the natural character are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.65	Part 2/ Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE-P15	Oppose	The proposed amendments seek to replicate provisions of the NZCPS. This does not assist plan users as it provides no further direction than that set out in higher order documents. Furthermore, it is inappropriate to apply the NZCPS to riparian (river) margins.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Oppose in part	Considers this policy does not give effect to policy 13 of NZCPS.	Amend INF-CE-P16 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones) to require protection of natural character regardless of zoning.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Oppose	Operation and maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure in urban zones in the coastal environment should have a permissive regulatory regime supported by Policy INF-CE-P16 as notified.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.67	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE-P16	Oppose	WIAL opposes the submission as the amendments over simplify the management approach set out in the NZCPS nor do they consider the broadly defined area of the District that is included within the Coastal Environment. Furthermore, no specific drafting has been provided, thus it is difficult to evaluate the appropriateness of such changes in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Powerco Limited	FS61.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Oppose	Operation and maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure in urban zones in the coastal environment should have a permissive regulatory regime supported by Policy INF-CE-P16 as notified.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.96	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P16 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones: - Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P16 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins).	Retain policy INF-CE-P16 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-P16 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.112	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Support in part	Supports INF-CE-P16 in part.	[Not specified]
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.113	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Amend	Supports this policy in part as relates to activities within the coastal environment that are not otherwise managed in the general infrastructure provisions. Considers that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment). [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.46 to 4.49 of original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-CE-P16 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones) as follows: Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport, and Port Zones <u>and</u> the area of Natural Open Space Zone located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point: ... Allow for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within areas of coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport, and Port Zones <u>and</u> the area of Natural Open Space Zone located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point Road.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.114	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Amend	Submitter also has a submission filed with respect to the appropriateness of this zoning, therefore consequential changes may be required to this policy to address the zoning of the site. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.46 to 4.49 of original submission for full reason]	If amendments are not made to INF-CE-P16 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones): Seeks amendment to have relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Support	Supports policy that allows for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within areas of coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment. The railyard area, ferry terminal and Wairarapa Line are adjacent to the Wellington Harbour and therefore parts of the network are within the coastal margin.	Retain INF-CE-P16 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Airport and Port Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P16	Amend	Considers an amendment is required to include the maintenance and restoration of the natural character and avoid any significant adverse effects on the natural character in the same way as INF-CE-P19 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve).	Amend INF-CE-P16 as follows: Add at the end of the policy: <u>where:</u> <u>1. Related earthworks are of a scale that consider the maintenance and restoration the natural character; and</u> <u>2. Any significant adverse effects on the natural character are avoided and any other adverse effects on the natural character are avoided, remedied or mitigated</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.66	Part 2/ Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / General INF-CE-P15	Oppose	The proposed amendments seek to replicate provisions of the NZCPS. This does not assist plan users as it provides no further direction than that set out in higher order documents. Furthermore, it is inappropriate to apply the NZCPS to riparian (river) margins.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P17	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain INF-CE-P17 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.97	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P17	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P17 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones: - Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P17	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P17 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins).	Retain policy INF-CE-P17 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.115	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P17	Oppose in part	Opposes INF-CE-P17 to the extent that it places an unduly onerous constraint on the use of the highly modified area of Natural Open Space zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes INF-CE-P17 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.116	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P17	Amend	Opposes INF-CE-P17 to the extent that it places an unduly onerous constraint on the use of the highly modified area of Natural Open Space zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-CE-P17 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones) as follows: Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones <u>(excluding the area located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point)</u> : • Within coastal and riparian margins. Provide for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones <u>(excluding the area located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point)</u> , where: 1.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.117	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P17	Amend	Opposes INF-CE-P17 to the extent that it places an unduly onerous constraint on the use of the highly modified area of Natural Open Space zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-CE-P17 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones).
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P17	Support	Supports policy that allows for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within areas of coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment. The railyard area, ferry terminal and Wairarapa Line are adjacent to the Wellington Harbour and therefore parts of the network are within the coastal margin.	Retain INF-CE-P17 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P18	Oppose	Considers the policy does not direction as to the management of effects and does not give effect to policy 13 NZCPS.	Amend INF-CE-P18 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) to give effect to policy 13 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P18	Oppose	The rules for upgrading control the allowable effects envelope to an appropriate scale. Accordingly, the policy as notified allowing for upgrading outside of the most sensitive coastal environment areas is appropriate.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P18	Oppose	The rules for upgrading control the allowable effects envelope to an appropriate scale. Accordingly, the policy as notified allowing for upgrading outside of the most sensitive coastal environment areas is appropriate.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.36	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P18	Oppose	Considers that the policy INF-CE-P18 applies outside areas of high natural character and outside riparian areas, and does not conflict with NZCPS Policy 13.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.98	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P18	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P18 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and - Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P18	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P18 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins)	Retain policy INF-CE-P18 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P18	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-P18 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.118	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P18	Oppose	Opposes this policy insofar as it encourages the duplication of controls within the coastal environment that can otherwise be managed by the general infrastructure provisions. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.46 to 4.49 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-CE-P18 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) in it's entirety.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P18	Support	Supports policy that allows for upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas (noting there are none of these areas within the rail corridor) and coastal margins.	Retain INF-CE-P18 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P19	Oppose	Considers that while undergrounding may usually be preferable, a blanket 'allow' policy is inappropriate as it does not give direction to consider whether the effects are appropriate.	Amend INF-CE-P19 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment that is located underground or within an existing road reserve) to provide direction about acceptable effects of undergrounding.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P19	Oppose	Undergrounding of infrastructure in the coastal environment should be allowed as promoted in the policy.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.6	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P19	Oppose	Undergrounding of infrastructure in the coastal environment should be allowed as promoted in the policy.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.99	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P19	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P19 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment that is located underground or within an existing road reserve: - Within high coastal natural character areas.) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P19	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P19 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment that is located underground or within an existing road reserve: Within high coastal natural character areas)	Retain policy INF-CE-P19 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment that is located underground or within an existing road reserve: Within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P20	Support in part	Considers it appropriate to delete reference to operational need.	Amend INF-CE-P20 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve) Within high coastal natural character areas. Only allow for the upgrading of existing infrastructure that is located above ground and outside an existing road reserve within high coastal natural character areas where: 1. The activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values described in SCHED13 or the natural character; 2. Any significant adverse effects are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 3. There is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be undertaken inside a high coastal natural character areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P20	Oppose	Operational need is a relevant consideration to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in a coastal environment context, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P20	Oppose	Operational need is a relevant consideration to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in a coastal environment context, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.37	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P20	Oppose	Considers that the policy INF-CE-P20 requires that the activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values of Schedule SCHED13 or natural character and requires avoidance of significant adverse effects (and other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated). Operational need is a legitimate consideration for infrastructure that has limited locational or operational options within the coastal environment.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.100	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P20	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P20 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve: - Within high coastal natural character areas.) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P20	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P20 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve: Within high coastal natural character areas).	Retain policy INF-CE-P20 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve: Within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Oppose	Considers the policy too permissive. Access to the coastline is highly prized even rocky outcrops and small beaches. We have already have the Oriental Bay to Kilbirnie cycleway where concrete has been poured and fencing erected eradicating a number of small waterside enclaves and denying access to the water.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Oppose	Considers the policy does not direction as to the management of effects and does not give effect to policy 13 NZCPS.	Amend INF-CE-P21 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones) to give effect to policy 13 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Oppose	Upgrading of existing infrastructure in urban zones in the coastal environment should have a permissive regulatory regime supported by Policy INF-CE-P21 as notified	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Powerco Limited	FS61.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Oppose	Upgrading of existing infrastructure in urban zones in the coastal environment should have a permissive regulatory regime supported by Policy INF-CE-P21 as notified.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.101	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P21 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones: - Within coastal and riparian margins.) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P21 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins).	Retain policy INF-CE-P21 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.61	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-P21 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.119	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Support in part	For the reasons set out in paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of the covering submission, WIAL supports this policy in part. Considers that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is and used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment). [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Supports INF-CE-P21 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones) and seeks amendment.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.120	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Amend	For the reasons set out in paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of the covering submission, WIAL supports this policy in part. Considers that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is and used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment). [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-CE-P21 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones) as follows: Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones: • Within coastal and riparian margins. Allow for the upgrading of existing infrastructure within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment in the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, and Special Purpose Zones <u>and the area of Natural Open Space Zone located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point Road.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.121	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Amend	For the reasons set out in paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of the covering submission, WIAL supports this policy in part. Considers that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is and used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment). [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-CE-P21 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones).
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.10	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.122	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P21	Amend	Submitter also has a submission filed with respect to the appropriateness of this zoning (refer to paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of the covering submission), therefore consequential changes may be required to this policy to address the zoning of the site. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	If amendments are not made to INF-CE-P21 Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones and Special Purpose Zones): Seeks amendment to have relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P22	Oppose	Considers the policy does not direction as to the management of effects and does not give effect to policy 13 NZCPS.	Amend INF-CE-P22 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located underground or within an existing road reserve) to give effect to policy 13 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P22	Oppose	Upgrading of existing infrastructure in rural, open space and recreation zones that is underground or in roads in the coastal environment should have a permissive regulatory regime supported by Policy INF-CE-P22 as notified	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P22	Oppose	Upgrading of existing infrastructure in rural, open space and recreation zones that is underground or in roads in the coastal environment should have a permissive regulatory regime supported by Policy INF-CE- P22 as notified.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.102	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P22	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P22 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located underground or within an existing road reserve: - Within coastal and riparian margins.) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P22	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P22 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located underground or within an existing road reserve: Within coastal and riparian margins).	Retain policy INF-CE-P22 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located underground or within an existing road reserve: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P22	Support	Supports recognition that there are specific circumstances in which the upgrade of existing infrastructure may be appropriate within coastal margins. In particular, KiwiRail support that these policies link to functional and operational needs.	Retain INF-CE-P22 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located underground or within an existing road reserve: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Support in part	Considers it appropriate to delete reference to operational need.	Amend INF-CE-P23 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve): Within coastal and riparian margins. Only allow for the upgrading of existing infrastructure that is located above ground and outside an existing road reserve in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones within riparian margins and coastal margins in the coastal environment where: 1. The activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the natural character; 2. Any significant adverse effects are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 3. There is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be undertaken within coastal margins or riparian margins in the coastal environment.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.10	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Oppose	Operational need is a relevant consideration to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in a coastal environment context, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.10	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Oppose	Operational need is a relevant consideration to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in a coastal environment context, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.38	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Oppose	Considers that the policy INF-CE-P23 requires that the activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values of Schedule SCHED13 or natural character and requires avoidance of significant adverse effects (and other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated). Operational need is a legitimate consideration for infrastructure that has limited locational or operational options within the coastal environment.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.103	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P23 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve: - Within coastal and riparian margins.) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P23 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins).	Retain policy INF-CE-P23 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.123	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Support in part	Supports INF-CE-P23	Retain INF-CE-P23 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.124	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Amend	Considers that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment). [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-CE-P23 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve) as follows: Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones (<u>excluding the area located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u>) that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve: Only allow for the upgrading of existing infrastructure that is located above ground and outside an existing road reserve in the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones (<u>excluding the area located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u>) within riparian margins and coastal margins in the coastal environment where: ...
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.11	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.125	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Amend	Submitter also has a submission filed with respect to the appropriateness of this zoning (refer to paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of the covering submission), therefore consequential changes may be required to this policy to address the zoning of the site.	If amendments are not made to INF-CE-P23 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve): Seeks amendment to have relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.126	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Amend	[See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-CE-P23 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve).
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Support	Supports recognition that there are specific circumstances in which the upgrade of existing infrastructure may be appropriate within coastal margins. In particular, KiwiRail support that these policies link to functional and operational needs.	Retain INF-CE-P23 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment of the Rural Zone and Open Space and Recreation Zones that is located aboveground and outside an existing road reserve: Within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Oppose	Considers the policy too permissive. Access to the coastline is highly prized even rocky outcrops and small beaches. We have already have the Oriental Bay to Kilbirnie cycleway where concrete has been poured and fencing erected eradicating a number of small waterside enclaves and denying access to the water.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Not specified	Considers the policy does not direction as to the management of effects and does not give effect to policy 13 NZCPS.	Amend INF-CE-P24 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment) to give effect to policy 13 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.11	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Oppose	No revised policy wording has been proposed to determine the impact of any change. We reserve our position on any amendments to this policy pending ensuring any revised wording does not seek a threshold more restrictive than avoiding significant adverse effects in areas in the coastal environment given that no areas of outstanding natural character have been included in the Proposed District Plan.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.11	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Oppose	No revised policy wording has been proposed to determine the impact of any change. We reserve our position on any amendments to this policy pending ensuring any revised wording does not seek a threshold more restrictive than avoiding significant adverse effects in areas in the coastal environment given that no areas of outstanding natural character have been included in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.39	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P23	Oppose	Considers that the policy INF-CE-P24 applies outside areas of high natural character and outside riparian margins and does not conflict with NZCPS Policy 13.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.91	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Oppose in part	Considers that the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) Policy 13(1)(a) requires that for areas of outstanding natural character, adverse effects are avoided. NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b) requires that for natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment, significant adverse effects are avoided, and all other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.92	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Amend	Considers that In order to give effect to Policy 13 of the NZCPS and to achieve the outcomes sought by CE-O1, the wording of this policy needs to be strengthened to apply to all other areas of the coastal environment.	Seeks to Amend INF-CE-P24 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment) as follows: New infrastructure within the coastal environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and ▲ Outside of coastal and riparian margins. <u>Allow for new infrastructure within the coastal environment where it is located outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal margins and riparian margins. Only allow for new infrastructure in the coastal environment where any significant adverse effects on natural character are avoided and other adverse effects on natural character are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.40	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Support	Meridian agrees that the 'avoid significant adverse effects' and 'avoid, remedy or mitigate other effects' is appropriate. However, Meridian also considers it remains valid to consider functional and operational needs in the circumstances covered by Policy INF-CE-P24.	Amend / Amend provision to insert a reference to considering the functional needs and operational needs of the proposed infrastructure.
Waka Kotahi	370.104	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P24 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and - Outside of coastal and riparian margins.) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P24 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins).	Retain policy INF-CE-P24 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.62	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-P24 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.127	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Oppose	Opposes this policy insofar as it encourages the duplication of controls within the coastal environment that can otherwise be managed by the general infrastructure provisions. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.47 to 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-CE-P24 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment) in its entirety.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.41	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CEP-P24	Oppose	Considers that the policy INF-CE-P24 may not be relevant for the airport but remains relevant for other infrastructure in the coastal environment.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P24	Support	Supports recognition that there are specific circumstances in which new infrastructure may be appropriate within coastal margins, is supported. In particular, KiwiRail support that these policies link to functional and operational needs of infrastructure.	Retain INF-CE-P24 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Support in part	Considers it appropriate to delete reference to "identified" values and operational need.	Amend INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment): Within high coastal natural character areas; or within coastal and riparian margins. Only allow for new infrastructure within high coastal natural character areas and within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment, where: 1. The activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values described in SCHED12 or the natural character; 2. Any significant adverse effects are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 3. There is a functional or operational need for the activity to be undertaken within these areas.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.12	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Oppose	Operational need is a relevant consideration to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in a coastal environment context, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.12	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Oppose	Operational need is a relevant consideration to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in a coastal environment context, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.42	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Oppose	Considers that the reference to the 'identified' values in Schedule SCHED12 is valid (in the interests of certainty in Plan implementation). Operational need is a relevant consideration, alongside the other considerations that seek to protect the natural character and values of the coastal environment.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.93	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Oppose	<p>Considers that the distinction between INF-CE-P24 and INF-CE-P25 is unnecessary and should be replaced with one policy that applies to the coastal environment.</p> <p>Further, it should be noted that providing for the functional need and operational requirement is in regard to the CMA in isolation as opposed to the terrestrial area (see NZCPS Policy 6(e)) and therefore Greater Wellington does not request this provision to be included in the provision for new infrastructure in the coastal environment.</p>	Delete INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: ...) in its entirety.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.43	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Oppose	Meridian does not agree that a combined policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the Plan's objectives and opposes the suggested deletion of functional need and operational requirements as a consideration.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.105	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Within high coastal natural character areas; or within coastal and riparian margins.) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Support	Supports proposed Policy INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas; or within coastal and riparian margins).	Retain policy INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas; or within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.63	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Support in part	Considers that the term functional and operational need of infrastructure is not in alignment with the terminology of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that utilises the terms functional need and operational requirement.	Retain INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas; or within coastal and riparian margins), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.64	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Amend	Considers that the term functional and operational need of infrastructure is not in alignment with the terminology of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that utilises the terms functional need and operational requirement.	<p>Amend INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas; or within coastal and riparian margins) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. There is a functional <u>need</u> or operational need <u>requirement</u> for the activity to be undertaken within these areas.</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.128	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Oppose	<p>Opposes INF-CE-P25.</p> <p>Considers that the policy goes further than the NZCPS which requires the avoidance of significant adverse effects and the avoidance, remediation and mitigation of other effects on natural character, natural features and landscapes. Amendments are proposed to the policy which therefore bring the policy into line with the NZCPS.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.46 to 4.49 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment) in it's entirety.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.44	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Oppose	Considers that the policy INF-CE-P25 may not be relevant for the airport but remains relevant for other infrastructure in the coastal environment.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.129	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Amend	<p>Opposes INF-CE-P25.</p> <p>Considers that the policy goes further than the NZCPS which requires the avoidance of significant adverse effects and the avoidance, remediation and mitigation of other effects on natural character, natural features and landscapes. Amendments are proposed to the policy which therefore bring the policy into line with the NZCPS.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.46 to 4.49 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>If INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment) is not deleted, amend as follows:</p> <p>INF-CE-P25 New infrastructure within the coastal environment:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Any significant adverse effects are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated on <u>natural character and natural features and landscapes</u>; and</p> <p>...</p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P25	Support	<p>Supports recognition that there are specific circumstances in which new infrastructure may be appropriate within coastal margins, is supported. In particular, KiwiRail support that these policies link to functional and operational needs of infrastructure.</p>	<p>Retain INF-CE-P25 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas; or within coastal and riparian margins) as notified.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.94	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P26	Amend	<p>Considers that Transpower has existing assets within the coastal environment, including the Kaiwharawhara Supply Point substation (designation TPR6) and underground cable, Oteranga Bay (designation TPR4) and associated lines, and Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station (designation TPRS) and associated lines.</p> <p>Considers the existing assets are regulated by the designations and the NESETA, noting that s43D RMA prescribes the relationship between designations and the NESETA. Policy P26 relates to existing National Grid assets within the Coastal Environment, and recognises the existing assets. The policy approach within P26 is supported and gives effect to Policies 2 and 5 of the NPSET. A minor amendment is sought to include “minor upgrade”, in recognition of the existing assets. A minor upgrade may be something like increasing the height of a pole support structure, or moving the same dimensioned pole within 5m of its existing location, or adding on an additional insulator.</p>	<p>Option 1: Retain INF-CE-P26 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment) with an amendment as follows:</p> <p>INF-CE-P26 Operation, maintenance, and repair and <u>minor upgrade</u> of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment</p> <p>Allow for the operation, maintenance, repair <u>and minor upgrade</u> of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.95	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P27	Support	<p>Considers Transpower has existing assets within the coastal environment, including the Kaiwharawhara Supply Point substation (designation TPR6) and underground cable, Oteranga Bay (designation TPR4) and associated lines, and Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station (designation TPRS) and associated lines. Both the Oteranga Bay (designation TPR4) and Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station (designation TPRS) are within areas of “High Coastal Natural Character” noting there are no existing assets within the identified “High Coastal Natural Character” outside the designations. Transpower has no existing assets in area of “Very High Coastal Natural Character”.</p> <p>Considers that while Transpower’s assets in high coastal natural character areas and potentially the coastal margin are within the designations, given the relationship between designations and the NESETA (as prescribed by s43D of the RMA), works to the existing lines and cables within the designation subject to the NESETA, and that that trigger consent under the NESETA, would be subject to the PDP policies. Considers as such P27 and P28 have implications for Transpower. Transpower supports P27 noting that while the coastal margin is defined, given the CMA line is not identified, it is not clear where the 10m margin area is located. This is particularly the case for more dynamic coastal environments where the CMA is not readily identifiable. Given the policy implications of defining the coastal margin, considers clarity is required (and sought in the submission to the definition) as to the physical application of the defined Coastal margin to enable efficient and effective plan implementation.</p>	<p>Retain INF-CE-P27 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (ND) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment...) as notified.</p> <p>[And, as sought in another submission point, clearly identify the coastal margin]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.96	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P28	Amend	Considers that Transpower has existing assets within the coastal environment, including the Kaiwharawhara Supply Point substation (designation TPR6) and underground cable, Oteranga Bay (designation TPR4) and associated lines, and Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station (designation TPR5) and associated lines. Both the Oteranga Bay (designation TPR4) and Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station (designation TPR5) are within areas of "High Coastal Natural Character" and there are no existing assets within the identified "High Coastal Natural Character" outside the designations. Transpower has no existing assets in area of "Very High Coastal Natural Character". Given the nature of the existing assets (which at Oteranga Bay are underground within the coastal margin and the High Natural Character Area and at Te Hikowhenua, are underground in the coastal margin and a single line for a small portion in the High Natural Character Area), that they are designated, and that the policy is specific to upgrades which are provided for and regulated under the NESETA, Transpower is comfortable with the policy. However, it reserves its position depending on the outcome of other submission points and relief sought as many of the National Grid provisions cannot be considered in isolation. Some minor amendments are sought to reflect that the policy considerations relate to the upgrade, thereby recognising existing assets.	Amend INF-CE-P28 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within the coastal environment...) as follows: INF-CE-P28 Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within the coastal environment: • Within high coastal natural character areas; or • Within coastal and riparian margins. Provide for the upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within high coastal natural character areas or within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment where: 1. The <u>upgrade</u> activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values described in SCHED12 for natural character; 2. Any significant adverse effects <u>of the upgrade</u> are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 3. There is a functional need or an operational need for the activity to be undertaken inside a high coastal natural character areas or within coastal margins or riparian margins in the coastal environment.
Avryl Bramley	202.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P30	Amend	Considers the rule too permissive. Access to the coastline is highly prized even rocky outcrops and small beaches. We have already have the Oriental Bay to Kilbirnie cycleway where concrete has been poured and fencing erected eradicating a number of small waterside enclaves and denying access to the water.	Amend INF-CE-R30 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure and new infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.68	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P30	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to require resource consent and notification for all infrastructure activities, regardless of their nature, scale or extent, within the coastal environment. Furthermore, such controls are not imposed on other activities within the District.	Disallow
Avryl Bramley	202.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P31	Amend	Considers the rule too permissive. Access to the coastline is highly prized even rocky outcrops and small beaches. We have already have the Oriental Bay to Kilbirnie cycleway where concrete has been poured and fencing erected eradicating a number of small waterside enclaves and denying access to the water.	Amend INF-CE-R31 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within coastal or riparian margins) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.69	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P31	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to require resource consent and notification for all infrastructure activities, regardless of their nature, scale or extent, within the coastal environment. Furthermore, such controls are not imposed on other activities within the District.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.97	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P31	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain INF-CE-P31 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.98	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P32	Oppose	<p>Opposes INF-CE-P32 and proposes an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid.</p> <p>Considers that the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET (noting the NPS-ET also applies to the coastal environment) in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The directive wording "only allow" within the policy does not reflect the enabling wording used in the NPS-ET. - The NPS-ET does not require that natural character be maintained or restored. Rather Policy 8 of the NPS-ET requires a 'seek to avoid' approach with policies 3 and 4 prescribing the matters to consider and have regard to. - The NPS-ET does not require significant adverse effects be avoided, rather policy 8 prescribes a seek to avoid approach. <p>It is also noted that although the National Grid is recognised of national significance within the NPS-ET (being a higher order policy document) it is afforded the exact same policy framework as other infrastructure (as provided in INF-CE P25). This further reinforces Transpower's concerns the PDP does not give effect to the NPS-ET.</p>	<p>Delete INF-CE-P32 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment) in its entirety.</p> <p>[And add a new National Grid specific policy as per separate submission point]</p>
Waka Kotahi	370.106	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R27	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	<p>Retain INF-CE-R27 (Operation, maintenance, repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and - Outside of coastal and riparian margins.) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.65	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R27	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-R27 (Operation, maintenance, repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.130	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R27	Oppose	<p>Opposes INF-CE-P27.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.47 and 4.47 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete INF-CE-R27 (Operation, maintenance, repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) in its entirety.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.45	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R27	Support	Meridian agrees that Rule INF-CE-R27 will be redundant where consents (and consent conditions) authorise infrastructure in the coastal environment.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R27	Support	Supports that the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure is provided for as a permitted activity in the coastal environment, outside of coastal margins.	Retain INF-CE-R27 (Operation, maintenance, repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.107	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R28	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	<p>Retain INF-CE-R28 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within high coastal natural character areas.) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Avryl Bramley	202.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Amend	Considers the rule too permissive. Access to the coastline is highly prized even rocky outcrops and small beaches. We have already have the Oriental Bay to Kilbirnie cycleway where concrete has been poured and fencing erected eradicating a number of small waterside enclaves and denying access to the water.	Amend INF-CE-R29 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within coastal or riparian margins) so that it is not a permitted activity and that notification is mandatory.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.70	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-P29	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to require resource consent and notification for all infrastructure activities, regardless of their nature, scale or extent, within the coastal environment. Furthermore, such controls are not imposed on other activities within the District.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.46	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Oppose	Considers that the rule applies to existing established infrastructure (not new infrastructure). The terms on which such infrastructure is able to be established and operate within the coastal environment will be determined by consent conditions or the permitted activity rule under which it is established. In this respect, the rule may not be strictly necessary in any event. The request by the submitter to require notification is not relevant (or appropriate).	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.108	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-R29 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Within coastal or riparian margins.) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.66	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-R29 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.131	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Support in part	Supports INF-CE-P29 in part. Considers that that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is and used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment). [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for further detail]	Not specified.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.12	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.132	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Amend	<p>Considers that that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is and used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment).</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for further detail]</p>	<p>Amend INF-CE-R29 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) as follows:</p> <p>INF-CE-R29 Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within coastal or riparian margins. <p>Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Special Purpose Zones, <u>and the area of Natural Open Space Zone located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u></p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Rural Zones, Open Space and Recreation Zones (<u>excluding the area between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u>)</p> <p>2. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with INF-S3.</p> <p>Rural Zones, Open Space and Recreation Zones (<u>excluding the area between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u>)</p> <p>...</p>
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.13	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.133	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Amend	<p>Considers that that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is and used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment).</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for further detail]</p>	Delete INF-CE-R29 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) in its entirety.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.14	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.134	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Amend	<p>Submitter also has a submission filed with respect to the appropriateness of this zoning (refer to paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of the covering submission), therefore consequential changes may be required to this policy to address the zoning of the site.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for further detail]</p>	<p>If INF-CE-R29 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) is not amended:</p> <p>Seeks that INF-CE-R29 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) is amended to give relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning.</p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R29	Support	Supports that the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure is provided for as a permitted activity within coastal margins, subject to standards.	Retain INF-CE-R29 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.109	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R30	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-R30 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure and new infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and - Outside of coastal and riparian margins.) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.67	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R30	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-R30 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure and new infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.135	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R30	Oppose	Opposes INF-CE-R30. [See paragraph 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.47 to 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-CE-R30 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure and new infrastructure within the coastal environment) in its entirety.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.61	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R30	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of upgrading existing infrastructure within the coastal environment.	Retain INF-CE-R30 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure and new infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.110	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R31	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-R31 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Within coastal or riparian margins.) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.68	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R31	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-R31 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.136	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R31	Support in part	Supports INF-CE-R31 in part. Considers that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment). [See paragraph 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Supports INF-CE-R31 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) in part and seeks amendment.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.15	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R31	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.137	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R31	Amend	Supports INF-CE-R31 in part. Considers that this provision also needs to include the area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, which is highly modified and is used by WIAL for a range of ancillary airport activities (such as navigational aids and meteorological equipment). [See paragraph 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-CE-R31 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) as follows: ... Residential Zones, Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, Industrial Zones, Special Purpose Zones <u>and the area of Natural Open Space Zone located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u> ... Rural Zones, Open Space and Recreation Zones (<u>excluding the area between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u>) ... Rural Zones, Open Space and Recreation Zones (<u>excluding the area between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u>) ...
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.16	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R31	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.138	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R31	Amend	[See paragraph 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-CE-R31 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) in its entirety.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.139	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R31	Amend	Submitter also has a submission filed with respect to the appropriateness of this zoning (refer to paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of the original submission), therefore consequential changes may be required to this policy to address the zoning of the site. [See paragraph 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	If INF-CE-R31 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) is not amended: Seeks that INF-CE-R31 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment) is amended to give relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.62	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R31	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of upgrading existing infrastructure within coastal margins, subject to standards.	Retain INF-CE-R31 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.111	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R32	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-R32 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Within high coastal natural character areas.) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.112	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R33	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-R33 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and - Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.69	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R33	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-R33 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.140	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R33	Oppose	Opposes INF-CE-R33. [See paragraph 4.30 to 4.31, 4.47 - 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-CE-R33 (new infrastructure within the coastal environment) in its entirety.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.47	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R33	Oppose	Considers that the policy INF-CE-P25 may not be relevant for the airport but remains relevant for other infrastructure in the coastal environment.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.63	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R33	Support	Supports that new infrastructure is provided for as a permitted activity in the coastal environment, outside of coastal margins.	Retain INF-CE-R33 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.113	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R34	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-CE-R34 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: - Within high coastal natural character areas; or - Within coastal or riparian margins.) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.70	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R34	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-CE-R34 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas; or Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.141	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R34	Oppose	Opposes INF-CE-R34. Considers that a discretionary activity is unduly onerous and notes that the rationale for establishing rules within “coastal margins” is premised on Policy 6(1)(i) of the NZCPS. There are other limbs within Policy 6 that need to be considered. A restricted discretionary activity achieves a greater balancing of these provisions. Policy INF-CE-P25 also identifies specific controls on when infrastructure should be allowed within these areas. These matters better lend themselves to a restricted discretionary activity status. [See paragraph 4.46 - 4.49 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes INF-CE-R34 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.142	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R34	Amend	<p>Opposes INF-CE-R34.</p> <p>Considers that a discretionary activity is unduly onerous and notes that the rationale for establishing rules within “coastal margins” is premised on Policy 6(1)(i) of the NZCPS. There are other limbs within Policy 6 that need to be considered. A restricted discretionary activity achieves a greater balancing of these provisions.</p> <p>Policy INF-CE-P25 also identifies specific controls on when infrastructure should be allowed within these areas. These matters better lend themselves to a restricted discretionary activity status.</p> <p>[See paragraph 4.46 - 4.49 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend INF-CE-R34 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment) as follows:</p> <p>New infrastructure within the coastal environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within high coastal natural character areas; or • Within coastal or riparian margins <p>All Zones:</p> <p>Activity Status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p>1. The matters in INF-P6 and INF-P25.</p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.64	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R34	Support	<p>Supports that new infrastructure is provided for as a permitted activity within coastal margins, subject to standards.</p>	<p>Retain INF-CE-R34 (New infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas; or Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.</p>
Avryl Bramley	202.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R35	Amend	<p>Considers that Gas and electric reticulation are treated the same and Gas will be phased out by 2040.</p> <p>Without stricter rules surrounding these, run the risk of the Gas companies undertaking unnecessary repairs or renewals and then attempting to be recompensated for stranded assets by consumers.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend INF-CE-R35 (Operation, maintenance, repair of existing National Grid) to have controls on gas company activity to ensure that only maintenance necessary to keep the network functioning at a minimal level until final phase out is permitted.</p>
Powerco Limited	FS61.34	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R35	Oppose	<p>Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.99	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R35	Amend	<p>Considers that while the rule and activity status are supported, specific to the National Grid, the existing designations, and the NESETA provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid. On this basis, R35 for existing National Grid infrastructure (that are otherwise captured by the NESETA and the existing designations) is of no relevance to Transpower in respect of rule application and only adds confusion and potential errors in the application of rules.</p>	<p>Seeks to delete reference to the National Grid within INF-CE-R35 (Operation, maintenance, repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment)</p>
Avryl Bramley	202.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R36	Amend	<p>Considers that Gas and electric reticulation are treated the same and Gas will be phased out by 2040.</p> <p>Without stricter rules surrounding these, run the risk of the Gas companies undertaking unnecessary repairs or renewals and then attempting to be recompensated for stranded assets by consumers.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend INF-CE-R36 (Gas transmission pipeline corridor) to have controls on gas company activity to ensure that only maintenance necessary to keep the network functioning at a minimal level until final phase out is permitted.</p>
Powerco Limited	FS61.35	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R36	Oppose	<p>Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.100	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R36	Amend	Considers that while the rule and activity status are supported, specific to the National Grid, the existing designations, and the NESETA provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid. On this basis, R36 for existing National Grid infrastructure (that are otherwise captured by the NESETA and the existing designations) is of no relevance to Transpower in respect of rule application and only adds confusion and potential errors in the application of rules.	Seeks to delete reference to the National Grid within INF-CE-R36 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure: outside of high...)
Avryl Bramley	202.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R37	Amend	Considers that Gas and electric reticulation are treated the same and Gas will be phased out by 2040. Without stricter rules surrounding these, run the risk of the Gas companies undertaking unnecessary repairs or renewals and then attempting to be recompensated for stranded assets by consumers. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-CE-R37 (Coastal Environment upgrades) to have controls on gas company activity to ensure that only maintenance necessary to keep the network functioning at a minimal level until final phase out is permitted.
Powerco Limited	FS61.36	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R37	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.101	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R37	Oppose	Considers while the rule and activity status are supported, specific to the National Grid, the existing designations, and the NESETA provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid. On this basis, R37 for existing National Grid infrastructure (that are otherwise captured by the NESETA and the existing designations) is of no relevance to Transpower in respect of rule application and only adds confusion and potential errors in the application of rules.	Delete Rule INF-CE-R37 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within the coastal environment: within high coastal natural character areas; or within coastal or riparian margins) in its entirety.
Avryl Bramley	202.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R38	Amend	Considers that Gas and electric reticulation are treated the same and Gas will be phased out by 2040. Without stricter rules surrounding these, run the risk of the Gas companies undertaking unnecessary repairs or renewals and then attempting to be recompensated for stranded assets by consumers. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-CE-R38 (Gas transmission pipeline corridor) to have controls on gas company activity to ensure that only maintenance necessary to keep the network functioning at a minimal level until final phase out is permitted.
Powerco Limited	FS61.37	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R38	Oppose	Not a relevant Resource Management Act consideration.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.102	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R39	Support	Considers the NESETA does not apply to new National Grid assets. On this basis, Transpower supports the permitted rule, noting that other applicable INF chapter rules would apply.	Retain INF-CE-R39 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.103	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Coastal Environment / INF-CE-R40	Support	Considers the NESETA does not apply to new National Grid assets. On this basis, Transpower supports the default discretionary activity rule as it provides a robust consenting framework whilst still recognising the national significance of the National Grid.	Retain INF-CE-R40 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas; or Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the Introduction to the INF-ECO chapter should include, under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions', a statement that seeks to clarify the interaction between the INF-ECO chapter and other Plan chapters.</p> <p>Meridian understood the intention of the Plan to be that the rules for renewable electricity generation activities, structures and buildings would be wholly contained in the REG chapter. Meridian supports this approach.</p> <p>Considers the note in the preamble is not entirely helpful in clarifying this.</p> <p>Meridian accepts that the objectives and policies of the ECO Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter are applicable to renewable electricity generation activities. However, considers the standards listed for general infrastructure activities in the INF-ECO chapter are entirely inappropriate for renewable electricity generation activities and structures and should not be construed as a 'permitted baseline' for renewable electricity generation activities there, and particularly not for existing wind farms.</p>	Retain the Introduction to Chapter INF-ECO with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that the Introduction to the INF-ECO chapter should include, under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions', a statement that seeks to clarify the interaction between the INF-ECO chapter and other Plan chapters.</p> <p>Meridian understood the intention of the Plan to be that the rules for renewable electricity generation activities, structures and buildings would be wholly contained in the REG chapter. Meridian supports this approach.</p> <p>Considers the note in the preamble is not entirely helpful in clarifying this.</p> <p>Meridian accepts that the objectives and policies of the ECO Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter are applicable to renewable electricity generation activities. However, considers the standards listed for general infrastructure activities in the INF-ECO chapter are entirely inappropriate for renewable electricity generation activities and structures and should not be construed as a 'permitted baseline' for renewable electricity generation activities there, and particularly not for existing wind farms.</p>	<p>Amend the Introduction to Chapter INF-ECO, by inserting under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions', the following (or similar) clarification note:</p> <p><u>The rules applicable to renewable electricity generation activities are contained in Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation. The rules in Chapter INF-ECO Infrastructure Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity do not apply to renewable electricity generation activities.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.104	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Amend	<p>Considers Transpower's operational activities involve upgrading and 'recutting' access tracks, vegetation trimming and vegetation removal. Transpower's maintenance and climate change adaptation activities will involve making foundations stronger/bigger, and relocating assets (among other things). Transpower is required to clear paths and undertake vegetation trimming/clearance to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure clearance under and adjacent to the lines; • Provide access to the lines and support structure assets, including for fault response purposes; • Enable maintenance of support structures including painting, foundation strengthening and replacement; and • Reconductor lines. <p>Transpower has a cyclical maintenance programme, but typically inspections can occur any time between 6 and 18 months. The decision to trim or clear vegetation on inspection depends on factors such as the age of the support structure, nature of the vegetation, landowner relationships, and the operational requirements of the asset. The requirement to provide sufficient clearance under the lines is a regulatory requirement of the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. Clearance is required for safety reasons (primarily to prevent flashovers). While trimming/ clearance is a safety requirement, it is subject to local authority plan provisions (such as when the site is an SNA which is a 'Natural Area' for the purpose of the National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities (NESETA)). Considers that it is important that it is recognised in the PDP that some of these activities will have unavoidable impacts and will sometimes be in SNAs given the extent and location of Transpower's assets. These activities are critical to the functioning of the National Grid, and should be provided for.</p>	Seeks to amend the Infrastructure - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity (INF-ECO) chapter provisions to recognise and provide for the National Grid as set out in subsequent submission points.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.105	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Amend	Supports the introductory text but seeks clarification that the National Grid is subject to specific policies and rules and the general sub-chapter provisions do not apply.	<p>Amend the introduction to the Infrastructure - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity (INF-ECO) as follows:</p> <p>This sub-chapter applies to infrastructure within Natural Features and Landscape Overlays. It applies in addition to the principal Infrastructure Chapter.</p> <p><u>Included within the sub-chapter are provisions specific to the National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipelines Corridor (GTPC). For the avoidance of doubt, other sub-chapter policies and rules within this sub-chapter do not apply to the National Grid.</u></p> <p>Note: The objectives of the Infrastructure Chapter apply.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.106	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Oppose in part	Considers that on the basis INF-ECO-R44 is to be amended [as requested in other submission point regarding this rule] so it does not apply to the National Grid, considers Standard S19 will not be applicable to the National Grid. If the intent is for S19 to apply to the National Grid Transpower opposes its application as the submitter considers the NESETA manages vegetation works for existing National Grid infrastructure and the provision of a standard to apply to the National Grid adds unnecessary confusion and interpretation issues.	Opposes reference to INF-ECO-S19 (Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area) in any National Grid specific rules.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.107	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Amend	Considers that on the basis INF-ECO-R44 is to be amended [as requested in other submission point regarding this rule] so it does not apply to the National Grid, considers Standard S19 will not be applicable to the National Grid. If the intent is for S19 to apply to the National Grid, Transpower opposes its application as the submitter considers the NESETA manages vegetation works for existing National Grid infrastructure and the provision of a standard to apply to the National Grid adds unnecessary confusion and interpretation issues.	Seeks to delete reference to INF-ECO-S19 (Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area) from any National Grid specific rules.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.108	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Oppose in part	Considers that on the basis INF-ECO-R44 is to be amended so it does not apply to the National Grid, INF-ECO-S20 will not be applicable to the National Grid. If the intent is for INF-ECO S20 to apply to the National Grid Transpower opposes its application as it duplicates the NESETA and adds unnecessary confusion and interpretation issues.	Opposes reference to INF-ECO-S20 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) in any National Grid specific rules.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.109	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Amend	Considers that on the basis INF-ECO-R44 is to be amended so it does not apply to the National Grid, Standard S20 will not be applicable to the National Grid. If the intent is for S20 to apply to the National Grid Transpower opposes its application as it duplicates the NESETA and adds unnecessary confusion and interpretation issues.	Seeks to delete reference to INF-ECO-S20 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) from any National Grid specific rules.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Support in part	Notes that the introduction to this sub-chapter states that the objectives of the Infrastructure chapter apply. Further, that this sub-chapter applies in addition to the Infrastructure chapter. That means that both the policies in the Infrastructure chapter as well as those in this sub-chapter will apply to use and development in SNAs. Forest & Bird's overarching submission for this chapter is that the provisions should be no less protective than those in the ECO chapter. The provisions in this chapter should mirror the ECO provisions, with the amendments made as sought by F&B in respect of that chapter.	Amend chapter to mirror ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter to apply a similar level of protection.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.22	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Oppose	Given the general nature of the relief sought, Transpower opposes the submission point.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.71	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Oppose	WIAL opposes the relief sought by the submitter as it is appropriate for a different planning framework to apply for regionally significant infrastructure in recognition of the social, cultural and economic benefits it provides for the community and the operational and locational constraints of that infrastructure.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.48	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Oppose	Meridian does not agree that the objectives for significant natural areas (in the SNA chapter) should be replicated in this INF-ECO chapter.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.10	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Oppose	The purpose of this chapter is evidently to help understand the balance and reconcile the need to provide for infrastructure with the need to protect areas of important biodiversity. It is therefore not appropriate to mirror the level of stringency in the ECO chapter as applied more broadly.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Support	Supportive of the entire sub-chapter as it is logical and strikes a good balance between use and protection.	Retain the Infrastructure (Ecosystems and Biodiversity) chapter as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' to include Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.120	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / General INF-ECO	Support	Greater Wellington support the inclusion and protection of SASM.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.110	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that Transpower has existing assets within identified SNAs [see full submission for image supplied].</p> <p>Transpower is required to undertake vegetation trimming/clearance necessary for the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid, including (but not limited to) trimming that may be required by the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. Related, is the operational requirement for clearance of vegetation on access tracks to enable Transpower to access the grid infrastructure to undertake its operation, maintenance and upgrade. Submitter considers the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET. Considers the policy directive within INF-ECO-P35 that works "do not adversely affect the biodiversity values" does not give effect to the NPS-ET. Considers the policy is drafted such that all and any adverse effects are to be avoided. Considers that such a requirement is onerous given the policy relates to existing infrastructure which will often have safety requirements and obligations in respect of adjacent vegetation. Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to reflect the realities of maintaining the National Grid and ensuring safe and necessary vegetation clearance distances.</p> <p>(Option B) [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new National Grid specific policy as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P2 Operation, and maintenance and minor upgrade of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>Provide for the operation, maintenance and minor upgrade of the National Grid while managing the adverse effects of these activities.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.111	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Amend	<p>The submitter does not oppose the identification of SNAs, but considers the policy approach has to be cognisant of the need to develop the National Grid and also give effect to the NPS-ET. Transpower proposes an amended policy approach specific to the National Grid [in general]. Considers that key to the approach is the recognition of the need to provide and enable the National Grid, whilst also providing a robust framework to manage effects. Specific to INF-ECO-P37, while Transpower accepts the policy does have regard to the route, site and method selection process, and operational needs, considers they apply in context of the policy chapeau to 'give priority to avoiding adverse effects'. Submitter queries how the term "give priority to avoiding adverse effects" would be implemented. Queries if this requires avoidance as the default position. Transpower's preference is for development within SNA's to be addressed in the specific National Grid development policy (within the INF chapter). Considers this would enable any new National Grid development to be considered in a comprehensive manner.</p>	<p>Add new National Grid specific policy to replace INF-ECO-P37 (New development of National Grid within significant natural areas) as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P6 Development of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>Provide for the development of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>1. In urban zoned areas, development should minimise adverse effects on urban amenity and should avoid material adverse effects on the Commercial and Mixed-Use zones, and areas of high recreational or amenity value and existing sensitive activities.</u></p> <p><u>2. Seek to avoid the adverse effects of the National Grid within areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, and SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, outside the coastal environment.</u></p> <p><u>3. Where the National Grid has a functional need or operational need to locate within the coastal environment, manage adverse effects by:</u></p> <p><u>a. Seeking to avoid adverse effects on areas identified in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p><u>and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes, and the Coastal Margin.</u></p> <p><u>b. Where it is not practicable to avoid adverse effects on the values of the areas in SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes; and the Coastal Margin because of the functional needs or operational needs of the National Grid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on those values.</u></p> <p><u>c. Seeking to avoid significant adverse effects on:</u></p> <p><u>i. other areas of natural character</u></p> <p><u>ii. natural attributes and character of other natural features and natural landscapes.</u></p> <p><u>iii. indigenous biodiversity values that meet the criteria in Policy 11(b) of the NZCPS 2010</u></p> <p><u>d. Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>e. Recognising there may be some areas within SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas, SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes; and the Coastal Margin, where avoidance of adverse effects is required to protect the identified values and characteristics.</u></p> <p><u>4. Remedy or mitigate any adverse effects from the operation, maintenance, upgrade, major upgrade or development of the National Grid which cannot be avoided, to the extent practicable; and</u></p> <p><u>5. When considering the adverse effects in respect of 1-3 above:</u></p> <p><u>a. Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection; and</u></p> <p><u>b. Consider the constraints arising from the operational needs or functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects.</u></p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Amend	Considers Policy 11 of NZCPS is not given effect to by the current policies. Seeks new policy to do so.	<p>Add new policy INF-ECO-PX (All infrastructure activities in the coastal environment):</p> <p><u>Only allow activities within a significant natural area in the coastal environment where it can be demonstrated that they:</u></p> <p><u>1. Avoid adverse effects on the matters in Policy 11(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010;</u></p> <p><u>2. Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on the matters in Policy 11(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010; and</u></p> <p><u>3. Protect other indigenous biodiversity values in accordance with ECO-P1</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.23	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Oppose	In its submission Transpower seeks a specific National Grid policy approach to give effect to the NPSET and the NZCPS.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.49	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Oppose	Meridian considers that, taken together, the objectives and policies of the INF-ECO chapter do give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.143	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that that a new policy and method is required to allow for the removal of vegetation within significant natural areas where necessary to provide for the safe and/or efficient operation of regionally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.50 to 4.55 in original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new policy as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-ECO-P38 Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas</u></p> <p><u>Enable vegetation removal within significant natural areas identified within SCHED8 where:</u></p> <p><u>1. The vegetation removal is required to provide for the ongoing and safe operation of regionally significant infrastructure; and,</u></p> <p><u>2. Any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values within a significant natural area are considered in accordance with ECO-P1.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.32	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Support	<p>Supports provisions that allow for vegetation removal within SNA's as required for the safe and efficient operation of regionally significant infrastructure such as rail.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.50	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Support	Meridian agrees that the additional policy and proposed new rule, providing for appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas, have merit.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.144	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that that a new policy and method is required to allow for the removal of vegetation within significant natural areas where necessary to provide for the safe and/or efficient operation of regionally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.50 to 4.55 in original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>INFR-ECO-R43A</u></p> <p><u>All Zones</u></p> <p><u>Removal of vegetation within significant natural areas to protect regionally significant infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity Status: Restricted discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>3. The matters in INF-ECO-P38</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.33	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Support	Supports provisions that allow for vegetation removal within SNA's as required for the safe and efficient operation of regionally significant infrastructure such as rail. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.51	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / New INF-ECO	Support	Meridian agrees that the additional policy and proposed new rule, providing for appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas, have merit.	Allow / Allow the requested addition of the policy and rule.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain INF-ECO-P33 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.114	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Support	Support this policy as under the maintenance and repair definition it 'means any work or activity necessary to continue the operation or functioning of existing infrastructure.' Waka Kotahi consider this sufficient to cover off health and safety risks such as vegetation control to preserve sight lines.	Retain INF-ECO-P33 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.115	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-P33 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Support	Supports proposed policy INF-ECO-P33 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area).	Retain policy INF-ECO-P33 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.145	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Oppose in part	Opposes INF-ECO-P33 [See paragraphs 4.49 to 4.54 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes INF-ECO-P33 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) in part and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.146	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Amend	Opposes INF-ECO-P33 [See paragraphs 4.49 to 4.54 of original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-ECO-P33 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as follows: Provide for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within significant natural areas where the activity, including associated earthworks, not adversely affect the biodiversity values—it can be demonstrated that: <u>1. There is an operational need or functional need that means the infrastructure's location cannot be practicably avoided; and</u> <u>2. Any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values within a significant natural area are applied in accordance with ECO-P1.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.52	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Oppose	Meridian considers Policy INF-ECO-P33 is appropriate and necessary, to provide for existing lawfully authorised infrastructure, so opposes its deletion. Meridian supports the proposed clause 2 (which requires adverse effects to be managed in accordance with Policy ECO-P1). The policy applies to existing infrastructure such that the locational considerations may not be relevant.	Amend / Amend provision to disallow requested deletion, but allow in part the requested amendments (clause 2).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.147	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Amend	Opposes INF-ECO-P33 [See paragraphs 4.49 to 4.54 of original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-ECO-P33 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) in its entirety.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.53	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Oppose	Meridian considers Policy INF-ECO-P33 is appropriate and necessary, to provide for existing lawfully authorised infrastructure, so opposes its deletion. Meridian supports the proposed clause 2 (which requires adverse effects to be managed in accordance with Policy ECO-P1). The policy applies to existing infrastructure such that the locational considerations may not be relevant.	Amend / Amend provision to disallow requested deletion, but allow in part the requested amendments (clause 2).
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.65	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Support	Supports policy which provides for the operation, maintenance and repair of infrastructure within SNAs. KiwiRail note there are mapped Significant Natural Areas that include KiwiRail land. The SNAs as proposed, recognise established rail infrastructure and do not include existing structures or railway tracks but do cover KiwiRail land adjacent to infrastructure on the Johnsonville Line and at Hawkins Hill. KiwiRail therefore have an interest in these provisions.	Retain INF-ECO-P33 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Oppose in part	INF-ECO-P34 incorrectly cross-refers to the effects management hierarchy in Policy ECO-P2. This needs to be amended to ECO-P1 where the hierarchy sits.	Amend Policy INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas) so the cross-reference to the effects management hierarchy is ECO-P1.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.54	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Support	Meridian agrees the correct reference is to Policy P1.	Allow / Allow the requested amendment (replacing ECO-P2 with ECO-P1)

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Powerco Limited	127.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Oppose in part	Considers that this policy incorrectly cross-refers to the effects management hierarchy in Policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas). This needs to be amended to ECO-P1 where the hierarchy sits.	Amend Policy INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas) as follows: Allow for upgrades to existing infrastructure and for new infrastructure within significant natural areas where it can be demonstrated that: 1. There is an operational need or functional need that means the infrastructure's location cannot be avoided; and 2. Any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values within a significant natural area are applied in accordance with ECO-P1, ECO-P2
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Support	Meridian agrees the correct reference is to Policy P1.	Allow / Allow the requested amendment (replacing ECO-P2 with ECO-P1)
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Oppose in part	Supports the requirement that ECO P1 is met, although this should be expressed more clearly. We have made submissions about ECO-P1, and seek that those amendments are also given effect to via this policy. Opposes the inclusion of paragraph 1 in this policy, as it adds another standard that arguably will lessen the protections required to be given by ECO-P1. If it is to remain, we oppose the reference to operational need, as that encompasses a very broad range of considerations. We have sought that ECO P1 reference ECO P5. If that does not occur, ECO P5 will also need to be referenced in this policy. Notes that the reference to ECO-P2 in this policy should be ECO-P1.	Amend INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas): Consider allowing Allow for upgrades to existing infrastructure and for new infrastructure within significant natural areas <u>only</u> where it can be demonstrated that: 1. There is an operational need or functional need that means the infrastructure's location cannot be avoided; and 2. Any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values within a significant natural area are managed applied in accordance with ECO-P1 and ECO P5 .
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.13	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Oppose	Operational need and functional need are relevant considerations to determine if infrastructure is appropriate insignificant natural areas, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.13	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Oppose	Operational need and functional need are relevant considerations to determine if infrastructure is appropriate insignificant natural areas, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.34	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Oppose	<p>Considers it appropriate to include operational and functional needs within this policy. These terms are well defined in relation to infrastructure activities and KiwiRail seeks that the needs of infrastructure are recognised and provided for in policy.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.57	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P33	Support	Meridian agrees the correct reference is to Policies P1 and P5.	Allow / Allow the requested amendment (replacing ECO-P2 with ECO-P1 and ECO-P5)
Waka Kotahi	370.116	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Support	Supports proposed policy INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas).	Retain policy INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.148	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Oppose	<p>Opposes INF-ECO-P34</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.50 to 4.55 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas as follows) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.149	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Amend	<p>Opposes INF-ECO-P34</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.50 to 4.55 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas as follows) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.150	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Amend	Opposes INF-ECO-P34 [See paragraphs 4.50 to 4.55 of original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas as follows): Allow for upgrades to existing infrastructure and for new infrastructure within significant natural areas where it can be demonstrated that: 1. There is an operational need or functional need that means the infrastructure's location cannot be <u>practicably</u> avoided; and 2. Any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values within a significant natural area are applied in accordance with ECO-P2 <u>ECO-P1</u> .
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.56	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Support	Meridian agrees the correct reference is to Policy P1.	Allow / Allow the requested amendment (replacing ECO-P2 with ECO-P1)
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.66	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P34	Support	Supports policy to allow for upgrades to and new infrastructure in SNAs.	Retain INF-ECO-P34 (Upgrades to and new infrastructure in significant natural areas) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.112	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P35	Amend	Considers that Transpower has existing assets within identified SNAs [see full submission for image supplied]. Transpower is required to undertake vegetation trimming/clearance necessary for the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid, including (but not limited to) trimming that may be required by the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. Related, is the operational requirement for clearance of vegetation on access tracks to enable Transpower to access the grid infrastructure to undertake its operation, maintenance and upgrade. Submitter considers the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET. Considers the policy directive within INF-ECO-P35 that works "do not adversely affect the biodiversity values" does not give effect to the NPS-ET. Considers the policy is drafted such that all and any adverse effects are to be avoided. Considers that such a requirement is onerous given the policy relates to existing infrastructure which will often have safety requirements and obligations in respect of adjacent vegetation. Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to reflect the realities of maintaining the National Grid and ensuring safe and necessary vegetation clearance distances. (Option A) [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend policy INF-ECO-P35 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid infrastructure within a significant natural area) as follows: Provide for the operation, maintenance, and repair <u>and minor upgrade of</u> existing transmission lines within significant natural areas where the activity, including associated earthworks, does not adversely affect the biodiversity values, while managing the adverse effects of these activities.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.61	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P35	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain INF-ECO-P35 (Operation, maintenance, and repair of existing National Grid Infrastructure with a significant natural area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.24	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECOP35	Oppose	While Transpower supports the provision of a policy specific to the National Grid, in its submission Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the NPSET and to ensure safe and necessary vegetation clearance distances.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Waka Kotahi	370.117	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P35	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-P35 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P35	Support	Supports proposed policy INF-ECO-P35 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid infrastructure within a significant natural area).	Retain policy INF-ECO-P35 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.113	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P36	Oppose	Considers that Transpower has existing assets within identified SNA's and is required to provide a reliable and efficient transmission network. The SNA's across the city are extensive and cover both the open space and rural environments. The intent of the NPS-ET and NESETA is to provide a comprehensive regime for the National Grid recognising its national significance. Of relevance to the upgrading of the National Grid are policies 1-6. Considers that, as currently drafted, Transpower has concerns INF-ECO-P36 does not give effect to the NPS-ET. The cross references to the ECO hierarchy policy 2 (noting this cross reference appears an error and it should be ECO-P1) does not give effect to the NPS-ET. While Transpower is not outright opposed to the cross reference to the ECO policies, it has reservations that a direct cross reference to general policies will not reflect the nuanced approach that is required in order to give effect to the NPS-ET. Furthermore the cross reference to the effects management hierarchy is not appropriate for all maintenance activities given the necessity of the works. Transpower has proposed an amended policy approach to give effect to the NPS-ET. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes policy INF-ECO-P36 (Upgrading the National Grid within significant natural areas) and seeks amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.114	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P36	Amend	Considers that Transpower has existing assets within identified SNA's and is required to provide a reliable and efficient transmission network. The SNA's across the city are extensive and cover both the open space and rural environments. The intent of the NPS-ET and NESETA is to provide a comprehensive regime for the National Grid recognising its national significance. Of relevance to the upgrading of the National Grid are policies 1-6. Considers that, as currently drafted, Transpower has concerns INF-ECO-P36 does not give effect to the NPS-ET. The cross references to the ECO hierarchy policy 2 (noting this cross reference appears an error and it should be ECO-P1) does not give effect to the NPS-ET. While Transpower is not outright opposed to the cross reference to the ECO policies, it has reservations that a direct cross reference to general policies will not reflect the nuanced approach that is required in order to give effect to the NPS-ET. Furthermore the cross reference to the effects management hierarchy is not appropriate for all maintenance activities given the necessity of the works. Transpower has proposed an amended policy approach to give effect to the NPS-ET. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend policy INF-ECO-P36 (Upgrading the National Grid within significant natural areas) as follows: INF-ECO-P36 Upgrading the National Grid within significant natural areas Provide for upgrading of the National Grid within significant natural areas by applying the effects management hierarchy in ECO-P2. <u>In providing for the upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within significant natural areas:</u> <u>1. Seek to avoid adverse effects on biodiversity values.</u> <u>2. When considering major upgrades, have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection;</u> <u>3. Recognise the constraints arising from the operational needs and functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects; and</u> <u>4. Recognise the potential benefits of upgrades to the National Grid to people and communities;</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.62	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P36	Support	Notes incorrect reference to ECO-P2, considers ECO-P5 should also be referenced.	Amend INF-ECO-P36 (Upgrading the National Grid within significant natural areas): <u>Consider providing Provide for upgrading of the National Grid within significant natural areas <u>only</u> where it can be demonstrated that any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity are managed in accordance with by applying the effects management hierarchy in ECO-P21 and ECO-P5.</u>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.25	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECOP36	Oppose	While Transpower supports the provision of a policy specific to the National Grid, in its submission Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the NPSET and to ensure safe and necessary vegetation clearance distances.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Waka Kotahi	370.118	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P36	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-P36 (Upgrading the National Grid within significant natural areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P36	Support	Supports proposed policy INF-ECO-P36 (Upgrading the National Grid within significant natural areas).	Retain policy INF-ECO-P36 (Upgrading the National Grid within significant natural areas) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.115	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P37	Oppose	The submitter does not oppose the identification of SNAs, but considers the policy approach has to be cognisant of the need to develop the National Grid and also give effect to the NPS-ET. Transpower proposes an amended policy approach specific to the National Grid [in general]. Considers that key to the approach is the recognition of the need to provide and enable the National Grid, whilst also providing a robust framework to manage effects. Specific to INF-ECO-P37, while Transpower accepts the policy does have regard to the route, site and method selection process, and operational needs, considers they apply in context of the policy chapeau to 'give priority to avoiding adverse effects'. Submitter queries how the term "give priority to avoiding adverse effects" would be implemented. Queries if this requires avoidance as the default position. Transpower's preference is for development within SNA's to be addressed in the specific National Grid development policy (within the INF chapter). Considers this would enable any new National Grid development to be considered in a comprehensive manner.	Delete INF-ECO-P37 (New development of National Grid within significant natural areas) in its entirety. [And add a new National Grid specific policy]
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.63	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P37	Support in part	Notes incorrect reference to ECO-P2. Supports direction to give priority to avoiding adverse effects. Considers this policy confusing, as it covers different and potentially conflicting standards. Considers it would be simpler, and still meet the direction provided by the NPSET require adherence to ECO-P1, which contains an inherent consideration of the extent to which effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated. Notes it is also subject to part 2, including the requirement to protect significant indigenous biodiversity under s6(c).	Amend INF-ECO-P37 (New development of National Grid within significant natural areas): Give priority to avoiding adverse effects of the National Grid on significant natural areas by applying the effects management hierarchy in ECO-P21 when located within significant natural areas, by: 1. Having regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection and techniques and measures proposed; and 2. Considering the constraints arising from the operational needs and functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.26	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECOP37	Oppose	In its submission Transpower seeks deletion of reference to the National Grid within the rule given the NESETA prevails.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.94	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P37	Amend	Considers the wording of this policy is inconsistent with the 'avoid, minimise, remedy' direction of the effects management hierarchy in ECO-P1 and should be amended to be consistent.	Amend INF-ECO-P37 (New development of National Grid within significant natural areas) to reference the effects management hierarchy and ensure consistency with the 'avoid, minimise, remedy' direction in ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas).
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECOP37	Oppose	Oppose the submission in so far as it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Transpower submission.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.119	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P37	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-P37 (New development of National Grid within significant natural areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P37	Support	Supports proposed policy INF-ECO-P37 (New development of National Grid within significant natural areas).	Retain policy INF-ECO-P37 (New development of National Grid within significant natural areas) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.64	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R41	Oppose in part	Notes INF-ECO-S19 provides for cutting new tracks up to 2.5m wide in SNAs. Considers this is not appropriate as a permitted activity, and does not give effect to INF-ECO P33. Seeks either deletion of this activity from INF-ECO-S19, or amend this Permitted activity rule. Considers that new tracks should be a RD activity. Notes INF-ECO-S20 is not clear as to whether it applies to earthworks for the maintenance of existing tracks, or for new tracks. Considers that new tracks should not be a Permitted activity as this does not give effect to INF-ECO P33. Considers that new tracks should be clearly excluded from being a Permitted activity.	Amend INF-ECO-R41 (Operation, maintenance, repair, and removal of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) to exclude new tracks from being a Permitted activity. Add new sub-rule making new tracks a Restricted Discretionary activity.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.65	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R41	Oppose in part	Considers new tracks (vegetation trimming, removal and earthworks) for operation, maintenance repair and removal should be included in this RD activity rule. Considers this rule should not apply in the coastal environment where there are policy 11 (NZCPS) matters present. Seeks to amend the matters of discretion as they are considered too narrow to provide for proper consideration of biodiversity values, and do not give effect to INF-ECO P33. Considers this approach is out of step with the rest of the plan, which generally provides for matters of discretion that refer back to the relevant policies. Corresponding amendments to the assessment criteria for ECO-INF-S19 and ECO-INF-S20 have also been sought.	Amend INF-ECO-R41 (Operation, maintenance, repair, and removal of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area): 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of INF-ECO-R41.1 cannot be achieved; and b. <u>The significant natural area does not contain any matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment.</u> Matters of discretion are: 1. <u>The matters in INF-ECO-P33 (or refer back to ECO P1)</u> 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard not met as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.66	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R41	Amend	Seeks new rule to give effect to policy 11 of NZCPS.	Add new rule INF-ECO-R41.3 (Operation, maintenance, repair, and removal of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area): <u>6. Activity status: Non Complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with the requirements of INF-ECO R41.1 cannot be achieved; and</u> <u>b. The significant natural area includes matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment.</u> <u>Section 88 information requirements for applications:</u> <u>Applications for activities within an identified significant natural area must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, an ecological assessment in accordance with APP15:</u> <u>1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and</u> <u>2. Demonstrating that ECO P5 (or refer to the new policy 11 policy sought above) has first been met, and the effects management hierarchy at ECO-P1 has been applied to other adverse effects.</u>
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.14	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R41	Oppose	Non-complying activity status for operation, maintenance, repair and removal of infrastructure from significant natural areas not meeting permitted activity standard is not supported. The current restricted discretionary activity status allows necessary work to be considered on its merits and level of effects.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.14	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P41	Oppose	Non-complying activity status for operation, maintenance, repair and removal of infrastructure from significant natural areas not meeting permitted activity standard is not supported. The current restricted discretionary activity status allows necessary work to be considered on its merits and level of effects.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.35	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R41	Oppose	Considers the restricted discretionary status is acceptable where requirements of INF-ECO-R41.1 cannot be met. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.58	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R41	Oppose	Meridian opposes the requested non-complying activity status. The rule is not necessary because, within SNAs, most infrastructure will require a consent to establish and the terms of the consent will manage effects on the values of the SNA of operation, maintenance and repair. Removal of infrastructure does not warrant noncomplying activity status. It is also relevant that this activity status has not been retained in the Natural and Built Environments Bill.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.120	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R41	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-R41 (Operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.67	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R41	Support	Supports the ability to operate, maintain, repair and remove existing infrastructure within a SNA as a permitted activity, subject to standards.	Retain INF-ECO-R41 (Operation, maintenance, repair and removal of existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.67	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R42	Oppose in part	Considers it is unclear why the matters of discretion refer to the standards, as no standards appear to be relevant to the activity. Supports the matters of discretion referring back to INF-ECO-P33. Seeks that ECO-P1 is also referred to. If exemption suggested is accepted, then seeks that the rule become a Non-complying activity status for upgrading existing infrastructure.	Amend INF-ECO-R42 (Upgrades to existing infrastructure within a significant natural area): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in INF-ECO-P33 and <u>ECO-P1</u> ; and 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard not met as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard. <u>Exemption: The significant natural area does not contain any matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment.</u> Add new rule INF-ECO-R42.2: <u>2. Activity status: Non Complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>1. The significant natural area includes matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment.</u> <u>Section 88 information requirements for applications:</u> <u>Applications for activities within an identified significant natural area must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, an ecological assessment in accordance with APP15:</u> <u>1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and</u> <u>2. Demonstrating that ECO P5 (or refer to the new policy 11 policy sought above) has first been met, and the effects management hierarchy at ECO-P1 has been applied to other adverse effects.</u>
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.15	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R42	Oppose	Non-complying activity status for upgrading of existing infrastructure in the significant natural areas in the coastal environment (where subject to Policy 11 of the NZCPS) is not supported. This may capture areas subject to Policy 11(b) where the policy directive in the NZCPS is avoid significant adverse effects and contemplates some level of impact can be considered	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.15	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P42	Oppose	Non-complying activity status for upgrading of existing infrastructure in the significant natural areas in the coastal environment (where subject to Policy 11 of the NZCPS) is not supported. This may capture areas subject to Policy 11(b) where the policy directive in the NZCPS is avoid significant adverse effects and contemplates some level of impact can be considered.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.36	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R42	Oppose	Considers the restricted discretionary status is acceptable for upgrades to existing infrastructure. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.59	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R42	Oppose	Meridian agrees that reference to Policy ECOP1 is appropriate but opposes the requested non-complying activity status.	Amend / Allow the correction of the reference to ECO-P1. Disallow the requested exemption and the proposed new non-complying activity rule.
Waka Kotahi	370.121	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R42	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-R42 (Upgrades to existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.68	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R42	Support	Supports the ability to upgrade existing infrastructure as a restricted discretionary activity and construct new infrastructure as a discretionary activity within a SNA.	Retain INF-ECO-R42 (Upgrades to existing infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.68	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R43	Oppose	Considers this rule should have a non-complying activity status to give effect to S6(c) policy 11 NZCPS.	Amend INF-ECO-R43 (New infrastructure within a significant natural area): 1. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Non-complying</u>
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.16	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R43	Oppose	Non-complying activity status for new infrastructure in significant natural areas is not supported. This may be unavoidable in some circumstances due to functional need and operational need, and does not take into account the scale of any work and associated effects. It is important that infrastructure has a consent pathway in appropriate circumstances.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.16	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-P43	Oppose	Non-complying activity status for new infrastructure in significant natural areas is not supported. This may be unavoidable in some circumstances due to functional need and operational need, and does not take into account the scale of any work and associated effects. It is important that infrastructure has a consent pathway in appropriate circumstances.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.37	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R43	Oppose	<p>Considers the discretionary status is acceptable for new infrastructure.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.60	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R43	Oppose	Meridian opposes the requested non-complying activity status. The submission does not provide reasoning that supports non-complying activity status in terms of the requirements of s. 32AA of the RMA.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.122	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R43	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-R43 (New infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.69	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R43	Support	Supports the ability to upgrade existing infrastructure as a restricted discretionary activity and construct new infrastructure as a discretionary activity within a SNA.	Retain INF-ECO-R43 (New infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.116	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R44	Oppose	<p>Considers that, specific to the National Grid, the NESETA manages the trimming, felling and removal of vegetation and earthworks, with the activity status under the NESETA determined by the provisions in the PDP. The NESETA provides for earthworks and trimming, felling or removal of any vegetation as permitted activities subject to conditions. Considers that the default activity status of Restricted discretionary under clause 3 does not reflect that provided under regulation 34 of the NESETA. Given the NESETA prevails, Transpower considers clause 1 of Rule R44 is not required as the control of earthworks within an SNA is managed under the NESETA. With respect to vegetation works, under Regulation 30 of the NESETA, resource consent is required under Regulation 31 (for a controlled activity) or Regulation 32 for a restricted discretionary activity) if:</p> <p>A. A rule prohibits or restricts the works (Reg 30(2)(a)); or</p> <p>B. The vegetation is in a "natural area" (a term defined in NESETA) (Reg 30(2)(b)). It is noted the standards within INF-ECO-S19 do not reflect that in the NESETA and therefore Transpower does not support them applying to the National Grid. The purpose of the NESETA is to provide a comprehensive, nationally consistent framework for existing National Grid Assets. Transpower opposes the imposition of rules to manage existing assets, noting those provided in Rule R44 do not reflect the NESETA. Considers the potential is for confusion over plan interpretation and implementation.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes reference to the National Grid in INF-ECO-R44 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a significant natural area).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.117	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R44	Amend	<p>Considers that, specific to the National Grid, the NESETA manages the trimming, felling and removal of vegetation and earthworks, with the activity status under the NESETA determined by the provisions in the PDP. The NESETA provides for earthworks and trimming, felling or removal of any vegetation as permitted activities subject to conditions. Considers that the default activity status of Restricted discretionary under clause 3 does not reflect that provided under regulation 34 of the NESETA. Given the NESETA prevails, Transpower considers clause 1 of Rule R44 is not required as the control of earthworks within an SNA is managed under the NESETA. With respect to vegetation works, under Regulation 30 of the NESETA, resource consent is required under Regulation 31 (for a controlled activity) or Regulation 32 for a restricted discretionary activity) if:</p> <p>A. A rule prohibits or restricts the works (Reg 30(2)(a)); or</p> <p>B. The vegetation is in a “natural area” (a term defined in NESETA) (Reg 30(2)(b)). It is noted the standards within INF-ECO-S19 do not reflect that in the NESETA and therefore Transpower does not support them applying to the National Grid. The purpose of the NESETA is to provide a comprehensive, nationally consistent framework for existing National Grid Assets. Transpower opposes the imposition of rules to manage existing assets, noting those provided in Rule R44 do not reflect the NESETA. Considers the potential is for confusion over plan interpretation and implementation.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend INF-ECO-R44 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a significant natural area) by deleting reference to the National Grid from the rule.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.69	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R44	Oppose in part	<p>INF-ECO-S19 provides for cutting new tracks up to 2.5m wide in SNAs, which is not considered appropriate as a permitted activity, and does not give effect to INF-ECO P33. Seeks to either delete this activity from INF-ECO-S19, or amend this Permitted activity rule. Considers new tracks should be RD activity. INF-ECO-S20 is not clear as to whether it applies to earthworks for the maintenance of existing tracks, or for new tracks - considers new tracks should not be Permitted as this does not give effect to INF-ECO P33. Considers new tracks should be clearly excluded from this Permitted activity rule.</p>	Amend INF-ECO-R44 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a significant natural area) to exclude new tracks from being a Permitted activity. Add new sub-rule making new tracks a Restricted Discretionary activity.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.27	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECOR44	Oppose	<p>In its submission Transpower seeks deletion of reference to the National Grid within the rule given the NESETA prevails.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower’s submission.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.70	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R44	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that if this activity is to remain controlled, it should have some parameters around it, for example how close the vegetation removal needs to be to the lines to still come within the controlled rule.</p>	Add additional matters of control to INF-ECO-R22.2 to include additional parameters, e.g. how close vegetation removal can be to the lines to come within the Controlled activity status.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.71	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R44	Oppose in part	INF-ECO-R44.3: Supports the matters of discretion referring back to INF-ECO-P33, and also seeks that ECO-P1 is referred to. Considers rule should include an exemption for SNA's not including matters listed in policy 11 of NZCPS. If exemption suggested is accepted, then seeks that the rule become a Non-complying activity status activities in SNA's with policy 11 matters.	<p>Amend INF-ECO-R44 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a significant natural area):</p> <p>3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of INF-ECO-R44.1 or INF-ECO-R44.2 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard not met as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard; and 2. The matters in INF-ECO-P33 and ECO-P1. <u>Exemption: The significant natural area does not contain any matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment.</u></p> <p>Add new sub-rule INF-ECO-R44.4:</p> <p>4. Activity status: Non Complying Where: 1. The significant natural area includes matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment. <u>Section 88 information requirements for applications:</u> <u>Applications for activities within an identified significant natural area must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, an ecological assessment in accordance with APP15:</u> 1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and 2. Demonstrating that ECO P5 (or refer to the new policy 11 policy sought above) has first been met, and the effects management hierarchy at ECO-P1 has been applied to other adverse effects.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.28	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R44	Oppose	In its submission Transpower seeks deletion of reference to the National Grid within the rule given the NESETA prevails.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.118	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R45	Oppose	Considers that, specific to the National Grid, the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 ("NESETA") provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid, and on this basis, INF-ECO-R45 for existing National Grid structures captured by the NESETA is of limited relevance to Transpower in respect of rule application. It is noted the NESETA provides a Discretionary activity status under Regulations 39 of the NESETA for those activities subject to the NESETA but not otherwise captured under other regulations in the NESETA. The purpose of the NESETA is to provide a comprehensive, nationally consistent framework for existing National Grid Assets. Transpower opposes the imposition of rules to manage existing assets and instead seeks reliance on the NESETA.	Delete Rule INF-ECO-R45 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within a significant natural area) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.72	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R45	Support in part	Supports matters of discretion referring to INF-ECO-P36 subject to the submission point made on that policy. Seeks that ECO-P1 also be referred to. If exemption suggested is accepted, then seeks that the rule become a Non-complying activity status for upgrading existing infrastructure.	<p>Amend INF-ECO-R45 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within a significant natural area):</p> <p>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in INF-ECO-P36 and <u>ECO-P1</u>. <u>Exemption: The significant natural area does not contain any matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment.</u></p> <p>Add new sub-rule:</p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Non-complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>1. The significant natural area includes matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment.</u> <u>Section 88 information requirements for applications:</u> <u>Applications for activities within an identified significant natural area must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, an ecological assessment in accordance with APP15:</u> <u>1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and</u> <u>2. Demonstrating that ECO P5 (or refer to the new policy 11 policy sought above) has first been met, and the effects management hierarchy at ECO-P1 has been applied to other adverse effects.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.29	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R45	Oppose	In its submission Transpower seeks deletion of reference to the National Grid within the rule given the NESETA prevails.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.73	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R46	Support in part	Supports the matters of discretion referring back to INF-ECO-P39, subject to amendments sought on that policy. Seek that ECO-P1 is also referred to. Should include exemption for activities in SNAs not containing any policy 11 matters. Seeks to add subsequent Non-complying activity status rule for activities in breach of this exemption.	Amend INF-ECO-R46 (Upgrading existing gas transmission pipeline corridor within a significant natural area): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. The infrastructure is located underground; or b. The infrastructure is located within an existing road reserve. <u>Exemption: he significant natural area does not contain any matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment.</u> Matters of discretion are: The matters in INF-ECO-P36 and ECO-P1. <u>Add new sub-rule INF-ECO-R46.X:</u> <u>Activity status: Non Complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>1. The significant natural area includes matters identified in Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment.</u> <u>Section 88 information requirements for applications:</u> <u>Applications for activities within an identified significant natural area must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, an ecological assessment in accordance with APP15:</u> <u>1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and</u> <u>2. Demonstrating that ECO P5 (or refer to the new policy 11 policy sought above) has first been met, and the effects management hierarchy at ECO-P1 has been applied to other adverse effects.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.74	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R46	Oppose in part	Considers the activity should be non-complying.	Amend INF-ECO-R46 (Upgrading existing gas transmission pipeline corridor within a significant natural area): 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Non-complying</u> Where: Compliance with any of the requirements of INF-ECO-R46.1 cannot be achieved.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.119	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R47	Support	Considers the activity status and associated policies provide an appropriate framework in which to manage the National Grid.	Retain INF-ECO-R47 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a significant natural area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.75	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R47	Oppose in part	Considers this rule should have a non-complying activity status.	Amend INF-ECO-R47 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a significant natural area): 1. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Non-complying</u>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.30	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-R47	Oppose	Transpower supports the discretionary activity status. The activity status and associated policies provide an appropriate framework in which to manage the National Grid, and a non-complying activity status would not give effect to the NPSET (particularly Policies 2, 3 and 8).	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Support in part	Considers that a new assessment matter should be added in order to ensure that fire risk mitigation is taken into account when assessing applications to trim or remove indigenous vegetation in areas subject to high fire risk.	Amend INF-ECO-S19 (Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Amend	Considers that a new assessment matter should be added in order to ensure that fire risk mitigation is taken into account when assessing applications to trim or remove indigenous vegetation in areas subject to high fire risk.	Amend INF-ECO-S19 (Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area) as follows: Assessment criteria: ... <u>3. The degree to which the trimming or removal of affected vegetation will provide for the health and safety of people, property, and the environment through the management of fire risk.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.76	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Oppose in part	Considers the width in paragraph 1 should be limited to 2m to accommodate an existing track. Opposes new tracks being a Permitted activity. Replace assessment criteria with that listed under ECO-S1 to give effect to INF-ECO-P33.	Amend INF-ECO-S19 (Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area): <u>1. Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area must be limited to 2m within the footprint of existing infrastructure, access tracks or fences to accommodate an existing track.</u> Assessment criteria: 1. Operational or functional needs of infrastructure; and 2. The effect of the activity and removal on the identified biodiversity values of the significant natural area and the measures taken to avoid, minimise or remedy the effects and where relevant the ability to offset biodiversity impacts. <u>1. The extent to which the trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation limits the loss, damage or disruption to the ecological processes, functions and integrity of the significant natural area; and</u> <u>2. The effect of the vegetation removal on the identified biodiversity values.</u>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.31	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECOS19	Oppose	On the basis INF-ECO-R44 is to be amended so it does not apply to the National Grid, Standard S19 will not be applicable to the National Grid. If the intent is for S19 to apply to the National Grid Transpower opposes its application as the NESETA manages vegetation works for existing National Grid infrastructure and the provision of a standard to apply to the National Grid adds unnecessary confusion and interpretation issues.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.61	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Oppose	Considers that the subject matter of the requested amendments is addressed already by the wording of the standard as notified. The requested amendments are unnecessary.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.95	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Amend	Considers that Policy 24 of the RPS directs councils to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values. The 'identified' qualifier limits the consideration of effects to those values identified within the SNA at the time of plan notification. The values of most SNAs have been identified only at a high-level, and often only through desktop analysis. The assessment required to identify the scope of effects may identify additional values and this should be part of the consideration of effects at the time consent is applied for.	Seeks to amend wording to remove 'identified' before 'significant biodiversity values' when referring to adverse effects caused by activities or maintenance of biodiversity values.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.62	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Oppose	Considers that the values of concern should be those that have been identified as the reason for identification of the area as significant. Broadening the consideration to all values, as proposed by the submission, will create uncertainty and potential unwarranted costs for applicants for consents.	Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of 'identified'.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.6	Part 2 /Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity /INF-ECO-S19	Support	Support the proposal from GWRC to remove 'identified' before 'significant biodiversity values'. We agree with them that the assessment required to identify the scope of effects may identify additional values, and this should be part of the consideration of effects at the time consent is applied for.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.96	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Amend	Vegetation trimming standards and rules should be amended so that they also apply to both indigenous and non-indigenous vegetation. This would make it clear that all vegetation (aside from pest plants) is to be protected in these areas, except where otherwise specified for restoration or other purposes. Any non-indigenous plants within SNAs that are not pest plants may provide significant habitat for indigenous biodiversity such as birds, bats and lizards. This understanding is recognised in section 6(c) of the Act which directs the protection of the "significant habitats of indigenous fauna" not the significant indigenous habitats of indigenous fauna.	Seeks to amend standard (where relevant) to change 'indigenous vegetation' to 'vegetation'.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Support	Supports INF-ECO-S19 for its aspirations to protect and enhance the City's SNA. Notwithstanding this support, it is considered appropriate to enable the continued safe and efficient operation of electricity lines though the provisions of the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 or the Telecommunications Act 2001.	Retain INF-ECO-S19 (Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.123	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-S19 (Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.70	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Amend	Supports a standard for trimming or removing indigenous vegetation within a SNA. However, KiwiRail request the limit for this be increased to 5m within the footprint of existing infrastructure. KiwiRail typically clear vegetation within 5m of railway tracks as part of routine corridor maintenance throughout the country. This is the optimum clearance distance to ensure the rail network can operate safely and efficiently.	Amend INF-ECO-S19 (Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area) as follows: 1. Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area must be limited to 5m <u>5m</u> within the footprint of existing infrastructure, access tracks or fences.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Oppose	INF-ECO-S20 should be amended to at least provide a nominal allowance for other infrastructure that may require some localised earthworks in significant natural areas (e.g. for maintenance and upgrading). The provision provides for 50m3 of earthworks per transmission line support structure as a permitted activity and is otherwise consistent with the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Line Activities) Regulations 2009. The Auckland Unitary Plan for example provides for 5m3 of earthworks in significant natural areas for infrastructure works.	Amend INF-ECO-S20 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) as follows: 1. Earthworks within a significant natural area must not exceed: a. More than 50m3 per transmission line support structure; or b. More than 5m3 for other infrastructure; or <u>More than 5m3 for other infrastructure; or</u> 100m3 per access track.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.2	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Support	WELL support this submission point to the extent that a permitted earthworks quantum should be provided for infrastructure located within SNAs. Similar to the submitter, WELL own and operate linear infrastructure that, through functional need, traverse SNAs. So as to enable the continued operation and maintenance of such infrastructure, a permitted activity standard for soil disturbing activities is considered appropriate in the PDP. WELL note that a 50m3 quantum has been sought for transmission line support structures; however, a 5m3 volume for pole structures is also supported as per the submission point.	Allow
Powerco Limited	127.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Oppose	Considers that whilst this is consistent with the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Line Activities) Regulations 2009, there should be at least a nominal allowance for other infrastructure that may require some localised earthworks in significant natural areas (e.g. for maintenance and upgrading). The Auckland Unitary Plan for example provides for 5m3 of earthworks in significant natural areas for infrastructure works.	Amend standard INF-ECO-S20 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) as follows: 1. Earthworks within a significant natural area must not exceed: a. More than 50m3 per transmission line support structure; or b. More than 5m3 for other infrastructure; or b. c. 100m3 per access track.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.14	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Support	WELL support this submission point to the extent that a permitted earthworks quantum should be provided for infrastructure located within SNAs. Similar to the submitter, WELL own and operate linear infrastructure that, through functional need, traverse or are located within SNAs. So as to enable the continued operation and maintenance of such infrastructure, a permitted activity standard for soil disturbing activities is considered appropriate in the PDP. WELL note that a 50m3 quantum has been sought for transmission line support structures; however, a 5m3 volume for pole structures is also supported as per the submission point.	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.77	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Oppose in part	Considers that this should be limited to maintenance of existing tracks if it is to be a Permitted activity. Replace assessment criteria with that listed under ECO-S1 to give effect to INF-ECO-P33.	Amend INF-ECO-S20 (Earthworks within a significant natural area): 1. Earthworks within a significant natural area must <u>be limited to maintenance of existing tracks. not exceed:</u> More than 50m3 per transmission line support structure; or 100m3 per access track. Assessment criteria: 1. Operational or functional needs of infrastructure; and 2. The effect of the activity and removal on the identified biodiversity values of the significant natural area and the measures taken to avoid, minimise or remedy the effects and where relevant the ability to offset biodiversity impacts. <u>1. The extent to which the earthworks limits the loss, damage or disruption to the ecological processes, functions and integrity of the significant natural area; and</u> <u>2. The effect of the earthworks on the identified biodiversity values.</u>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.32	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECOS20	Oppose	On the basis INF-ECO-R44 is to be amended so it does not apply to the National Grid, Standard S20 will not be applicable to the National Grid. If the intent is for S20 to apply to the National Grid Transpower opposes its application as it duplicates the NESETA and adds unnecessary confusion and interpretation issues.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.38	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is appropriate to provide for earthworks as a permitted activity subject to standards and this shouldn't be limited to access tracks only. KiwiRail also seeks the retention of the assessment criteria as proposed which recognises the operational or functional needs of infrastructure.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.63	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Oppose	Considers that the standards are very restrictive, limiting the potential for adverse effects to minor, and ensuring that earthworks with the potential for adverse effects more than minor will require consent. The requested amendments are not necessary.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.97	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Amend	Considers that Policy 24 of the RPS directs councils to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values. The 'identified' qualifier limits the consideration of effects to those values identified within the SNA at the time of plan notification. The values of most SNAs have been identified only at a high-level, and often only through desktop analysis. The assessment required to identify the scope of effects may identify additional values and this should be part of the consideration of effects at the time consent is applied for.	Seeks to amend wording to remove 'identified' before 'significant biodiversity values' when referring to adverse effects caused by activities or maintenance of biodiversity values.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.64	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S19	Oppose	Considers that the values of concern should be those that have been identified for the SNA as the reason why the area is significant.	Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of 'identified'.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Support	Support the proposal from GWRC to remove 'identified' before 'significant biodiversity values'. Agree with them that the assessment required to identify the scope of effects may identify additional values and this should be part of the consideration of effects at the time consent is applied for.	Allow
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Support in part	<p>Supports INF-ECO-S20 as it provides stricter earthworks parameters for infrastructure within a demonstrable SNA.</p> <p>Considers that sub-clause b should be amended so as not to only apply to 'transmission'. [Submitter refers to sub-clause b, but requests amendment in sub-clause a]</p>	Retain INF-ECO-S20 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Amend	Considers that INF-ECO-S20 should be amended so sub-clause a does not only apply to 'transmission'. [Submitter refers to sub-clause b, but requests amendment in sub-clause a]	Amend INF-ECO-S20 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Earthworks within a significant natural area must not exceed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. More than 50m3 per transmission electricity line support structure; or b. 100m3 per access track.
Waka Kotahi	370.124	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-ECO-S20 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.71	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Ecosystems and Biodiversity / INF-ECO-S20	Support	Supports a standard for earthworks within a SNA, noting 100m3 per access track is permitted by this standard.	Retain INF-ECO-S20 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) as notified.
John Tiley	142.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Amend	<p>Considers that the Northern Reserves Management Plan 2008 (NRMP) reflects and guides how the Council values its landscape features including the approach to protection. [Inferred reason provided].</p> <p>The PDP facilitates development as a priority instead of protecting ridgelines, setting aside any adverse effects which harm community and amenity values.</p> <p>The NRMP adopts a philosophy that ridgelines, and associated open spaces, are significantly important to communities and the landscape must be protected accordingly. Continuing this approach would be consistent with precepts set out by Council over the last twenty years.</p> <p>Any protections provided are couched in terms of development effects being mitigated, minimised, remedied, minor, or carefully designed and managed. All these terms are subjective and fail to address the harm done by any intrusion on a ridgeline.</p> <p>As the city continues to grow, landscape values on a local and community scale assume greater importance to many without easy access to open space and the enjoyment of views of preserved areas such as the Town Belt and Outer Green Belt. Ridgelines across the city must enjoy protection to benefit their respective communities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that all city ridgelines remain free of any development.
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.2	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	<p>Supports Mr Tiley's submission about the importance of these listed ridgelines to Wellington's landscape, environment, and liveability. Mount Victoria ridgeline is one of the identified ridgelines in the Proposed District Plan, as it is also in the Operative District Plan. The submitter seeks that number 22 Alexandra Road must remain within the identified Mount Victoria Ridgeline as it is in the Operative Plan, rather than be removed from it as is proposed under the Proposed District Plan. The submitter also considers that the intention to remain relatively undeveloped as a crucially important ridgeline should be achieved by retaining the Operative District Plan Open Space zoning rather than rezoning to Residential as is proposed in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 142.5]</p>	Allow / Seeks that that number 22 Alexandra Road retains the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.2	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	<p>Supports Mr Tiley's submission about the importance of these listed ridgelines to Wellington's landscape, environment, and liveability. Mount Victoria ridgeline is one of the identified ridgelines in the Proposed District Plan, as it is also in the Operative District Plan. The submitter seeks that number 22 Alexandra Road must remain within the identified Mount Victoria Ridgeline as it is in the Operative Plan, rather than be removed from it as is proposed under the Proposed District Plan. The submitter also considers that the intention to remain relatively undeveloped as a crucially important ridgeline should be achieved by retaining the Operative District Plan Open Space zoning rather than rezoning to Residential as is proposed in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 142.5]</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow / Seeks that number 22 Alexandra Road retains the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.74	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Support	The submissions identify the need for greater clarity and better protection in the Plan for the city's identified ridgelines and hilltops. Wellington Civic Trust supports these points	Allow
Andy Foster	FS86.27	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	<p>Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 142.5].</p>	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.65	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	Considers that some ridgelines in the rural area feature lawfully established wind turbines and wind farm infrastructure. Their presence should be acknowledged. The aim of being 'free of any development' is unachievable and not relevant for those situations.	Disallow / Disallow the request in relation to existing built development within ridgeline overlays.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Churton Park Community Association	189.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Amend	<p>Considers that the Northern Reserves Management Plan 2008 (NRMP) reflects and guides how the Council values its landscape features including the approach to protection. [Inferred reason provided].</p> <p>Considers that the PDP facilitates development as a priority instead of protecting ridgelines, setting aside any adverse effects which harm community and amenity values.</p> <p>The NRMP adopts a philosophy that ridgelines, and associated open spaces, are significantly important to communities and the landscape must be protected accordingly. Continuing this approach would be consistent with precepts set out by Council over the last twenty years.</p> <p>Any protections provided are couched in terms of development effects being mitigated, minimised, remedied, minor, or carefully designed and managed. All these terms are subjective and fail to address the harm done by any intrusion on a ridgeline.</p> <p>As the city continues to grow, landscape values on a local and community scale assume greater importance to many without easy access to open space and the enjoyment of views of preserved areas such as the Town Belt and Outer Green Belt. Ridgelines across the city must enjoy protection to benefit their respective communities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that all city ridgelines remain free of any development.
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Support	<p>Supports submission 189 in seeking to change the Proposed District Plan to more fully protect and enhance the City's natural landscapes including Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes and Ridgelines and Hilltops, and request that all the CPCA proposals are adopted. It is the view of the submitter that the only new activities to be allowed in these areas should be those essential pieces of infrastructure that cannot be located anywhere else. Housing development should not be allowed.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 189.5]</p>	Allow
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.11	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Support	<p>Supports submission 189 in seeking to change the Proposed District Plan to more fully protect and enhance the City's natural landscapes including Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes and Ridgelines and Hilltops, and request that all the CPCA proposals are adopted. It is our strong view that the only new activities to be allowed in these areas should be those essential pieces of infrastructure that cannot be located anywhere else. Housing development should not be allowed.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 189.5]</p>	Allow
Andy Foster	FS86.38	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	<p>Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 189.5].</p>	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.66	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	<p>Considers that some ridgelines in the rural area feature lawfully established wind turbines and wind farm infrastructure. Their presence should be acknowledged. The aim of being 'free of any development' is unachievable and not relevant for those situations.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the request in relation to existing built development within ridgeline overlays.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose in part	<p>Considers the Introduction to the INF-NFL chapter should include, under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions', a statement that seeks to clarify the interaction between the INF-NFL chapter and other Plan chapters.</p> <p>Meridian understood the intention of the Plan to be that the rules for renewable electricity generation activities, structures and buildings would be wholly contained in the REG chapter. Meridian supports this approach. Considers the note in the preamble is not entirely helpful in clarifying this. Meridian accepts that the objectives and policies of the NFL Natural Features and Landscapes chapter are applicable to renewable electricity generation activities. However, considers the standards listed for general infrastructure activities in the INF-NFL chapter are entirely inappropriate for renewable electricity generation activities and structures and should not be construed as a 'permitted baseline' for renewable electricity generation activities there, and particularly not for existing wind farms.</p>	Retain the preamble to Chapter INF-NFL Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Amend	<p>Considers the Introduction to the INF-NFL chapter should include, under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions', a statement that seeks to clarify the interaction between the INF-NFL chapter and other Plan chapters.</p> <p>Meridian understood the intention of the Plan to be that the rules for renewable electricity generation activities, structures and buildings would be wholly contained in the REG chapter. Meridian supports this approach. Considers the note in the preamble is not entirely helpful in clarifying this. Meridian accepts that the objectives and policies of the NFL Natural Features and Landscapes chapter are applicable to renewable electricity generation activities. However, considers the standards listed for general infrastructure activities in the INF-NFL chapter are entirely inappropriate for renewable electricity generation activities and structures and should not be construed as a 'permitted baseline' for renewable electricity generation activities there, and particularly not for existing wind farms.</p>	<p>Amend the preamble to Chapter INF-NFL Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes, under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions', by inserting the following (or similar) clarification note:</p> <p><u>The rules applicable to renewable electricity generation activities in the coastal environment are contained in Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation. The rules in Chapter INF-NFL Natural Features and Landscapes do not apply to renewable electricity generation activities.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.120	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Amend	As a general comment, Transpower notes there are ten policies within the INF-NFL sub-chapter that are exclusive to the National Grid and the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor. Considers the number of policies is excessive and they could be rationalised.	Seeks to rationalise the number of policies in the Infrastructure - Natural Features and Landscapes (INF-NFL) chapter specific to the National Grid in the form of a revised set of National Grid specific policies.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.121	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Amend	Supports the introductory text to the INF-NFL chapter but seeks clarification that the National Grid is subject to specific policies and rules (P51 – P60 and R53. R54, R56 and R57) and the general sub-chapter provisions do not apply.	<p>Amend the introduction the Infrastructure - Natural Features and Landscapes chapter as follows:</p> <p>This sub-chapter applies to infrastructure within Natural Features and Landscape Overlays. It applies in addition to the principal Infrastructure Chapter.</p> <p><u>Included within the sub-chapter are provisions specific to the National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipelines Corridor (GTPC). For the avoidance of doubt, other sub-chapter policies and rules within this sub-chapter do not apply to the National Grid.</u></p> <p>Note: The objectives of the Infrastructure Chapter apply.</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.78	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Not specified	Considers that the provisions for this chapter should be no less protective than those in the Natural Features and Landscape chapter. The provisions (objectives, policies and rules) in this chapter should mirror the Natural Features and Landscape provisions, with the amendments made as sought by Forest & Bird in respect of that chapter.	Amend the chapter to mirror the Natural Features and Landscapes, and be as protective as that chapter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.17	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	The general request to make the provisions in the INF-NFL section no less protective than the general Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter is not supported and does not recognise operational needs and functional needs of infrastructure that differs from land uses in general.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.33	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	Given the general nature of the relief sought, Transpower opposes the submission point.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.72	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	WIAL opposes the relief sought by the submitter as it is appropriate for a different planning framework to apply for regionally significant infrastructure in recognition of the social, cultural and economic benefits it provides for the community and the operational and locational constraints of that infrastructure.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.17	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	The general request to make the provisions in the INF-NFL section no less protective than the general Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter is not supported and does not recognise operational needs and functional needs of infrastructure that differs from land uses in general.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.67	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	Considers that it's not necessary or appropriate to 'mirror' (replicate) the NFL chapter provisions within the INF-NFL chapter. The values of identified features and landscapes are described in the Schedules and the objectives and policies, correctly, focus on managing the effects of activities (including, in the INF-NFL chapter, the effects of infrastructure).	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.79	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose in part	Considers the Introduction does not acknowledge the potential adverse effects of infrastructure on indigenous biodiversity, landscape and natural character values. Seeks amendment to make it clear that these are important values that may be adversely affected, and which require protection. Considers other relevant District Plan provisions should similarly include reference to ECO, NFL, NATC and CE chapters.	Amend INF-NFL-Introduction to acknowledge the potential adverse effects of infrastructure on indigenous biodiversity, landscape and natural character values, and make it clear that these are important values that may be adversely affected and require protection.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.73	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	WIAL opposes the relief sought by the submitter as it is appropriate for a different planning framework to apply for regionally significant infrastructure in recognition of the social, cultural and economic benefits it provides for the community and the operational and locational constraints of that infrastructure.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.68	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary or appropriate to 'mirror' (replicate) the NFL chapter provisions within the INF-NFL chapter. The values of identified features and landscapes are described in the Schedules and the objectives and policies, correctly, focus on managing the effects of activities (including, in the INF-NFL chapter, the effects of infrastructure).	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.80	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Support in part	Seeks consequential amendments to give effect to submission points on INF-NFL policies above, and also to mirror the rules (as amended by F&B submissions) in the NFL chapters. Considers rules should be as protective as those sought by Forest & Bird in the NFL chapter.	Amend INF-NFL-R53-57 to give effect to policy changes requested in above submission points, mirror Natural Features and Landscapes rules, and be as protective as the amendments sought to the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.34	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	Given the general nature of the relief sought, Transpower opposes the submission point.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.74	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	WIAL opposes the relief sought by the submitter as it is appropriate for a different planning framework to apply for regionally significant infrastructure in recognition of the social, cultural and economic benefits it provides for the community and the operational and locational constraints of that infrastructure.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.69	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary or appropriate to 'mirror' (replicate) the NFL chapter provisions within the INF-NFL chapter. The values of identified features and landscapes are described in the Schedules and the objectives and policies, correctly, focus on managing the effects of activities (including, in the INF-NFL chapter, the effects of infrastructure).	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' to include Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.121	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / General INF-NFL	Support	Greater Wellington support the inclusion and protection of SASM.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.122	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INF-NFL	Amend	<p>The policy approach is supported and considers it gives effect to Policies 2 and 5 of the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Considers that, notwithstanding the policy support, given the wider issues with how the policy framework within the INF-NFL chapter gives effect to the NPS-ET, Transpower seeks an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid that address all the natural environment overlays. Reference is also sought to include minor upgrade within the policy to reflect the permitted activity status for minor upgrade works within the NESETA and enabling policy framework within the NPS-ET.</p>	<p>Option 1: Seeks to add a new policy as follows:</p> <p><u>NF-NFL-X Operation, maintenance, repair and minor upgrade of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops, special amenity landscapes, and outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes (including within the coastal environment).</u></p> <p><u>Allow for the operation, maintenance, repair and minor upgrade of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops, special amenity landscapes, and outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes (including within the coastal environment), while managing the adverse effects of these activities.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.123	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INF-NFL	Amend	<p>The policy approach is supported and considers it gives effect to Policies 2 and 5 of the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Considers that, notwithstanding the policy support, given the wider issues with how the policy framework within the INF-NFL chapter gives effect to the NPS-ET, Transpower seeks an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid that address all the natural environment overlays. Reference is also sought to include minor upgrade within the policy to reflect the permitted activity status for minor upgrade works within the NESETA and enabling policy framework within the NPS-ET.</p>	<p>Option 2: Seeks to add a new National Grid specific policy as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NG-P2 Operation, and maintenance and minor upgrade of the National Grid</u></p> <p><u>Provide for the operation, maintenance and minor upgrade of the National Grid while managing the adverse effects of these activities</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.124	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INF-NFL	Amend	<p>Transpower has existing assets within identified areas of significant amenity landscapes. Considers the activity status for upgrades is regulated by the NESETA. Supports that component of the policy to “provide for the upgrading of existing National Grid infrastructure” on the basis it gives effect to the NPS-ET and in particular policy 2 and 5. However, submitter opposes the matters within the policy for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clause 1. Considers the term ‘at a scale’ is subjective and does not recognise the characterises and technical and operational requirements and constraints of the National Grid. The NPS-ET does not require the activity to be of a scale that protects the identified values. Considers the identified values in the scheduled areas are very broad and it is unclear what aspects of the values are to be maintained or restored. - Clause 3. Considers this is not applicable to the National Grid in that there are no assets within SAL’s with the coastal environment. <p>Transpower has concerns the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET and therefore opposes INF-NFL-P57 and proposes an amended policy framework (to apply to SALs and ONFL’s) specific to the National Grid. The proposed approach has a ‘seek to avoid’ directive, considers this reflects policy 8 of the NPS-ET and provides a more appropriate and comprehensive policy framework that recognises the existing assets. Considers that utilisation and upgrading of existing National Grid assets should be facilitated in that it makes use of existing assets and will generally have less adverse environmental effect than that associated with the creation of new assets.</p>	<p>Add a new National Grid specific policy for Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Significant Amenity Landscapes as follows:</p> <p><u>NF-NFL-XX Upgrade of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within special amenity landscapes, and outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes (including within the coastal environment)</u></p> <p><u>In providing for the upgrade of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within special amenity landscapes, and outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes (including within the coastal environment):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Seek to avoid adverse effects on special amenity landscapes, and outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes</u> <u>2. When considering major upgrades, have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection;</u> <u>3. Recognise the constraints arising from the operational needs and functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects; and</u> <u>4. Recognise the potential benefits of upgrades to the National Grid to people and communities.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.125	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INF-NFL	Amend	<p>Transpower has existing assets within identified areas of significant amenity landscapes. Considers the activity status for upgrades is regulated by the NESETA. Supports that component of the policy to "provide for the upgrading of existing National Grid infrastructure" on the basis it gives effect to the NPS-ET and in particular policy 2 and 5. However, submitter opposes the matters within the policy for the following reasons:</p> <p>- Clause 1. Considers the term 'at a scale' is subjective and does not recognise the characterises and technical and operational requirements and constraints of the National Grid. The NPS-ET does not require the activity to be of a scale that protects the identified values. Considers the identified values in the scheduled areas are very broad and it is unclear what aspects of the values are to be maintained or restored.</p> <p>- Clause 3. Considers this is not applicable to the National Grid in that there are no assets within SAL's with the coastal environment.</p> <p>Transpower has concerns the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET and therefore opposes INF-NFL-P57 and proposes an amended policy framework (to apply to SALs and ONFL's) specific to the National Grid. The proposed approach has a 'seek to avoid' directive, considers this reflects policy 8 of the NPS-ET and provides a more appropriate and comprehensive policy framework that recognises the existing assets. Considers that utilisation and upgrading of existing National Grid assets should be facilitated in that it makes use of existing assets and will generally have less adverse environmental effect than that associated with the creation of new assets.</p>	<p>Add a new National Grid specific policy for Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Significant Amenity Landscapes as follows:</p> <p><u>INF-NFL-XX Upgrade of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within special amenity landscapes, and outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes (including within the coastal environment)</u> <u>In providing for the upgrade of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within special amenity landscapes, and outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes (including within the coastal environment):</u> <u>1. Seek to avoid adverse effects on special amenity landscapes, and outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes.</u> <u>2. When considering major upgrades, have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection.</u> <u>3. Recognise the constraints arising from the operational needs and functional needs of the National Grid, when considering measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects.</u> <u>4. Recognise the potential benefits of upgrades to the National Grid to people and communities; and</u> <u>5. Remedy or mitigate any adverse effects from the operation, maintenance, upgrade, major upgrade or development of the National Grid which cannot be avoided.</u></p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.81	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INF-NFL	Amend	Seeks new policy to give effect to policy 11 of NZCPS.	<p>Add new policy INF-NFL-PX (All infrastructure activities in ridgelines and hilltops, special amenity landscapes, outstanding natural features and landscapes):</p> <p><u>Only allow activities within a significant natural area in the coastal environment where it can be demonstrated that they:</u> <u>1. Avoid adverse effects on the matters in Policy 11(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010;</u> <u>2. Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on the matters in Policy 11(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010; and</u> <u>3. Protect other indigenous biodiversity values in accordance with ECO-P1.</u></p>
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.18	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INF-NFL	Oppose	Adding a policy in regard to Policy 11 of the NZCPS (indigenous biodiversity) in the INF-NFL sub chapter is opposed. This matter should be addressed in the INF-ECO sub chapter.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.35	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INFNFL	Oppose	In its submission Transpower seeks a specific National Grid policy approach to give effect to the NPSET.	Disallow / Seeks that submission is disallowed in part in so far as the relief sought is inconsistent with that sought in Transpower's submission.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.75	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INF-NFL	Oppose	WIAL opposes the relief sought by the submitter as it is appropriate for a different planning framework to apply for regionally significant infrastructure in recognition of the social, cultural and economic benefits it provides for the community and the operational and locational constraints of that infrastructure. Furthermore, the INF-CE subchapter deals with matters in the Coastal Environment. Considers that it is inappropriate to duplicate/replicate controls in multiple chapters of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Powerco Limited	FS61.18	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INF-NFL	Oppose	Adding a policy in regard to Policy 11 of the NZCPS (indigenous biodiversity) in the INF-NFL sub chapter is opposed. This matter should be addressed in the INF-ECO sub chapter.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.70	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / New INF-NFL	Oppose	Considers that NZCPS Policy 11 addresses indigenous biological diversity (not natural features and landscapes). The requested text is not relevant for chapter INF-NFL. F2410	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.82	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P38	Oppose	Opposes blanket provision for operation of infrastructure without consideration of related policy NFL-P2. Seek redrafting to ensure consideration of other relevant policies, or include wording in this policy to mirror NFL-P2.	Amend INF-NFL-P38 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within ridgelines and hilltops): Allow for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within ridgelines and hilltops <u>with consideration given to NFL-P2.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.125	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P38	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P38 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.72	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P38	Support	Supports policy to allow for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops. KRH-2 is located within the ridgelines and hilltops overlay.	Retain INF-NFL-P38 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P39	Oppose in part	INF-NFL-P39 relates to Significant Amenity Landscapes and incorrectly refers to SCHED 12 and should refer to SCHED 11. It does correctly hyperlink to SCHED 11 in the ePlan.	Amend Policy INF-NFL-P39 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within special amenity landscapes (including within the coastal environment)) to refer to SCHED 11 rather than SCHED 12.
Powerco Limited	127.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P39	Oppose in part	Considers that the policy relates to Significant Amenity Landscapes and incorrectly refers to SCHED 12 and should refer to SCHED 11. It does correctly hyperlink to SCHED 11 in the ePlan.	Amend policy INF-NFL-P39 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within special amenity landscapes (including the coastal environment)) to refer to SCHED11 (Special Amenity Landscapes) rather than SCHED12 (High Coastal Natural Character Areas) as follows: Allow for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure located within special amenity landscapes where: 1. Associated earthworks and vegetation removal are of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values as described in <u>SCHED11</u> . SCHED12.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.83	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P39	Oppose in part	Considers the policy needs to be no less protective than those in NFL chapter. Opposes use of "identified" as per previous submission comments and also seek that this cross references NFL and ECO provisions that provide for protection of biodiversity. Considers that amendments are needed include direction that effects are not only to be managed, but that certain areas, including overlays, need to be protected. This includes values in the coastal environment.	Amend INF-NFL-P39 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within special amenity landscapes (including within the coastal environment): Allow for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure located within special amenity landscapes where: 1. Associated earthworks and vegetation removal are of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values as described in SCHED12. 2. <u>[Insert reference to relevant NFL and ECO provisions for biodiversity protection]</u> 3. <u>[Insert direction that effects are not only need to be managed but protected in certain areas]</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.71	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P39	Oppose	Considers that the relevant values are (only) those that give rise to the identification of the area in the Schedule. The provisions of the NFL and ECO chapters apply anyway (that is clear in the structure of this Plan) and the requested references to these chapters are unnecessary. [Inferred reference to submission point 345.83 not 345.82]	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.126	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P39	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P39 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within special amenity landscapes (including within the coastal environment)) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P40	Oppose in part	INF-NFL-P40 relates to Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes and incorrectly refers to SCHED 11 and should refer to SCHED 10. It does correctly hyperlink to SCHED 10 in the ePlan.	Amend Policy INF-NFL-P40 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes (including within the coastal environment)) to refer to SCHED 10 rather than SCHED 11.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.84	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P40	Oppose in part	Oppose blanket 'allow' direction for operation of existing infrastructure in ONFLs. We seek clearer direction to enable assessment of effects at the time of consenting. We oppose 'identified' values. This policy needs to give effect to policy 11 of the NZCPS. We also point out the drafting error in this policy as it should refer to SCHED10, rather than SCHED11.	Amend INF-NFL-P40 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes (including within the coastal environment)): Allow for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure located within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes where: 1. Associated earthworks and vegetation removal are of a scale that protects the identified values described in SCHED110. <u>[Add direction to enable assessment of effects at consenting stage, and amend overall policy to give effect to policy 11 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement]</u>
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.19	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P40	Oppose	Adding further direction in this policy in regard to Policy 11 (indigenous biodiversity) of the NZCPS is not supported. This matter should be addressed in the INF-ECO sub chapter and not the INF-NFL provisions.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.24	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P40	Oppose	The submission point tries to assign an activity status to existing infrastructure within Natural Features and Landscapes areas. It is unclear how this is to take place as the infrastructure will be lawfully established. The term or undertaking of "reconsenting" in relation to existing infrastructure is unclear to WELL – consequently, the submission point is requested to be rejected.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.19	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P40	Oppose	Adding further direction in this policy in regard to Policy 11 (indigenous biodiversity) of the NZCPS is not supported. This matter should be addressed in the INF-ECO sub chapter and not the INF-NFL provisions.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.72	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P40	Oppose	Considers that the request in relation to 'reconsenting' is confusing because land use consents are generally not time limited. The relevant values are (only) those that give rise to the identification of the area in the Schedule. The requested 'direction' in relation to NZCPS Policy 11 is also confusing because that policy addresses indigenous biological diversity, not landscape values, so is not directly relevant for the INFNFL chapter.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.127	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P40	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P40 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes (including within the coastal environment)) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.85	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P41	Oppose in part	Seek amendment to say "Only allow" to ensure matters considered are provisional on meeting this policy.	Amend INF-NFL-P41 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within ridgelines and hilltops): <u>Only allow</u> for the upgrading of existing infrastructure within ridgelines and hilltops where: 1. The activities is compliant with the underlying infrastructure provisions; and 2. Any adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape values can be managed.
Waka Kotahi	370.128	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P41	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P41 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.73	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P41	Support	Supports policy to allow for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops. KRH-2 is located within the ridgelines and hilltops overlay.	Retain INF-NFL-P41 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.86	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P42	Oppose in part	Considers a blanket "allow" policy is inappropriate as it gives no direction as to whether the effects of undergrounding may be appropriate.	Amend INF-NFL-P42 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road): Allow for the upgrading of existing infrastructure within a special amenity landscape area where the infrastructure is located underground or within an existing legal road <u>add direction about what effects are considered appropriate when undergrounding</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.20	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P42	Oppose	Allowing for upgrading of underground infrastructure and infrastructure in existing roads in special amenity landscapes is an appropriate policy direction.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.20	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P42	Oppose	Allowing for upgrading of underground infrastructure and infrastructure in existing roads in special amenity landscapes is an appropriate policy direction.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.129	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P42	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P42 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road.) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P43	Oppose in part	INF-NFL-P43 relates to Significant Amenity Landscapes and incorrectly refers to SCHED 12 and should refer to SCHED 11. It does correctly hyperlink to SCHED 11 in the ePlan.	Amend Policy INF-NFL-P43 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located aboveground and outside an existing legal road) to refer to SCHED 11 rather than SCHED 12.
Powerco Limited	127.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P43	Oppose in part	Considers that the policy relates to Significant Amenity Landscapes and incorrectly refers to SCHED 12 and should refer to SCHED 11. It does correctly hyperlink to SCHED 11 in the ePlan.	Amend policy INF-NFL-P43 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within a special amenity landscaped (including within the coastal environment) that is located aboveground and outside an existing legal road) to refer to SCHED11 (Special Amenity Landscapes) rather than SCHED12 (High Coastal Natural Character Areas) as follows: Provide for the upgrading of existing infrastructure that is located above ground and outside an existing legal road within a special amenity landscape where: 1. The activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values as described in <u>SCHED11</u> ; SCHED12 ; ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.87	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P43	Oppose in part	Considers it inappropriate to apply a 'provide for' direction to activities in the coastal environment, particularly for upgrading as it can cause significant adverse effects. Considers the matters for consideration don't provide for the protection of biodiversity and need to include relevant ECO and NFL provisions. Opposes 'identified' values and seeks deletion of point 4.	Amend INF-NFL-P43 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located aboveground and outside an existing legal road): Provide for the upgrading of existing infrastructure that is located above ground and outside an existing legal road within a special amenity landscape where: 1. The activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values as described in SCHED12; 2. If located outside the coastal environment any adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 3. If located within the coastal environment any significant adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 4. There is a functional need or an operational need for the activity to be undertaken within the special amenity landscape. 4. It aligns with the matters set out in [the relevant ECO and NFL policies]
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.21	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P43	Oppose	Operational need and functional need are relevant considerations to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in special amenity landscapes, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy. Reference to other NFL chapter policies is not supported as the intent is for the INF chapter to be generally self-contained to properly consider infrastructure specific issues.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.21	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P43	Oppose	Operational need and functional need are relevant considerations to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in special amenity landscapes, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy. Reference to other NFL chapter policies is not supported as the intent is for the INF chapter to be generally self-contained to properly consider infrastructure specific issues.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.39	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P43	Oppose	Seeks the retention of the assessment criteria as notified which recognises the operational or functional needs of infrastructure. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.73	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P43	Oppose	Considers that the relevant values are (only) those that give rise to the identification of the area in the Schedule. Functional and operational need are relevant considerations. The proposed additional clause 4 is not necessary because the objectives and policies of the referenced chapters are applicable in any event.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.130	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P43	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P43 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located aboveground and outside an existing legal road) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.88	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P44	Oppose in part	Considers a blanket "allow" policy is inappropriate as it gives no direction as to whether the effects of undergrounding may be appropriate. Considers the policy needs to be conditional on considering other policies such as ECO-P1, NFL-P5 & P6 as well as the additional ECO and NFL policies sought by Forest & Bird to maintain biodiversity.	Amend INF-NFL-P44 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes (including within the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road): Provide for the upgrading of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes where the infrastructure is located underground or within an existing legal road <u>with consideration given to the appropriateness of effects as set out in ECO-P1, NFL-P5, NFL-P6 [and any other relevant ECO and NFL policies]</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.131	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P44	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P44 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes (including within the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P45	Oppose	This policy applies to upgrading of infrastructure outside legal road and above ground within Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes. Clause 1 of the policy has a requirement that the activity is of a scale that protects the identified values in SCHED10. This could have the effect of being treated as an "avoid" provision and appears to go beyond RPS Policy 26 which requires policies, rules or methods to protect outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes from <u>inappropriate</u> subdivision, use or development. For functional and operational reasons some infrastructure such as telecommunications infrastructure may need to be located in these environments (e.g. for line of sight radio links). Therefore, it is important that the policy framework allows for this in appropriate circumstances, particularly where a facility may have significant community benefits, can not be reasonably located elsewhere and adverse effects are mitigated to the extent practicable.	Amend Policy INF-NFL-P45 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes (including within the coastal environment) that is located above ground and outside an existing legal road) as follows: Only allow for the upgrading of existing infrastructure that is located outside an existing legal road and above ground within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes where: 1. <u>Having regard to the matters in Policy INF-P6, the activity is of a scale that protects the identified values described in SCHED10 from inappropriate development;</u>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.3	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P45	Support	WELL agree with the submitter that as currently drafted INF-NFL-P45 will be overly restrictive in undertaking upgrades to the electricity distribution network that may be located within the Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes policy areas. WELL agree that the policy is more restrictive than required (under the RPS), and consequently should be amended. The proposed amendments posed by the submitter are considered to be suitable in that they can also be applied to other infrastructure providers with assets within the Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes Policy areas.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.89	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P45	Oppose in part	Considers the policy fails to give effect to policies 11 and 15 of the NZCPS. Considers activities should be subject to consideration of NFL-P5 and P6, the INF-NFL-PXX policy sought below and all relevant ECO provisions. Opposes the use of "identified" values given the shortcomings of SCHED10, and seeks deletion of point 4.	Amend INF-NFL-P45 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes (including within the coastal environment) that is located above ground and outside an existing legal road): Only allow for the upgrading of existing infrastructure that is located outside an existing legal road and above ground within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes where: 1. The activity is of a scale that protects the identified values described in SCHED10; 2. If located outside the coastal environment any significant adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 3. If located within the coastal environment any adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided; and 4. There is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be undertaken within the outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes. 4. It aligns with the matters set out in NFL-P5, NFL-P6, INF-NFL-PX, and ECO-P1. <u>[Amend overall policy to give effect to Policies 11 and 15 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement]</u>
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.22	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P45	Oppose	Operational need and functional need are relevant considerations to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in outstanding natural landscapes and features, particularly as the policy has broader application than the coastal environment, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy. Reference to other NFL chapter policies is not supported as the intent is for the INF chapter to be generally self-contained to properly consider infrastructure specific issues.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.22	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P45	Oppose	Operational need and functional need are relevant considerations to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in outstanding natural landscapes and features, particularly as the policy has broader application than the coastal environment, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy. Reference to other NFL chapter policies is not supported as the intent is for the INF chapter to be generally self-contained to properly consider infrastructure specific issues.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.40	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P45	Oppose	Seeks the retention of the assessment criteria as notified which recognises the operational or functional needs of infrastructure. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.74	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P45	Oppose	Considers that the relevant values are (only) those that give rise to the identification of the area in the Schedule. The request to give effect to NZCPS Policy 11 is confusing because that policy addresses indigenous biological diversity, not landscape values, so is not directly relevant for the INF-NFL chapter. Meridian considers the policy already gives effect to NZCPS Policy 15, in the manner intended by that policy. The references to policies in other chapters of the plan are not necessary because, in the structure of this Plan, they are applicable anyway.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.132	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P45	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P45 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes (including within the coastal environment) that is located above ground and outside an existing legal road) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.90	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P46	Oppose in part	Opposes the 'allow' direction of this policy. Seek amendment to "Only allow..."	Amend INF-NFL-P46 (New infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops): <u>Only allow</u> for the installation of new infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops where: 1. The activities is compliant with the underlying zone provisions and general rules; and 2. Any adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape values can be managed.
Waka Kotahi	370.133	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P46	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P46 (New infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.74	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P46	Support	Supports policy to allow for new infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops.	Retain INF-NFL-P46 (New infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.91	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P47	Oppose in part	Considers it inappropriate to apply a 'provide for' direction to activities in the coastal environment, particularly for new infrastructure as it an cause significant adverse effects. While undergrounding is usually preferable, considers a blanket "provide for" policy is inappropriate as it does not give direction as to whether the effects are appropriate. Considers the matters for consideration don't provide for the protection of biodiversity and need to include relevant ECO and NFL provisions.	Amend INF-NFL-P47 (New infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road): Provide for the installation of new infrastructure within special amenity landscapes where the infrastructure is located underground or within an existing legal road <u>[with consideration given to the appropriateness of effects in reference to relevant ECO and NFL provisions]</u> .
Waka Kotahi	370.134	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P47	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P47 (New infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.92	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P48	Oppose in part	Considers the policy fails to give effect to policy 11 of the NZCPS. Activities should be subject to consideration of NFL-P3 & P4, ECO-P1 and the INF-NFL-PXX policy sought below. Opposes the use of 'identified' values and seeks deletion of point 4.	Amend INF-NFL-P48 (New infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located above ground and outside and existing legal road): Only allow for new infrastructure that is located outside an existing legal road and above ground within a special amenity landscape where: 1. The activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values as described in SCHED11; 2. If located outside the coastal environment any adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 3. If located within the coastal environment any significant adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 4. There is a functional need or an operational need for the activity to be undertaken within the special amenity landscape <u>4. It aligns with the matters set out in NFL-P5, NFL-P6, INF-NFL-PX, and ECO-P1.</u> <u>[Amend overall policy to give effect to Policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement]</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.23	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P48	Oppose	Operational need and functional need are relevant considerations to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in special amenity landscapes, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy. Reference to other NFL chapter policies is not supported as the intent is for the INF chapter to be generally self-contained to properly consider infrastructure specific issues.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.23	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P48	Oppose	Operational need and functional need are relevant considerations to determine if infrastructure is appropriate in special amenity landscapes, and accordingly should not be deleted from the policy. Reference to other NFL chapter policies is not supported as the intent is for the INF chapter to be generally self-contained to properly consider infrastructure specific issues.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.41	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P48	Oppose	Seeks the retention of the assessment criteria as notified which recognises the operational or functional needs of infrastructure. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.75	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P48	Oppose	Considers that the relevant values are (only) those that give rise to the identification of the area in the Schedule. Functional and operational need are relevant considerations. The proposed additional clause 4 is not necessary because the objectives and policies of the referenced chapters are applicable in any event. The request to give effect to NZCPS Policy 11 (indigenous biological diversity) is not directly relevant for special amenity landscapes.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.135	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P48	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P48 (New infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located above ground and outside and existing legal road) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P49	Oppose	This policy applies to new Infrastructure within Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes outside of the Coastal Environment. Clause 1 of the policy has a requirement that the activity is of a scale that protects the identified values in SCHED10. This could have the effect of being treated as an "avoid" provision and appears to go beyond RPS Policy 26 which requires policies, rules or methods to protect outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes from <u>inappropriate</u> subdivision, use or development. For functional and operational reasons some infrastructure such as telecommunications infrastructure may need to be located in these environments (e.g. for line of sight radio links). Therefore, it is important that the policy framework allows for this is appropriate circumstances, particularly where a facility may have significant community benefits, cannot be reasonably located elsewhere and adverse effects are mitigated to the extent practicable.	Amend Policy INF-NFL-P49 (New infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes outside the coastal environment) as follows: Only allow new infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes when located outside the coastal environment, where; 1. <u>Having regard to the matters in Policy INF-P6</u> , the activity is of a scale that protects the identified values described in SCHED10 <u>from inappropriate development</u> ;

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.4	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P49	Support	WELL agree with the submitter to the same extent as expressed above in the previous submission point (99.55). The PDP needs to be consistent with the RPS, consequently, provision in the PDP should be provided for appropriate development within the Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes policy areas.	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.93	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P49	Oppose in part	Considers activities should be subject to consideration of NFL-P5 and P6, the new INF-NFL-PXX policy (sought in below submission point) and ECO-P1. We oppose the use of "identified" and seek deletion of point 3	Amend INF-NFL-P49 (New infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes outside the coastal environment): Only allow new infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes when located outside the coastal environment, where: 1. The activity is of a scale that protects the identified values described in SCHED10; 2. Any significant adverse effects are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 3. There is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be undertaken within an outstanding natural feature or outstanding natural landscape in the coastal environment. 3. It aligns with the matters set out in NFL-P5, NFL-P6, INF-NFL-PX, and ECO-P1.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.42	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P49	Oppose	Seeks the retention of the assessment criteria as notified which recognises the operational or functional needs of infrastructure. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.76	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P49	Oppose	Considers that the relevant values are (only) those that give rise to the identification of the area in the Schedule. Functional and operational need are relevant considerations. The proposed additional clause 4 is not necessary because the objectives and policies of the referenced chapters are applicable in any event.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.136	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P49	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P49 (New infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes outside the coastal environment) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.94	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P50	Support in part	Opposes the use of "identified" values. Sports the avoidance of new infrastructure within ONFLs within the coastal environment.	Amend INF-NFL-P50 (New infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes within the coastal environment): Avoid new infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes within the coastal environment, unless it can shown that any adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.25	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P50	Oppose	WELL oppose this submission point as the intention is to essentially prohibit infrastructure locating and operating within Natural Features and Landscapes areas.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.77	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P50	Oppose	Considers that the relevant values are (only) those that give rise to the identification of the area in the Schedule.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.137	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P50	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-P50 (New infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes within the coastal environment) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.126	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P51	Support in part	The policy approach is supported and considers it gives effect to Policies 2 and 5 of the NPSET. Considers that, notwithstanding the policy support, given the wider issues with how the policy framework within the INF-NFL chapter gives effect to the NPSET, Transpower seeks an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid that address all the natural environment overlays. Reference is also sought to include minor upgrade within the policy to reflect the permitted activity status for minor upgrade works within the NESETA and enabling policy framework within the NPSET.	Supports the policy approach within the Infrastructure - Natural Features and Landscapes chapter, but seeks amendments.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.127	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P51	Amend	The policy approach is supported and considers it gives effect to Policies 2 and 5 of the NPS-ET. Considers that, notwithstanding the policy support, given the wider issues with how the policy framework within the INF-NFL chapter gives effect to the NPS-ET, Transpower seeks an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid that address all the natural environment overlays. Reference is also sought to include minor upgrade within the policy to reflect the permitted activity status for minor upgrade works within the NESETA and enabling policy framework within the NPS-ET.	Delete reference to the National Grid from INF-NFL-P51 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops).
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.128	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P52	Amend	The policy approach is supported and considers it gives effect to Policies 2 and 5 of the NPS-ET. Considers that, notwithstanding the policy support, given the wider issues with how the policy framework within the INF-NFL chapter gives effect to the NPS-ET, Transpower seeks an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid that address all the natural environment overlays. Reference is also sought to include minor upgrade within the policy to reflect the permitted activity status for minor upgrade works within the NESETA and enabling policy framework within the NPS-ET.	Delete reference to the National Grid from INF-NFL-P52 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within special amenity landscapes (including within the coastal environment)).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.129	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P53	Amend	<p>The policy approach is supported and considers it gives effect to Policies 2 and 5 of the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Considers that, notwithstanding the policy support, given the wider issues with how the policy framework within the INF-NFL chapter gives effect to the NPS-ET, Transpower seeks an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid that address all the natural environment overlays. Reference is also sought to include minor upgrade within the policy to reflect the permitted activity status for minor upgrade works within the NESETA and enabling policy framework within the NPS-ET.</p>	Delete reference to the National Grid from INF-NFL-P53 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes (including within the coastal environment)).
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.130	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P54	Amend	<p>Considers the existing National Grid assets traverse identified ridgelines and hilltops, and that the activity status for upgrades is regulated by the NESETA. Supports that component of the policy to “allow for the upgrading of existing National Grid infrastructure” on the basis it gives effect to the NPSET and in particular policy 2 which provides a very clear directive to ‘recognise and provide’ for the upgrade of the National Grid, and policy 5 to ‘enable’ the minor upgrade. However, opposes matters 1 and 2, within the policy for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clause 1. requires that “activities is compliant with the underlying infrastructure provisions”. <p>Considers the policy directive is unclear in that it is not known what are the specific infrastructure provisions to which the directive relates and what is meant by the term ‘complaint with’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clause 2. considers that the directive has wide implication in that it requires any adverse effects be managed, regardless of scale. Ridgeline and Hilltop values are not defined or described in the PDP and therefore considers it is unclear what outcomes are sought but the policy. <p>Considers that ridgelines and hilltops are not a section 6 RMA matter, and are distinct from section 7 RMA significant amenity landscapes. Considers that given the national significance of the National Grid, the enabling policy framework within the NPSET, that ridgelines and hilltops have no higher order policy support, and that the policy relates to the upgrade of existing National Grid assets, seeks amendment to exclude the qualifiers from applying to the National Grid. Considers the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET, and therefore opposes INF-NFL-P54 and instead proposes an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend policy INF-NFL-P54 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops as follows:</p> <p>INF-NFL-P54 Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops</p> <p>Allow for the upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) or Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops, <u>and specific to the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC)</u>, where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activities is compliant with the underlying infrastructure provisions; and 2. Any adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape values can be managed.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.131	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P55	Oppose	<p>Considers Transpower has no existing assets in a significant amenity landscape that is located underground or within an existing legal road. As such considers the policy is not applicable to the National Grid and references to the Grid shall be deleted.</p>	Opposes reference to the National Grid in policy INF-NFL-P55 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) or Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road).
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.132	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P55	Amend	<p>Considers Transpower has no existing assets in a significant amenity landscape that is located underground or within an existing legal road. As such the policy is not applicable to the National Grid and references to the Grid shall be deleted.</p>	<p>Delete reference to the National Grid from policy INF-NFL-P55 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) or Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road) as follows:</p> <p>INF-NFL-P55 Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) or Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road</p> <p>Allow for the upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) or Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a special amenity landscape where the infrastructure is located underground or within an existing legal road.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.133	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P56	Oppose	Considers the relationship between P55 and P56 is not clear (noting that P55 includes the proviso within the coastal environment and P56 relates to outside the coastal environment). Transpower has no existing assets in a significant amenity landscape that is located underground or within an existing legal road. As such considers the policy is not applicable to the National Grid and references to the Grid shall be deleted.	Opposes reference to the National Grid in (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within special amenity landscapes (outside of the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road) policy INF-NFL-P56.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.134	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P56	Amend	Considers the relationship between P55 and P56 is not clear (noting that P55 includes the proviso within the coastal environment and P56 relates to outside the coastal environment). Transpower has no existing assets in a significant amenity landscape that is located underground or within an existing legal road. As such considers the policy is not applicable to the National Grid and references to the Grid shall be deleted.	Delete reference to the National Grid from policy INF-NFL-P56 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within special amenity landscapes (outside of the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road) as follows: INF-NFL-P56 Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within special amenity landscapes (outside of the coastal environment) that is located underground or within an existing legal road Provide for the upgrading of existing infrastructure (outside CE) where the infrastructure is located underground or within an existing legal road.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.135	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P57	Oppose	Transpower has existing assets within identified areas of significant amenity landscapes. Considers the activity status for upgrades is regulated by the NESETA. Supports that component of the policy to “provide for the upgrading of existing National Grid infrastructure” on the basis it gives effect to the NPS-ET and in particular policy 2 and 5. However, submitter opposes the matters within the policy for the following reasons: - Clause 1. Considers the term ‘at a scale’ is subjective and does not recognise the characterises and technical and operational requirements and constraints of the National Grid. The NPS-ET does not require the activity to be of a scale that protects the identified values. Considers the identified values in the scheduled areas are very broad and it is unclear what aspects of the values are to be maintained or restored. - Clause 3. Considers this is not applicable to the National Grid in that there are no assets within SAL’s with the coastal environment. Transpower has concerns the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET and therefore opposes INF-NFL-P57 and proposes an amended policy framework (to apply to SALs and ONFL’s) specific to the National Grid. The proposed approach has a ‘seek to avoid’ directive, considers this reflects policy 8 of the NPS-ET and provides a more appropriate and comprehensive policy framework that recognises the existing assets. Considers that utilisation and upgrading of existing National Grid assets should be facilitated in that it makes use of existing assets and will generally have less adverse environmental effect than that associated with the creation of new assets.	Opposes reference to the National Grid in policy INF-NFL-P57 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) or Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located aboveground and outside an existing legal road). [And add new policy specific to the National Grid for Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Significant Amenity Landscapes]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.136	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P57	Amend	<p>Transpower has existing assets within identified areas of significant amenity landscapes. Considers the activity status for upgrades is regulated by the NESETA. Supports that component of the policy to "provide for the upgrading of existing National Grid infrastructure" on the basis it gives effect to the NPSET and in particular policy 2 and 5. However, submitter opposes the matters within the policy for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clause 1. Considers the term 'at a scale' is subjective and does not recognise the characterises and technical and operational requirements and constraints of the National Grid. The NPSET does not require the activity to be of a scale that protects the identified values. Considers the identified values in the scheduled areas are very broad and it is unclear what aspects of the values are to be maintained or restored. - Clause 3. Considers this is not applicable to the National Grid in that there are no assets within SAL's with the coastal environment. <p>Transpower has concerns the policy does not give effect to the NPSET and therefore opposes INF-NFL-P57 and proposes an amended policy framework (to apply to SALs and ONFL's) specific to the National Grid. The proposed approach has a 'seek to avoid' directive, considers this reflects policy 8 of the NPSET and provides a more appropriate and comprehensive policy framework that recognises the existing assets. Considers that utilisation and upgrading of existing National Grid assets should be facilitated in that it makes use of existing assets and will generally have less adverse environmental effect than that associated with the creation of new assets.</p>	<p>Delete reference to the National Grid from policy INF-NFL-P57 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) or Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within a special amenity landscape (including within the coastal environment) that is located aboveground and outside an existing legal road).</p> <p>[And add new policy specific to the National Grid for Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Significant Amenity Landscapes]</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.137	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P58	Oppose	<p>Transpower has existing assets within identified areas of significant amenity landscapes. Considers the activity status for upgrades is regulated by the NESETA. Supports that component of the policy to "provide for the upgrading of existing National Grid infrastructure" on the basis it gives effect to the NPS-ET and in particular policy 2 and 5. However, submitter opposes the matters within the policy for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clause 1. Considers the term 'at a scale' is subjective and does not recognise the characterises and technical and operational requirements and constraints of the National Grid. The NPS-ET does not require the activity to be of a scale that protects the identified values. Considers the identified values in the scheduled areas are very broad and it is unclear what aspects of the values are to be maintained or restored. - Clause 3. Considers this is not applicable to the National Grid in that there are no assets within SAL's with the coastal environment. <p>Transpower has concerns the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET and therefore opposes INF-NFL-P57 and proposes an amended policy framework (to apply to SALs and ONFL's) specific to the National Grid. The proposed approach has a 'seek to avoid' directive, considers this reflects policy 8 of the NPS-ET and provides a more appropriate and comprehensive policy framework that recognises the existing assets. Considers that utilisation and upgrading of existing National Grid assets should be facilitated in that it makes use of existing assets and will generally have less adverse environmental effect than that associated with the creation of new assets.</p>	<p>Opposes reference to the National Grid in policy INF-NFL-P58 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes (including within the coastal environment)).</p> <p>[And add new policy specific to the National Grid for Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Significant Amenity Landscapes]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.138	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P58	Amend	<p>Transpower has existing assets within identified areas of significant amenity landscapes. Considers the activity status for upgrades is regulated by the NESETA. Supports that component of the policy to "provide for the upgrading of existing National Grid infrastructure" on the basis it gives effect to the NPSET and in particular policy 2 and 5. However, submitter opposes the matters within the policy for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clause 1. Considers the term 'at a scale' is subjective and does not recognise the characterises and technical and operational requirements and constraints of the National Grid. The NPSET does not require the activity to be of a scale that protects the identified values. Considers the identified values in the scheduled areas are very broad and it is unclear what aspects of the values are to be maintained or restored. - Clause 3. Considers this is not applicable to the National Grid in that there are no assets within SAL's with the coastal environment. <p>Transpower has concerns the policy does not give effect to the NPSET and therefore opposes INF-NFL-P57 and proposes an amended policy framework (to apply to SALs and ONFL's) specific to the National Grid. The proposed approach has a 'seek to avoid' directive, considers this reflects policy 8 of the NPSET and provides a more appropriate and comprehensive policy framework that recognises the existing assets. Considers that utilisation and upgrading of existing National Grid assets should be facilitated in that it makes use of existing assets and will generally have less adverse environmental effect than that associated with the creation of new assets.</p>	<p>Delete reference to the National Grid from policy INF-NFL-P58 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) and Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes (including within the coastal environment).</p> <p>[And add new policy specific to the National Grid for Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Significant Amenity Landscapes]</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.139	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P59	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is not clear why INF-NFL-P59 is within the NFL chapter given it relates to the CE and not NFL's. As with other INF-NFL policies, Transpower opposes INF-NFL-P59. Considers policy INF-NFL-P59 has implications for any new Cook Strait cables at Oteranga Bay, and other new National Grid assets within the CE. Considers the avoid directive within the policy does not give effect to the NPS-ET, including Policy 8, noting that it applies to the entire coastal environment and not only the higher values areas. Considers the higher order policy support for the policy is not clear noting the NZCPS does not impose a blanket avoid requirement for the coastal environment, within Policy 6(1)(a) recognising the provision of infrastructure and the transmission of electricity. Seeks a new policy that provides a comprehensive policy approach that gives effect to and reconciles the NPS-ET and NZCPS. Considers given the comprehensive nature of the policy sought, it is proposed to be located in the INF chapter rather than sub chapters.</p>	<p>Delete policy INF-NFL-P59 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within the coastal environment) in its entirety.</p> <p>[And add new policy specific to the National Grid in the Infrastructure (INF) chapter]</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.140	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-P60	Oppose	<p>Opposes INF-NFL-P60 and proposes an amended policy framework specific to the National Grid. Has specific concerns the policy does not give effect to the NPSET in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific to clause 1. 2. and 3., considers the NPS-ET does not require the activity to be of a scale that protects the identified values for ONFL's, not maintains or restores those for SAL's. It does not require the avoidance of visually obtrusive structures within ridgelines and hilltops. The ridgelines and hilltops cover a large extent of the city and given the linear nature of the transmission network and the visual element associated with its support structures, considers it would not be possible or practicable to 'avoid visually obtrusive structures. - In response to clause 4. considers the NPS-ET does not require significant adverse effects be avoided. - Considers Clause 5. is acceptable in so far as it relates to functional or operational need. Considers the reference to 'reasonably practical alternative locations' is not necessary given the definitions of operational and functional need. Has concerns with the term 'practical' as it is considered to introduce uncertainty. Considers the term 'practicable' is more readily understood. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason</p>	<p>Delete INF-NFL-P60 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops, outside the coastal environment).</p> <p>[And add a new National Grid specific policy in the Infrastructure chapter]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Firstgas Limited	304.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R48	Support	INF-NFL-R48 is supported as it provides for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of infrastructure within the special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops.	Retain INF-NFL-R48 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops (including within the coastal environment)) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.138	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R48	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-R48 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops (including within the coastal environment)) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.75	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R48	Support	Supports this rule which allows for the operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops, subject to earthworks standards.	Retain INF-NFL-R48 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops (including within the coastal environment)) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R49	Support	INF-NFL-R49 is supported as it provides for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of infrastructure within the special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops.	Retain INF-NFL-R49 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.139	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R49	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-R49 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.76	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R49	Amend	Supports provision for upgrading infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops. However, KiwiRail seek amendment to allow for upgrades to the radio station at Hawkins Hill.	Amend INF-NFL-R49 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within the special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops) as follows: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The infrastructure is located underground; or b. The infrastructure is located within an existing <u>rail or road</u> reserve; or c. The upgrade is contained entirely within an existing building or structure.
Waka Kotahi	370.140	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R50	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-R50 (Upgrading of existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.141	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R51	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-R51 (New infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.142	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R52	Support	These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NFL-R52 (New infrastructure within special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R52	Amend	Considers that in relation to Natural Features and Landscapes chapter that there are no triggers for active engagement with Mana Whenua.	Seeks amendment to INF-NFL-R52.2 (New infrastructure within special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops) to include triggers for active engagement with Taranaki Whānui in relation to SASM as matter of discretion under rule.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.77	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R52	Amend	Supports provision for new infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops. However, KiwiRail seek amendment to allow for new infrastructure.	Amend INF-NFL-R52 (New infrastructure within special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The infrastructure is located underground; or b. The infrastructure is located within an existing rail or road reserve.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.141	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R53	Oppose	Considers existing National Grid assets traverse Outstanding Natural Landscapes (at Oteranga Bay noting that while some of the assets are within the Oteranga Bay designation, others are not), Special Amenity Landscapes across the city, and Ridgelines and Hilltops across the city. The existing assets within the Boom Rock/Pipinui Point Escarpment Outstanding Natural Features overlay are within the Transpower Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station Designation (ID: TPR5) and are therefore no subject to any rule. Considers the NESETA provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid. Considers that INF-NFL-R53 for existing National Grid structures captured by the NESETA is of no relevance to Transpower in respect of rule application and only adds confusion and potential errors in the application of rules.	Opposes reference to the National Grid in INF-NFL-R53 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops (including within the coastal environment).
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.142	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R53	Amend	Considers existing National Grid assets traverse Outstanding Natural Landscapes (at Oteranga Bay noting that while some of the assets are within the Oteranga Bay designation, others are not), Special Amenity Landscapes across the city, and Ridgelines and Hilltops across the city. The existing assets within the Boom Rock/Pipinui Point Escarpment Outstanding Natural Features overlay are within the Transpower Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station Designation (ID: TPR5) and are therefore no subject to any rule. Considers the NESETA provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid. Considers that INF-NFL-R53 for existing National Grid structures captured by the NESETA is of no relevance to Transpower in respect of rule application and only adds confusion and potential errors in the application of rules.	Delete reference to the National Grid from Rule INF-NFL-R53 (Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops (including within the coastal environment) as follows: INF-NFL-R53 Operation, maintenance and repair of existing National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops (including within the coastal environment) All Zones 1. Activity status: Permitted

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.143	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R54	Oppose	Considers that existing National Grid assets traverse Outstanding Natural Landscapes (at Oteranga Bay noting that while some of the assets are within the Oteranga Bay designation, others are not), Special Amenity Landscapes across the city, and Ridgelines and Hilltops across the city. Considers the existing assets within the Boom Rock/Pipinui Point Escarpment Outstanding Natural Features overlay are within the Transpower Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station Designation (ID: TPR5) and are therefore no subject to any rule. Considers the NESETA provides prevailing provisions for the upgrading of the National Grid. The NESETA provides a Discretionary activity status under Regulations 39 of the NESETA for those activities subject to the NESETA but not otherwise captured under other regulations in the NESETA. Considers INF-NFL-R54 for existing National Grid structures captured by the NESETA is of no relevance to Transpower in respect of rule application and adds confusion and potential errors in the application of rules.	Delete rule INF-NFL-54 (Upgrading of existing National Grid (NG) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes, or identified ridgelines and hilltops) in its entirety.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.144	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R56	Support in part	Considers that the NESETA does not apply to new National Grid assets. On this basis, Transpower supports the default discretionary activity rule as it provides a robust consenting framework whilst still recognising the national significance of the National Grid. Notwithstanding its support for a discretionary activity status, Transpower does query whether a discretionary activity status is appropriate for Ridgelines and Hilltops and seeks a restricted discretionary activity status for Ridgelines and Hilltops. Transpower is concerned Ridgelines and Hilltops are afforded the same policy framework as ONFL's even they are not section 6 RMA matters. The rationalise and even need for the Ridgelines and Hilltops is not evident given the identification of ONFLs and SALs.	Retain INF-NFL-R56 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops), with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.145	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R56	Amend	Considers that the NESETA does not apply to new National Grid assets. On this basis, Transpower supports the default discretionary activity rule as it provides a robust consenting framework whilst still recognising the national significance of the National Grid. Notwithstanding its support for a discretionary activity status, Transpower does query whether a discretionary activity status is appropriate for Ridgelines and Hilltops and seeks a restricted discretionary activity status for Ridgelines and Hilltops. Transpower is concerned Ridgelines and Hilltops are afforded the same policy framework as ONFL's even they are not section 6 RMA matters. The rationalise and even need for the Ridgelines and Hilltops is not evident given the identification of ONFLs and SALs.	Amend the activity status under INF-NFL-R56 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops) insofar as it relates to ridgelines and hilltops to Restricted Discretionary as follows: INF-NFL-R56.1 New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, <u>and</u> special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops . 1. Activity Status: Discretionary <u>INF-NFL-R56.2 New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within identified ridgelines and hilltops</u> 2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.146	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R57	Oppose	Considers the entire southern and western coastline is identified as an ONFL [see original submission for supplied image]. Opposes the non-complying activity status on the basis it does not give effect to the NPS-ET. The rule and associated policy framework would mean essential and nationally significant (as recognised in the NPS-ET) new National Grid assets (such as a new Cook Strait Cable within the existing Cook Strait Cable Protection Zone) would potentially not be able to secure consent in that it would be subject to a non-complying activity status and an 'avoid' policy directive (under P59) and therefore unable to pass the s104 RMA 'gateway test'. The activity status does not give effect to the NPS-ET.	Opposes the non-complying activity status for the new National Grid infrastructure within Rule INF-NFL-R57 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.147	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-R57	Amend	<p>Considers the entire southern and western coastline is identified as an ONFL [see original submission for supplied image].</p> <p>Opposes the non-complying activity status on the basis it does not give effect to the NPS-ET. The rule and associated policy framework would mean essential and nationally significant (as recognised in the NPS-ET) new National Grid assets (such as a new Cook Strait Cable within the existing Cook Strait Cable Protection Zone) would potentially not be able to secure consent in that it would be subject to a non-complying activity status and an 'avoid' policy directive (under P59) and therefore unable to pass the s104 RMA 'gateway test'. The activity status does not give effect to the NPS-ET.</p>	<p>Amend the activity status for the new National Grid infrastructure within Rule INF-NFL-R57 (New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, special amenity landscapes or identified ridgelines and hilltops) from non-complying to discretionary activity status, as follows:</p> <p>INF-NFL-R57 New National Grid (NG) & Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor (GTPC) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, within the coastal environment</p> <p>All Zones 1. Activity status: Non-Complying</p> <p><u>INF-NFL-R57a New National Grid (NG) infrastructure within outstanding natural features and outstanding landscapes, within the coastal environment</u></p> <p><u>All Zones 1. Activity status: Discretionary</u></p>
Firstgas Limited	304.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-S21	Amend	<p>Considers that INF-NFL-S21 should be amended. The ability to excavate up to a maximum volume of 350m3 per project during maintenance and repair works on existing infrastructure is required. This volume is based on the depth of the pipeline and standard operating procedures for trenching.</p>	<p>Amend INF-NFL-S21 (Earthworks) as follows:</p> <p>1. Earthworks must not exceed:</p> <p>a. More than 50m3 per transmission line support structure; or</p> <p>b. 100m3 per access track; and</p> <p>c. <u>More than 350m3 per maintenance or repair project.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.148	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-S21	Not specified	<p>Considers standard INF-NFL-S21 is applied to Rule INF-NFL-R48 which is not applicable to the National Grid. On that basis submitter is neutral on INF-NFL-S21. Considers that if the intent is for INF-NFL-S21 to apply to the National Grid (under Rules R53, 56 and 57) Transpower opposes its application as it either duplicates the NESETA or has not basis for inclusion as a standard for new National Grid assets. [Submitter has stated position as Neutral]</p>	<p>Retain INF-NFL-S21 (Earthworks) as notified, on the basis that it is not applicable to the National Grid.</p> <p>[Submitter has stated position as neutral]</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.98	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-S21	Amend	<p>Considers that Policy 24 of the RPS directs councils to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values. The 'identified' qualifier limits the consideration of effects to those values identified within the SNA at the time of plan notification. The values of most SNAs have been identified only at a high-level, and often only through desktop analysis. The assessment required to identify the scope of effects may identify additional values and this should be part of the consideration of effects at the time consent is applied for.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend wording to remove 'identified' before 'significant biodiversity values' when referring to adverse effects caused by activities or maintenance of biodiversity values.</p>
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-S21	Support	<p>Support the proposal from GWRC to remove 'identified' before 'significant biodiversity values'. Agree with them that the assessment required to identify the scope of effects may identify additional values and this should be part of the consideration of effects at the time consent is applied for.</p>	<p>Allow</p>
Waka Kotahi	370.143	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Features and Landscapes / INF-NFL-S21	Support	<p>These provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.</p>	<p>Retain INF-NFL-S21 (Earthworks) as notified.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Amend	Considers that it is unclear how Council will ensure and enforce compliance with seismic building standards and the quality of construction for the multi-storey buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that assurances are given to people who, due to seismic concerns, may have consciously decided to live in an area characterised by low-rise buildings, and suddenly have to navigate high rises in their neighbourhoods.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to INF-NH because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Kimberley Vermaey	348.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Amend	Considers that buildings in the Flood Hazard Overlay with water depths less than 0.5m should not require resource consents, subject to minimum floor levels. For buildings with floodwater depths 0.5m or greater, resource consent should be needed as proposed, with displacement effects considered.	Seeks that buildings with flood water depth of less than 0.5m in the Flood Hazard Overlay not require resource consents.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' to include Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.122	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INFNH	Support	Greater Wellington support the inclusion and protection of SASM.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
CentrePort Limited	402.71	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Oppose	Considers that there is a structural difficulty with Natural Hazards being included in the Infrastructure section when there is a separate and standalone chapter that specifically references Natural Hazards as well as coastal hazards included in the Coastal Environment. This creates uncertainty. For an infrastructure provider and for ease of plan usage these provisions should be in the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Seeks that Infrastructure Natural Hazards provisions are located within the Natural Hazards Chapter.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.24	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Oppose	Retaining the infrastructure rules related to natural hazards in the INF-NH sub-chapter rather than the general NH Chapter is preferred to keep the INF provisions largely self-contained in one location.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.76	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Support	WIAL shares the concerns of CentrePort Limited, that there is a lot of duplication in the Proposed Plan, particularly as it relates to the natural hazard provisions that apply to (regionally significant) infrastructure.	Allow
Powerco Limited	FS61.38	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Oppose	Retaining the infrastructure rules related to natural hazards in the INF-NH sub-chapter rather than the general NH Chapter is preferred to keep the INF provisions largely self-contained in one location.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.72	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Amend	Considers that there is a structural difficulty with Natural Hazards being included in the Infrastructure section when there is a separate and standalone chapter that specifically references Natural Hazards as well as coastal hazards included in the Coastal Environment. This creates uncertainty. For an infrastructure provider and for ease of plan usage these provisions should be in the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Seeks that Infrastructure Natural Hazards provisions are located within the Natural Hazards Chapter.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.77	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / General INF-NH	Support	WIAL shares the concerns of CentrePort Limited, that there is a lot of duplication in the Proposed Plan, particularly as it relates to the natural hazard provisions that apply to (regionally significant) infrastructure.	Allow
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / New INF-NH	Amend	Considers that students are vulnerable to the risks natural hazards pose to rental properties. Considers that students, due to affordability concerns, are likely to be renting older properties and if maintenance of existing infrastructure to mitigate the risks of natural hazards is not mandatory, this could place renters at risk. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that maintenance of existing rental property infrastructure to mitigate the risks of natural hazards should be mandatory. [Inferred decision requested].
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Support	Supports that any new builds that become rental properties will have controls in place to reduce natural hazard risks. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Retain INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Amend	Notes a typo in INF-NH-P61	Amend INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard overlays) as follows: When located in an overland flow path, stream corridor, or high coastal hazard area hazard area , have a functional need or operational need that means the infrastructure's location cannot be avoided and there are no reasonable alternatives.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.149	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Support	Generally supports INF-NH-P61 as considers it provides an appropriate policy framework in which to consider both new and existing infrastructure within hazard areas. Considers that given the linear nature of the Grid, while it can be designed in a manner that does not place the National Grid, people or properties at risk (nor exacerbate any risks), it cannot always avoid locating within or traversing through hazard overlays (and particularly stream corridors and ponding areas and fault lines).	Retain policy INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.99	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Support	Supports this policy directs that infrastructure is only established in the natural hazard and coastal Hazard Overlays where the risk is low, the risk is mitigated, or the location is unavoidable. This is appropriate and aligned with RPS direction (Policy 29).	Retain INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.144	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.73	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Support in part	Supports policy INF-NH-P61 but considers that for ease of plan usage it should instead be included in the overarching Natural Hazard Overlays chapter.	Retain INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) at notified, but relocate to the Natural Hazards Chapter.
CentrePort Limited	402.74	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Amend	Considers that for ease of plan usage policy INF-NH-P61 should instead be included in the overarching Natural Hazard Overlays chapter.	Seeks that INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) is relocated to the Natural Hazards Chapter.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.151	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Oppose	Opposes INF-NH-P61. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.91 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.152	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Amend	Opposes INF-NH-P61. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.91 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment. Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays Only allow for new infrastructure, and any associated structures in the Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays where the infrastructure or associated structures: 1. Do not create an intolerable level of increase the risk from the natural hazard to people, or other property or infrastructure; 2. Incorporate design measures to reduce the potential for damage to the infrastructure following a natural hazard or coastal hazard event to the extent reasonably practicable; and 3. <u>Have an operational or functional need to locate within Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays; and</u> 2-4 When located in an overland flowpath, stream corridor, or high coastal hazard area, have a functional need or operational need that means the infrastructure's location cannot be avoided and there are no reasonably practicable alternatives.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.43	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Support	Supports recognition that there is, in some instances, an operational or functional need to locate infrastructure within a natural hazard overlay. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.153	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Amend	Opposes INF-NH-P61. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.91 in original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.78	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-P61	Support	Supports recognition that in some instances there are operational and functional needs for activities to locate in certain locations, which can include within hazard areas. KiwiRail has existing infrastructure which is located within the mapped Natural Hazard Overlays. The rail network has been in place for many years and for various operational reasons, is unable to be easily relocated to avoid such hazard areas.	Retain INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Support	Supports INF-NH-R58 in its entirety. Supports the increased restrictions on building in areas that are deemed at higher risk of natural hazards.	Retain INF-NH-R58 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Powerco Limited	127.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Oppose	Stated that Powerco has existing gas distribution network in the road running along the coastal margins of the Island Bay area. This road along with several adjacent properties who may require connection to the gas network are located within the High Hazard Area of the Coastal Hazard Overlay. Considers that under this proposed rule maintenance and repair of the existing gas distribution infrastructure or providing a customer connection to an adjacent customer would require resource consent. Amendments to the rule are requested to reflect that existing gas distribution network in this hazard area may need to be maintained or upgraded, and adjacent properties if already established should be able to have a connection from this network. [refer to image in original submission]	Amend Rule INF-NH-R58 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The underground infrastructure does not result in a permanent change to the ground level within the: i. Ponding or overland flow path areas of the flood hazard extent; or ii. Stream corridor area of the flood hazard extent; and b. The underground infrastructure is not located within the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays (other than in regard to maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure in a road or customer connections); or c. If the underground infrastructure is located within the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlay it is also within the City Centre Zone.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Amend	Considers that new underground infrastructure should not be located in hazardous areas unless it will not worsen any impacts of an event, and includes resilience features to reduce any damage from events. Identifies that power generating facilities, water treatment and wastewater treatment, other public utilities, and infrastructure containing hazardous materials are BIC 3 structures, and references the MfE Active Fault Guidelines which recommends that such infrastructure is not built within 20 m of a fault with a recurrence interval of 5000 years or less. Understands the need to transport water, wastewater and electricity across the Wellington fault due to the location of the fault. However, considers that key network facilities such as substations and water and waste-water treatment should not be situated within 20 m of the Fault Hazard Overlays.	Amend INF-NH-R58-1 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The underground infrastructure does not result in a permanent change to the ground level within the: i. Ponding or overland flow path areas of the flood hazard extent; or ii. Stream corridor area of the flood hazard extent; and b. The underground infrastructure is not located within the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; or c. If the underground infrastructure is located within the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlay it is also within the City Centre Zone, and where it can be demonstrated that the infrastructure does not increase hazard impacts in a coastal hazard event; d. New infrastructure with the potential to increase impacts of the hazard in the event of an earthquake is not located within the Wellington, Ohariu, or Shepherd's Gully Fault Overlay. e. New and existing infrastructure include resilience features to reduce damage from natural hazard events.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.25	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Oppose	Amendments to clause (c) to require demonstration that infrastructure does not increase a natural hazard event in the central city zone is not supported. This may lead to unnecessary investigations or regulation via rules for business as usual works in the city centre such as customer connections.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.39	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Oppose	Amendments to clause (c) to require <u>demonstration</u> that infrastructure does not increase a natural hazard event in the central city zone is not supported. This may lead to unnecessary investigations or regulation via rules for business as usual works in the city centre such as customer connections.	Disallow
Firstgas Limited	304.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Support	INF-NH-R58 is supported as it provides the ability to construct new underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays where the infrastructure does not result in a permanent change to the ground level within the ponding or overland flow path areas of the flood hazard extent; or stream corridor area of the flood hazard extent.	Retain INF-NH-R58 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.150	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Support	The submitter considers they have underground assets within the Ohariu Fault (at the Karori Golf Club) and the within the Overland Flowpath and Inundation Area at Kaiwharawhara Road. Considers the NESETA provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid, and on this basis, Rules INF-NH-R58 and INF-NH-R59 (with limits), for existing National Grid structures captured by the NESETA are of limited relevance to Transpower in respect of rule application. It is noted the NESETA provides a Discretionary activity status under Regulations 39 of the NESETA for those activities subject to the NESETA but not otherwise captured under other regulations in the NESETA. Considers that notwithstanding the application of the NESETA, the maintenance and upgrade of the existing underground assets would be able to comply with the permitted activity standards. Supports the restricted discretionary activity status for the assets as coupled with the policy framework, considers the rule provides a robust but pragmatic framework in which to consider infrastructure in hazard areas.	Retain INF-NH-R58 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.145	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NH-R58 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.75	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Oppose	Opposes that resource consent for new underground infrastructure within the Special Port Zone is required. While new underground infrastructure is permitted outside of the high coastal inundation overlay three parts of the Commercial Port Area are subject to this overlay. It is non sensible to require resource consent for new underground infrastructure within the Special Port Zone where by its very nature underground infrastructure must be located where it is required to support operational Port activities.	Seeks that the Special Purpose Port Zone is excluded from INF-NH-R58 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays).
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.79	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R58	Support	Supports new underground infrastructure, and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays being a permitted activity, subject to standards.	Retain INF-NH-r58 (New underground infrastructure (including customer connections), and maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Support	Supports INF-NH-R59 in its entirety. Supports the increased restrictions on building in areas that are deemed at higher risk of natural hazards.	Retain INF-NH-R59 (Temporary infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.151	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Support	Supports the permitted and default restricted discretionary activity status for temporary infrastructure as coupled with the policy framework, considers the rule provides a robust but pragmatic framework in which to consider infrastructure in hazard areas.	Retain INF-NH-R59 (Temporary infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.146	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NH-R59 (Temporary infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.76	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Oppose	Opposes that resource consent for temporary activities within the overlay in the Special Port Zone is required. Temporary activities are permitted outside of the high coastal inundation overlay and it is considered unnecessary to require resource consent for temporary activities within the overlay in the Special Port Zone.	Seeks that the Special Purpose Port Zone is excluded from INF-NH-R59 (Temporary infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.154	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Oppose	Opposes INF-NH-R59. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.91 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes INF-NH-R59 (Temporary infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.155	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Amend	Opposes INF-NH-R59. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.91 in original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-NH-R59 (Temporary infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The temporary infrastructure is not located within the: iv. <u>The high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlay outside of the Natural Open Space Zone located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.88	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Oppose	The coast between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is subject to multiple coastal hazards, particularly coastal inundation, erosion and tsunamis. This area is also at risk from liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. Coastal hazard risk will increase in the near future due to sea level rise and other effects of climate change. Limiting restriction on infrastructure development in this area may allow for development in inappropriate areas which are not sustainable in the long term.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.156	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Amend	Opposes INF-NH-R59. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.91 in original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-NH-R59 (Temporary infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) in its entirety.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.89	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Oppose	The coast between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is subject to multiple coastal hazards, particularly coastal inundation, erosion and tsunamis. This area is also at risk from liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. Coastal hazard risk will increase in the near future due to sea level rise and other effects of climate change. Limiting restriction on infrastructure development in this area may allow for development in inappropriate areas which are not sustainable in the long term.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.80	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R59	Support	Supports provision for temporary activities within hazard overlays as a permitted activity, subject to standards.	Retain INF-NH-R59 (Temporary infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Support	Supports INF-NH-R60 in its entirety. Supports the increased restrictions on building in areas that are deemed at higher risk of natural hazards.	Retain INF-NH-R60 (New above ground infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Amend	Considers that new above ground infrastructure should not be located in hazardous areas unless it will not worsen any impacts of an event, and includes resilience features to reduce any damage from events. References the MfE Active Fault Guidelines that recommend that such infrastructure is not built within 20 m of a fault with a recurrence interval of 5000 years or less. Considers that this would be the Wellington, Ohariu and Shepherd's Gully Faults, but not the Terawhiti Fault has a recurrence interval greater than 5000 years. Understands the need to transport water, wastewater and electricity across faults due to their location. However, considers that new key network facilities such as substations and water and wastewater treatment should not be situated within 20 m of the Fault Hazard Overlays: A. Within 20 m of the Hazard Overlays of faults with recurrence intervals of 5000 years or lower; or, B. Within the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Zone Considers that if this infrastructure is severely damaged due to placement on a fault rupture, they can cause cascading additional hazards such as fire or waste contamination. Additionally, damage to key infrastructure due to its placement on the fault rupture reduces the city's resilience and continued functionality in the event of an earthquake.	Amend INF-NH-R60-1 (New above ground infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The infrastructure is located within: i. The ponding area of the flood hazard extent; ii. The low and medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; iii. The Sheppards Gully Fault Overlay, Ohariu Fault Overlay or the Terawhiti Fault Overlay; iv. The Liquefaction Overlay; or v. High hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the City Centre Zone, <u>where it can be demonstrated that the infrastructure does not increase the hazard impacts in a coastal hazard event.</u> b. <u>The infrastructure includes resilience features to reduce damage from natural hazards</u>
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.26	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Oppose	Amendments to the permitted activity standards to require demonstration that infrastructure does not increase a natural hazard event in the central city zone is not supported. This may lead to unnecessary investigations or regulation via rules for business as usual works in the city centre. Further, the requirement to include resilience features may not be appropriate or practical in all instances for routine works. Infrastructure in the city centre is necessary to serve development there.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.40	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Oppose	Amendments to the permitted activity standards to require demonstration that infrastructure does not increase a natural hazard event in the central city zone is not supported. This may lead to unnecessary investigations or regulation via rules for business as usual works in the city centre. Further, the requirement to include resilience features may not be appropriate or practical in all instances for routine works. Infrastructure in the city centre is necessary to serve development there.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.152	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Support	Considers that given the linear nature of the National Grid and locational constraints, while Transpower would endeavour to avoid locating new National Grid assets within hazard overlays, it is not always possible. Supports the restricted discretionary activity status for new assets which are not permitted as considers that coupled with the policy framework, the activity status, the rule provides a robust but pragmatic framework in which to consider infrastructure in hazard areas.	Retain INF-NH-R60 (New above ground infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.147	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-NH-R60 (New above ground infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.77	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Oppose	Opposes that resource consent for new above ground infrastructure within the overlay in the Special Port Zone is required. While new above ground infrastructure is permitted outside of the high coastal inundation overlay three parts of the Commercial Port Area are subject to this overlay. It is non sensible to require resource consent for new above ground infrastructure within the Special Port Zone where by its very nature above ground infrastructure must be located where it is required to support operational Port activities.	Seeks that the Special Purpose Port Zone is excluded from INF-NH-R60 (New above ground infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.157	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Oppose in part	Opposes INF-NH-R60. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.91 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes INF-NH-R60 (New above ground infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) in part and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.158	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Amend	Opposes INF-NH-R60. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.91 in original submission for full reason]	Amend INF-NH-R60 (New above ground infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The infrastructure is located within: ... <u>vi. High hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlay within the Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u> 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. The infrastructure is located within the: ... iv. High hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlay outside of the City Centre Zone <u>or outside of the Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u> ...
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.87	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Oppose	The coast between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is subject to multiple coastal hazards, particularly coastal inundation, erosion and tsunamis. This area is also at risk from liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. Coastal hazard risk will increase in the near future due to sea level rise and other effects of climate change. Limiting restriction on infrastructure development in this area may allow for development in inappropriate areas which are not sustainable in the long term. [Inferred reference to submission point 406.158]	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.159	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Amend	Opposes INF-NH-R60. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.91 in original submission for full reason]	Delete INF-NH-R60 (New above ground infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) in its entirety.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.90	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Oppose	The coast between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is subject to multiple coastal hazards, particularly coastal inundation, erosion and tsunamis. This area is also at risk from liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. Coastal hazard risk will increase in the near future due to sea level rise and other effects of climate change. Limiting restriction on infrastructure development in this area may allow for development in inappropriate areas which are not sustainable in the long term. [Inferred reference to submission point 406.159]	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.81	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Natural Hazards / INF-NH-R60	Support	Supports provision for new above ground infrastructure within hazard overlays as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity if standards cannot be met.	Retain INF-NH-R60 (New above ground infrastructure in Natural Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / General INF-OL	Oppose	The preamble to this section states that the notable trees chapter applies. All infrastructure notable tree rules should be included in the Other Overlays Sub Chapter. Rule TREE-S4 in the notable trees chapter should be a standard in the Other Overlays Sub-Chapter.	Amend the other Infrastructure Overlays Sub-Chapter as necessary such that the general notable trees chapter does not apply and all rules and standards for infrastructure work affecting notable trees is included within the Infrastructure Other Overlays Sub-Chapter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Powerco Limited	127.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / General INF-OL	Oppose in part	Considers that there are a number of piped awa shown in the SASM mapped overlay. This are located in built up areas of central Wellington. It is unclear if undertaking infrastructure work above these piped awa (e.g., routine work in roads) are considered to impact in this overlay, or if it is only if the piped awa is physically altered. This should be clearly clarified in the rules.	Amend the Infrastructure - Other Overlay rules relating to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori as necessary to clarify that work not directly affecting a piped awa (e.g. infrastructure work in the roads above) is not affected by the overlay and related rules.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / New INF-OL	Amend	Standard TREE-S4 should be relocated from the Notable Trees chapter to the Infrastructure – Other Overlays Sub-Chapter. The current wording is based on the Auckland Unitary Plan and was requested by the telecommunications submitters on the draft plan.	Seeks that TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) be relocated to the Infrastructure - Other Overlays sub-chapter.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.153	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-P62	Amend	<p>Considers, in terms of existing National Grid assets, in addition to single sites and features, the National Grid traverses the heritage area at Wilton (being the Otari Native Botanic Garden), the Old Coach Road in Johnsonville, a number of Sites of Significance to Māori (lines), Sites of Significance to Maori (Extent) including Kumuhore Ngakingaan and Ohariu-the Ika a Maru Takiwā, and a Site and Area of Significance to Maori at Oteranga Bay. Considers that, while Transpower endeavours to avoid the overlay areas identified in INF-OL-P62, given the linear nature of the National Grid and its associated operational and technical constraints, avoidance is not always practicable. Supports reference within the policy to INF-P6.</p> <p>In terms of the specific wording of the policy, Transpower makes the following comments:</p> <p>- Considers the term ‘give priority’ is not a common planning term and may give rise to interpretation issues. If the term in effect means avoid submitter is opposed. Recommends instead that the term be amended to ‘Seek’</p> <p>- Does not support the term ‘where possible’ as considers it sets a very high bar. Considers the term ‘practicable’ is more widely understood and has been agreed through consent order in the Greater Wellington Regional Council Proposed Natural Resource Plan. Transpower would support this term.</p>	<p>Amend INF-OL-P62 (Adverse effects of infrastructure on: 1. Historic heritage; 2. Notable trees; 3. Sites and areas of significance to Māori; and 4. Viewshafts) as follows:</p> <p>INF-OL-P62 Adverse effects of infrastructure on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic heritage; 2. Notable trees; 3. Sites and areas of significance to Māori; and 4. Viewshafts. <p>In the overlays identified in clauses 1-4 above:</p> <p>a. Give priority Seek to avoiding the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new infrastructure, on the values and attributes of the above overlays; and</p> <p>b. where the avoidance of adverse effects under clause a. is not possible practicable, the appropriateness of the substantial upgrades to, or the development of, new infrastructure will be determined by having regard to the matters listed in INF-P6.</p>
Waka Kotahi	370.148	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-P62	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-OL-P62 (Adverse effects of infrastructure on: 1. Historic heritage; 2. Notable trees; 3. Sites and areas of significance to Māori; and 4. Viewshafts.) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.78	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-P62	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain INF-OL-P62 (Adverse effects of infrastructure on: Historic heritage; Notable trees; Sites and areas of significance to Māori; and Viewshafts) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.160	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-P62	Oppose	<p>Opposes INF-OL-P62.</p> <p>Considers that use of the term “possible” within limb b should be amended to “practicable”. “Possible” is defined as “able to be done or achieved”. This sets a unreasonably high threshold, as it may be “possible” to avoid and effect, but is not “practicable” due to siting, design and costing constraints (for example).</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes INF-OL-P62 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.161	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-P62	Amend	<p>Opposes INF-OL-P62.</p> <p>Considers that use of the term “possible” within limb b should be amended to “practicable”. “Possible” is defined as “able to be done or achieved”. This sets a unreasonably high threshold, as it may be “possible” to avoid and effect, but is not “practicable” due to siting, design and costing constraints (for example).</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend INF-OL-P62 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>In the overlays identified in clauses 1-4 above:</p> <p>...</p> <p>b. Where the avoidance of adverse effects under clause a. is not possible <u>reasonably practicable</u>, the appropriateness of the substantial upgrades to, or the development of, new infrastructure will be determined by having regard to the matters listed in INF-P6.</p> <p>...</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.162	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-P62	Amend	<p>Opposes INF-OL-P62.</p> <p>Considers that use of the term “possible” within limb b should be amended to “practicable”. “Possible” is defined as “able to be done or achieved”. This sets a unreasonably high threshold, as it may be “possible” to avoid and effect, but is not “practicable” due to siting, design and costing constraints (for example).</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete INF-OL-P62 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) in its entirety.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.82	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-P62	Support	Supports policy where if avoidance of adverse effects on values and attributes of the other overlays isn't possible, assessment against matters listed in INF-P6 will determine whether the infrastructure is appropriate.	Retain INF-OL-P62 (Adverse effects of infrastructure on: Historic heritage; Notable trees; Sites and areas of significance to Māori; and Viewshafts) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R61	Oppose	Maintenance and upgrading of underground infrastructure is permitted subject to conditions. Aside from viewshafts, earthworks are only permitted to the extent they are not located in areas undisturbed by <u>the</u> infrastructure. Further allowances where the ground has been disturbed by other infrastructure or road transport infrastructure is sought to this rule.	<p>Amend Rule INF-OL-R61 (Maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted Where:</p> <p>a. The infrastructure is located on <u>a</u> site within a viewshaft listed in SCHED5; and/or</p> <p><u>b. The maintenance or upgrading does not involve earthworks on ground previously undisturbed by the infrastructure, or is located within a formed road corridor; or</u></p> <p><u>c. In the case of works within the protected root zone of a notable tree, complies with [new rule reference on Overlays Sub-Chapter for TREE-S4]</u></p>
Powerco Limited	127.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R61	Oppose	Considers that further allowances where the ground has been disturbed by other infrastructure or road transport infrastructure should be included in this rule.	<p>Amend Rule INF-OL-R61 (Maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The infrastructure is located within a viewshaft listed in SCHED5; and/or</p> <p>b. The maintenance or upgrading does not involve earthworks on ground previously undisturbed by the infrastructure; or is located within a formed road corridor; or</p> <p><u>c. In the case of works within the protected root zone of a notable tree, complies with TREE-S4.</u></p>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.15	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R61	Support	WELL consider that the Submitters amendments to INF-OL-R61 are sensible in regard to enabling standard network utility operator activities to occur within Outstanding Landscape areas which will not cause an adverse effect on the environment. WELL agree that enabling such activities within the road reserve as a permitted activity will help ensure that adverse environmental effects will be avoided given the already modified environment.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.154	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R61	Support	Supports the rule and accompanying activity status, noting the NESETA applies to existing National Grid assets and there are no existing underground National Grid assets within the Other Overlay areas (noting the cable at Oteranga Bay that is within a Site of Significance to Māori is in the CMA and therefore outside the jurisdiction of the District Plan). The cable is also within the substation designation.	Retain Rule INF-OL-R61 (Maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.149	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R61	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-OL-R61 (Maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.79	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R61	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain INF-OL-R61 (Maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.83	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R61	Support	Supports the ability to maintain or upgrade existing underground infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Retain INF-OL-R61 (Maintenance or upgrading of existing underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R62	Oppose	New underground infrastructure is only permitted in view shafts. This could have unintended consequences in regard to routine work in road corridors, or customer connections other than in regard to scheduled archaeological sites or Category A or B SASM.	Amend Rule INF-OL-R62 (New underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The infrastructure is located on <u>a site identified in SCHED5 (viewshafts) or</u> <u>b. The infrastructure does not involve earthworks on ground previously undisturbed by the infrastructure, or is located within a formed road corridor; or</u> <u>c. In the case of works within the protected root zone of a notable tree, complies with [new rule reference on Overlays Sub-Chapter for TREE-S4]; or</u> <u>d. Is a customer connection and the site is not an archaeological site identified in SCHED4 or a Category A or B Site of Significance to Māori identified in SCHED7.</u> <u>and any consequential changes to the restricted discretionary activity clause.</u>
Powerco Limited	127.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R62	Oppose	Considers that new underground infrastructure only being permitted in view shafts could have unintended consequences in regard to routine work in road corridors, or customer connections other than in regard to scheduled archaeological sites or Category A or B SASM.	Amend Rule INF-OL-R62 (New underground infrastructure in other overlays) are follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The infrastructure is located on <u>a site identified in SCHED5 (viewshafts); or</u> <u>b. The infrastructure does not involve earthworks on ground previously undisturbed by infrastructure, or is located within a formed road corridor; or</u> <u>c. In the case of works within the protected root zone of a notable tree, complies with TREE-S4; or</u> <u>d. Is a customer connection (including the above ground connection to the customer premises) and the site is not an archaeological site identified in SCHED 4 or a Category A or B Site of Significance to Māori identified in SCHED 7. and any consequential changes to the restricted discretionary activity clause.</u> And any consequential changes to the Restricted Discretionary activity rule.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.16	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R62	Support	WELL consider that the Submitters amendments to INF-OL-R62 are sensible in regard to enabling standard network utility operator activities to occur within Outstanding Landscape areas which will not cause an adverse effect on the environment. WELL agree that enabling such activities within the road reserve as a permitted activity will help ensure that adverse environmental effects will be avoided given the already modified environment. WELL agree that the current wording of OL-R62 could result in unintended consequences which could frustrate the operation and maintenance of infrastructure located within protected areas.	Allow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.155	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R62	Support	Supports the activity status and framework for new underground infrastructure within the defined Other Overlay areas. While Transpower endeavours to avoid the Overlay areas identified in INF-OL-P62, given the linear nature of the National Grid and its associated operational and technical constraints, avoidance is not always practicable.	Retain Rule INF-OL-R62 (New underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.150	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R62	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-OL-R62 (New underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.80	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R62	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain INF-OL-R62 (New underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.84	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R62	Support	Supports the ability to install new underground infrastructure in other overlays as a restricted discretionary activity.	Retain INF-OL-R62 (New underground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.151	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R63	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-OL-R63 (New aboveground customer connection lines in Other Overlays) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R63	Oppose	Considers that customer connections at heritage areas, heritage structures and archaeological sites should also be controlled as these places have values that are at least as significant as heritage buildings and SASMs.	Retain Rule INF-OL-R63 (New aboveground customer connection lines in Other Overlays) with amendment.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R63	Amend	Considers that customer connections at heritage areas, heritage structures and archaeological sites should also be controlled as these places have values that are at least as significant as heritage buildings and SASMs.	Amend Rule INF-OL-R63 (New aboveground customer connection lines in Other Overlays) so that within heritage areas and archaeological sites it is a controlled activity.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.29	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R63	Oppose	Permitted activity status for customer connections in heritage areas and archaeological sites as notified is preferred to minimise unnecessary regulation for routine service connections which reflect the pattern of development and general values of these areas in any case. Connections to the fabric of scheduled buildings is a controlled activity to address the method of connection in those instances.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.43	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R63	Oppose	Permitted activity status for customer connections in heritage areas and archaeological sites as notified is preferred to minimise unnecessary regulation for routine service connections which reflect the pattern of development and general values of these areas in any case. Connections to the fabric of scheduled buildings is a controlled activity to address the method of connection in those instances.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.156	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R64	Support	Supports the rules and accompanying activity status, noting the NESETA applies to existing National Grid assets.	Retain Rule INF-OL-R64 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal, of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.152	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R64	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-OL-R64 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal, of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.81	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R64	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain INF-OL-R64 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal, of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.163	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R64	Support	[See paragraphs 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Retain INF-OL-R64 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal, of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.85	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R64	Support	Supports the ability to operate, maintain, repair and remove existing above ground infrastructure within other overlays as a permitted activity.	Retain INF-OL-R64 (Operation, maintenance and repair, or removal, of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.157	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Support	Supports the rules and accompanying activity status, noting the NESETA applies to existing National Grid assets.	Retain Rule INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.153	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.61	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Not specified	Seeks clarification of the relationship between rule and Category A Sites and areas of significance.	Clarify how Category A Sites and areas of significance fits in rule INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays).
CentrePort Limited	402.82	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.164	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Oppose in part	Considers that both limbs 1 and 2 reference Category A of the Schedule 7. It is therefore not clear which rule applies to Category A Sites and areas of significance to Māori. Supports INF-OL-R65, subject to submitters proposed amendments to INF-OL-P62 being accepted.	Opposes INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.165	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Oppose in part	Considers that both limbs 1 and 2 reference Category A of the Schedule 7. It is therefore not clear which rule applies to Category A Sites and areas of significance to Māori. Supports INF-OL-R65, subject to submitters proposed amendments to INF-OL-P62 being accepted.	Delete INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) in its entirety.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.166	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Amend	Considers that both limbs 1 and 2 reference Category A of the Schedule 7. It is therefore not clear which rule applies to Category A Sites and areas of significance to Māori. Supports INF-OL-R65, subject to submitters proposed amendments to INF-OL-P62 being accepted.	Seeks that INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) is amended to refer to either Category A or Category B areas (not both).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.167	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Amend	Considers that both limbs 1 and 2 reference Category A of the Schedule 7. It is therefore not clear which rule applies to Category A Sites and areas of significance to Māori. Supports INF-OL-R65, subject to submitters proposed amendments to INF-OL-P62 being accepted.	If INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) is not amended to refer to either Category A or Category B areas (not both): Seeks that INF-OL-R65 is amended to refine the matters of discretion to reflect that operational and functional constraints of infrastructure mean that adverse effects cannot always be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.86	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Support	Supports the ability to upgrade existing infrastructure as a permitted activity and construct new infrastructure as a restricted discretionary activity within other overlays.	Retain INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Amend	Considers that upgrading of infrastructure in heritage areas, archaeological sites and SASMs should also be restricted discretionary as these places have values that are at least as significant as heritage buildings and structures.	Amend Rule INF-OL-R65 (Upgrading of existing aboveground infrastructure in Other Overlays) so that within heritage areas, sites and areas of significance to maori and archaeological sites it is a restricted discretionary activity.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.30	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Oppose	Permitted activity status in the stated overlays is appropriate for upgrading of existing above ground infrastructure. Existing infrastructure already forms part of the values/visual environment of an area, and the extent of upgrades in managed by standard INF-S4.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.44	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R65	Oppose	Permitted activity status in the stated overlays is appropriate for upgrading of existing above ground infrastructure. Existing infrastructure already forms part of the values/visual environment of an area, and the extent of upgrades in managed by standard INF-S4.	Disallow
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.61	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Oppose	All new above ground infrastructure and temporary infrastructure in Other Overlays not otherwise provided for is a restricted discretionary activity. It is considered that there is scope for some permitted activity allowances in heritage overlays such as telecommunications cabinets in roads complying with the permitted activity standards in the NESTF. These are small structures that would have minimal impact where within existing road corridors.	Amend Rule INF-OL-R66 (New aboveground infrastructure and temporary infrastructure in Other Overlays not otherwise provided for) by adding a new permitted activity clause as follows: <u>Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The infrastructure is located on a site identified in SCHED3 (Heritage areas) and is within a road; and</u> <u>b. Complies with the permitted activity standards (size, footprint area and group rules) of the NES-TF.</u>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.5	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Support	WELL support this submission point to the extent that minor network utility equipment (i.e., cabinets) should be enabled in the PDP to be placed within the road reserve of heritage areas. WELL agree with the submitter that such minor structures "...are small structures that would have minimal impact where within existing road corridors", and consequently consider that a permitted activity rule is appropriate from an effects perspective. The wording in the proposed sub-clause a put forward by the submitter is considered to adequately cover WELL's electricity distribution equipment to be contained within cabinets within the road reserve. The NES-TF does not apply to WELLS electricity distribution network, so sub-clause b as proposed by the submitter is not specifically supported by WELL.	Amend / Seeks that part of the submission in relation to sub clause a, be accepted as follows: <u>"a. The infrastructure is located on a site identified in SCHED3 (Heritage areas) and is within a road"</u> ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Powerco Limited	127.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Oppose	Considers that there is scope for some permitted activity allowances in heritage overlays such as minor utility cabinets in roads. These are small structures that would have minimal impact where within existing road corridors. [Refer to image in original submission]	Amend Rule INF-OL-R66 (New aboveground infrastructure and temporary infrastructure in Other Overlays not otherwise provided for) by adding a new permitted activity clause as follows: ... <u>Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The infrastructure is located on a site identified in SCHED3 (Heritage areas) and is within a road; and</u> <u>b. Any minor network utility structures in roads do not exceed 2m high x 2m2 footprint area.</u>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.13	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Support	WELL support this submission point as it is agreed that there is scope for permitted activities for network utility operators within heritage overlays. WELL consider that the submitter is correct in identifying that small, or minor NUO structures (such as those contained within cabinets) will pose negligible adverse effects in any given areas subject to Heritage area overlays, and within the road reserve. WELL support the addition of the proffered permitted activity rule standard.	Allow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.158	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Support	Supports the activity status and framework for new aboveground and temporary infrastructure within the defined Other Overlay areas. While Transpower endeavours to avoid the Overlay areas identified in INF-OL-P62, given the linear nature of the National Grid and its associated operational and technical constraints, avoidance is not always practicable.	Retain Rule INF-OL-R66 (New above ground infrastructure and temporary infrastructure in Other Overlays not otherwise provided for) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.154	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Support	Considers these provisions provide clear guidance in how to balance different interests where infrastructure overlaps with other areas and values.	Retain INF-OL-R66 (New aboveground infrastructure and temporary infrastructure in Other Overlays not otherwise provided for) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.83	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain INF-OL-R66 (New aboveground infrastructure and temporary infrastructure in Other Overlays not otherwise provided for) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.168	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Support in part	Supports INF-OL-R66 in part, subject to submitters proposed amendments to INF-OL-P62 being adopted.	Retain INF-OL-R66 (New aboveground infrastructure and temporary infrastructure in Other Overlays not otherwise provided for) as notified, provided submitters amendment to INF-OL-R62 is adopted.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.169	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	If submitters amendments to INF-OL-R62 (New aboveground infrastructure and temporary infrastructure in Other Overlays not otherwise provided for) are not adopted: Seeks that INF-OL-R66 is amended to refine the matters of discretion to reflect that operational and functional constraints of infrastructure mean that adverse effects cannot always be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.87	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Infrastructure Other Overlays / INF-OL-R66	Support	Supports the ability to upgrade existing infrastructure as a permitted activity and construct new infrastructure as a restricted discretionary activity within other overlays.	Retain INF-OL-R66 (New aboveground infrastructure and temporary infrastructure in Other Overlays not otherwise provided for) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that native animals are considered when planning large-scale renewable electricity generation activities.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Avryl Bramley	202.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks the removal of any provisions which restrict the ability of a property owner to generate own use power on site.
Bruce Crothers	319.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Not specified	Considers that distributed solar generation should be encouraged and supported.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.95	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Not specified	Considers that for the overall chapter, the provisions should be no less protective than those in the ECO chapter. The provisions in this chapter should mirror the ECO provisions, with the amendments made as sought by F&B in respect of that chapter. Delete any references to 'operational need', and 'identified' values.	Amend the chapter to mirror the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity provisions, and be as protective as that chapter. Delete all references to "operational need" and "identified" values in the chapter.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.78	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. Operational need is a valid consideration in the policy framework, particularly for regionally significant infrastructure, and ensures the Plan gives effect to the NPS-Renewable Electricity Generation. The values considered in the policy framework should be those identified in the Plan as the basis for identification of the area in the Plan Schedule(s).	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.96	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Oppose in part	Considers the Introduction is silent on the potential adverse effects from renewable electricity generation on indigenous biodiversity, landscape and natural character values. Amend to make it clear that these are important values that may be adversely affected, and which require protection.	Amend REG-Introduction to clarify that indigenous biodiversity, landscape, and natural character values are important values that may be affected by renewable energy generation, and that these values require protection.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.79	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Oppose	Considers that the potential for renewable electricity generation activities to create adverse environmental effects is acknowledged in the REG chapter (Objective REG-O2 and Policies REG-P3, REG-P4, REGP5, REG-P6, REG-7, REG-P8, REG-P9 and in the REG rules which require consents for certain REG activities to ensure potential adverse effects are assessed and managed.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.97	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Oppose in part	Considers the objectives REG-O1 to REG-O4 are inadequate to protect indigenous biodiversity. Seeks that the objectives of the relevant chapters, including Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Character, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Coastal Environment apply to all Renewable Electricity Generation provisions. Alternatively, seeks that a comprehensive set of objectives to be included into the REG chapter to provide for these matters, mirroring the objectives of the aforementioned chapters. Notes that the key NPS policy is C2: When considering any residual environmental effects of renewable electricity generation activities that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, decision-makers shall have regard to offsetting measures or environmental compensation including measures or compensation which benefit the local environment and community affected.	Amend chapter so that Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Character, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Coastal Environment objectives all apply to Renewable Energy Generation provisions, and ensure that NPS policy C2 is given effect to through the objectives.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.80	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Oppose	Considers that the potential for renewable electricity generation activities to create adverse environmental effects is acknowledged in the REG chapter (Objective REG-O2 and Policies REG-P3, REG-P4, REGP5, REG-P6, REG-7, REG-P8, REG-P9 and in the REG rules which require consents for certain REG activities to ensure potential adverse effects are assessed and managed. The objectives and policies that describe the values of indigenous biodiversity, landscape and natural character are set out in the relevant ECO chapters (ECO, NFL,NATC).	Disallow

Energy, Infrastructure and Transport - Renewable Energy Generation

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.100	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Support	Supports the provisions and direction in this chapter, including the recognition of the contributions that renewable energy can make to greenhouse gas emissions reduction. The chapter enables small scale renewable energy generation and provides for community and large-scale renewable energy generation. This direction is consistent with Proposed RPS Change 1 climate change policies, particularly Policy 11, and connects to the SRCC strategic objectives.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.69	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Support	The Renewable Electricity Generation chapter is supported, as it signals a direction to reduce carbon emissions and effects on climate change through the use of renewable energy technologies. This direction is reflected in the Renewable Energy Generation chapter which seeks to enable large and small-scale renewable energy investigation and generation activities.	Retain the Renewable Electricity Generation chapter as notified.
350 Wellington	396.1	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / General REG	Not specified	Supports the enabling and encouraging small and community-scale renewable energy generation projects.	Not specified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O1	Support	Considers the objective gives effect to the NPS-REG, the plan's Strategic Objectives and promotes an increase in renewable electricity generation.	Retain Objective REG-O1 (Benefits of renewable energy use and development) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.159	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O1	Support	Supports the directive of the objective to enable the use and development of the renewable energy sources.	Retain Objective REG-O1 (Benefits of renewable energy use and development) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.101	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O1	Amend	Considers the District Plan going as far as it can to promote energy efficient design of buildings and developments, including alterations to have regard to Policy 11 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure the renewable electricity generation and subdivision provisions have regard to Policy 11 of Proposed RPS Change 1 such that the District Plan goes as far as it can to promote energy efficient design of buildings and developments and enable renewable energy generation. This could also include provisions in the zones chapters.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.81	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O1	Support	Considers that the original submission seeks to ensure the renewable electricity generation provisions in the Plan go as far as they can to promote energy efficient design of buildings and enable renewable energy generation. Meridian agrees this is important in order to facilitate the transition from fossil fuel dependence to low or zero emissions economy (this being part of the purpose of GWRC's proposed RPS Change No. 1). Meridian considers there is scope for the Plan to do better in this regard and its own submission proposes refinements to better achieve the outcome GWRC seeks. Meridian does not agree that additional provisions in zone chapters are required to achieve this outcome (the framework of a self-contained REG chapter plus objectives and policies addressing other values in other chapters works well for this purpose).	Disallow / Seeks to retain the structure of the Plan as notified and, otherwise, allow the submission point and the amendments Meridian and other submitters seek to better enable the generation of electricity from renewable sources.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.170	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O1	Support	Supports REG-O1 insofar as it encourage and enable the development of renewable energy and thus will help submitter achieve its sustainability and climate change goals. [See paragraph 4.25 to 4.29 of original submission for further detail.]	Retain REG-O1 (Benefits of renewable energy use and development) as notified.
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O2	Amend	Considers that the addition of "...and the potential national benefits" subsequent to the DDP is unnecessary. National benefit is recognised by REG-O1 and unfairly weights REG-O2 in favour of the renewable generation activity, which is and should not be not the point of this Objective. Between the two objectives the appropriate balance is achieved.	Amend REG-O2 (Adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities) as follows: The actual and potential adverse effects on the environment and communities of the investigation, development, operation, maintenance and repair, and upgrading of renewable electricity generation activities are effectively managed, while recognising the functional needs and operational needs of renewable electricity generation activities and the potential national benefits.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.82	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O2	Oppose	Considers that the recognition of the potential national benefits is relevant in both objectives is appropriate.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O2	Support in part	Supports the outcome sought by Objective REG-O2 (adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities) but considers the wording might be improved by deleting some superfluous words.	Retain Objective REG-O2 (Adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O2	Amend	Supports the outcome sought by Objective REG-O2 (adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities) but considers the wording might be improved by deleting some superfluous words.	Amend Objective REG-O2 (Adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities) as follows: The actual and potential adverse effects on the environment and communities of the investigation, development, operation, maintenance and repair, and upgrading of renewable electricity generation activities are effectively managed, while recognising the functional needs and operational needs of renewable electricity generation activities and the potential national benefits.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.98	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O2	Oppose in part	In addition to the above submission point, considers that REG-O2 needs revision to clarify that certain natural values need protection, rather than adverse effects being 'effectively managed'.	Amend REG-O2 (Adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities) to clarify that some values require protection.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.83	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O2	Oppose	Considers that the clarification that certain values need protection is provided in the relevant chapters addressing natural features and landscapes, indigenous biodiversity, heritage etc.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.171	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O2	Support	Supports REG-O2 insofar as it encourage and enable the development of renewable energy and thus will help submitter achieve its sustainability and climate change goals. [See paragraph 4.25 to 4.29 of original submission for further detail.]	Retain REG-O2 (Adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O3	Support	Considers the objective is important for maintaining the operability and efficiency of existing renewable electricity generation activities.	Retain Objective REG-O3 (Adverse effects on renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.172	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O3	Support	Supports REG-O3 insofar as it encourage and enable the development of renewable energy and thus will help submitter achieve its sustainability and climate change goals. [See paragraph 4.25 to 4.29 of original submission for further detail.]	Retain REG-O3 (Adverse effects on renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.102	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O4	Amend	Considers the District Plan going as far as it can to promote energy efficient design of buildings and developments, including alterations to have regard to Policy 11 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure the renewable electricity generation and subdivision provisions have regard to Policy 11 of Proposed RPS Change 1 such that the District Plan goes as far as it can to promote energy efficient design of buildings and developments and enable renewable energy generation. This could also include provisions in the zones chapters.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.173	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-O4	Support	Supports REG-O4 insofar as they encourage and enable the development of renewable energy and thus will help submitter achieve its sustainability and climate change goals. [See paragraph 4.25 to 4.29 of original submission for further detail.]	Retain REG-O4 (Energy efficiency and conservation) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P1	Support	Considers that Policy REG-P1 is necessary to give effect to the NPS-REG and the Plan's Reg and Strategic objectives.	Retain Policy REG-P1 (Recognising the significance and benefits of the use and development of renewable energy) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.160	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P1	Support	Supports the policy recognition of the benefits of the use and development of renewable energy sources and generation.	Retain Policy REG-P1 (Recognising the significance and benefits of the use and the development of renewable energy) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.99	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P1	Support in part	Considers that as the objectives and policies of the Natural Environment Values and Coastal Environment chapters are not intended to apply to this chapter, this policy needs to include clauses recognising that natural values need to be protected, and may be adversely impacted by renewable generation.	Amend REG-P1 (Recognising the significance and benefits of the use and development of renewable energy) to include clauses recognising that natural values need protection as they may be adversely affected by renewable energy generation.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P1	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.84	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P1	Oppose	Considers that the clarification that certain values need protection is provided in the relevant chapters addressing natural features and landscapes, indigenous biodiversity, heritage etc.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.103	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P1	Amend	Considers the District Plan going as far as it can to promote energy efficient design of buildings and developments, including alterations to have regard to Policy 11 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure the renewable electricity generation and subdivision provisions have regard to Policy 11 of Proposed RPS Change 1 such that the District Plan goes as far as it can to promote energy efficient design of buildings and developments and enable renewable energy generation. This could also include provisions in the zones chapters.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.174	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P1	Support	Supports REG-P1 insofar as they encourage and enable the development of renewable energy and thus will help submitter achieve its sustainability and climate change goals. [See paragraph 4.25 to 4.29 of original submission for further detail.]	Retain REG-P1 (Recognising the significance and benefits of the use and development of renewable energy) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P2	Support	Considers that Policy Reg-P2 is necessary to give effect to the NPS-REG and the Plan's REG and Strategic objectives.	Retain Policy REG-P2 (Providing for renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.161	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P2	Support	Supports the policy recognition of the constraints and needs of renewable electricity generation activities, and the benefits of locating renewable electricity generation activities close to end use and to electricity transmission infrastructure. Considers the policy provides the framework to appropriately consider the issues with renewable electricity generation	Retain Policy RED-P2 (Providing for renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.100	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P2	Oppose in part	Considers that the policy is silent on the need to protect natural values. Given that the objectives and policies of the Natural Environment Values and Coastal Environment chapters are not intended to apply to this chapter, considers this policy needs to be amended to include clauses requiring that natural and coastal values are protected and should also clarify what the relationship between this policy and the later policies of this chapter are, as the later policies already appear to provide comprehensive decision making guidance	Amend REG-P2 (Providing for renewable electricity generation activities) to include clauses recognising that natural values need protection, and clarify the relationship between this policy and subsequent policies.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P2	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.85	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P2	Oppose	Considers that the clarification that certain values need protection is provided in the relevant chapters addressing natural features and landscapes, indigenous biodiversity, heritage etc.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.175	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P2	Support	Supports REG-P2 insofar as they encourage and enable the development of renewable energy and thus will help submitter achieve its sustainability and climate change goals. [See paragraph 4.25 to 4.29 of original submission for further detail.]	Retain REG-P2 (Providing for renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P3	Support	Considers provision for renewable electricity generation investigation activities in all areas is necessary to give effect to the NPS-REG and the Plan's REG and Strategic objectives.	Retain Policy REG-P3 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.101	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P3	Oppose in part	In point 1, supports the intent to avoid overlays and other sensitive areas in this policy, the Plan has not identified all areas that may be sensitive and require protection under higher order document. For example other areas of natural character in the coastal environment are required to be protected under policy 13 NZCPS. Further, residential SNAs are currently not protected. The direction to enable these activities where effects are minimised is contrary to the requirement in s5(2)(c) that effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Effects might be 'minimised' but still be very significant. Amend to include more appropriate direction to create the least amount of effects, while also avoiding, remedying or mitigating. 'Enable' should be amended to 'consider enabling'.	Amend REG-P3 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities): 1. Replace "enable" with "consider enabling". Amend to include direction to create least amount of effects while also avoiding, remedying, or mitigating remaining effects.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P3	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.86	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P3	Oppose	Considers that the amendment inserting 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.102	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P3	Oppose in part	<p>In point 2, generally supports the requirement to avoid significant adverse effects in overlays and other sensitive areas. However, this does not give effect to areas that contain NZCPS policy 11(a) matters. In that case, all adverse effects must be avoided. Amend this policy to give effect to NZCPS.</p> <p>'Allow' should be changed to 'consider allowing'. Delete 'identified' for the reasons given elsewhere in this submission.</p> <p>The list of ways to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects is not appropriate to ensure that natural values are protected. For example, ii. says nothing about the circumstances in which effects may need to be avoided in order to protect the values present. It starts from a presumption that there will not be avoidance, and that the adverse effects will be acceptable, where they are kept as small as possible. In our view it is not appropriate to include an exhaustive list of how to deal with effects in sensitive areas – unless that list includes direction that nonsignificant effects may need to be avoided altogether.</p>	<p>Amend REG-P3 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities):</p> <p>2. Replace "allow" with "consider allowing". Delete "identified" in point b. Amend to give effect to S11(a) of NZ Coastal Policy Statement. Remove list of ways to avoid, remedy, or mitigate effects.</p>
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P3	Support	<p>While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.</p>	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.87	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P3	Oppose	<p>Considers that the amendment inserting 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy.</p>	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.176	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site.</p> <p>Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.</p>	Opposes REG-P3 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.177	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P3	Amend	<p>Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site.</p> <p>Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.</p>	Seeks that REG-P3 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities) is amended to refer to the specific overlays of relevance.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P4	Support	<p>Supports REG-P4 in its entirety.</p>	Retain REG-P4 (Small scale renewable electricity generation outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P4	Support	<p>Considers provision for all scales of renewable electricity in all areas is necessary to give effect to the NPS-REG and to the Plan's REG and Strategic objectives.</p>	Retain Policy REG-P4 (Small scale renewable electricity generation outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.103	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P4	Oppose in part	Supports intent to avoid overlays and other sensitive areas in this policy, but considers the Plan has not identified all areas that may be sensitive and require protection under higher order document. For example other areas of natural character in the coastal environment are required to be protected under policy 13 NZCPS. Further, residential SNAs are currently not protected. Change 'enable' to 'consider enabling'.	Amend REG-P4 (Small scale renewable electricity generation outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) to identify areas that may be sensitive and require protection under higher order documents. Change "enable" to "consider enabling".
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P4	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.88	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P4	Oppose	Considers that the amendment inserting 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.178	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P4	Oppose in part	Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site. Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.	Opposes REG-P4 (Small scale renewable electricity generation outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.179	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P4	Amend	Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site. Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.	Seeks that REG-P4 (Small scale renewable electricity generation outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) is amended to refer to the specific overlays of relevance.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Support	Supports REG-P5 in its entirety.	Retain REG-P5 (Small-scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Support	Considers provision for all scales of renewable electricity in all areas is necessary to give effect to the NPS-REG and to the Plan's REG and Strategic objectives.	Retain Policy REG-P5 (Small-scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.104	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose in part	Delete references to 'operational need', and 'identified' values. Change 'allow' to 'only allow' or 'consider allowing'. Point 3 - Considers the direction to enable these activities where effects are minimised is contrary to the requirement in s5(2)(c) that effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Effects might be 'minimised' but still be very significant. Amend to include more appropriate direction to create the least amount of effects, while also avoiding, remedying or mitigating.	Amend REG-P5 (Small-scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins): <u>Consider Allowing</u> small scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, or coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment, where: ... 3. If located within an area identified as ridgelines and hilltops, any adverse effects on visual amenity and landscape values are minimised; <u>[Add direction to create least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating]</u> .

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.89	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose	Considers that the operational need is a relevant consideration. The values that should be considered are those that are identified for the relevant identified areas. The amendment inserting 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. The matters in NFL-P3, NFL-P4, ECO-P2, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6 and CE-P7 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). Policy REG-P5 correctly applies the mitigation hierarchy intended by the NZCPS for the coastal environment.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.105	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose in part	Delete references to 'operational need', and 'identified' values. Change 'allow' to 'only allow' or 'consider allowing'. Point 4 - Amend to include the same level of protection that SALs receive under the ONFL chapter. Amend a. to "The activity is of a scale and nature ...". Amend 'having regard to' the NFL policies to 'while applying'.	Amend REG-P5 (Small-scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins): <u>Consider</u> <u>Allowing</u> small scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, or coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment, where: ... 4. If located within an area identified in SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes: <u>Amend to include same level of protection as SALs receive under NFL chapter</u> a. The activity is of a scale <u>and nature</u> that maintains or restores the identified values, including restoration and conservation activities; b. Outside the coastal environment any adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated; c. Within the coastal environment, any significant adverse effects are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and d. There is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be undertaken inside a Special Amenity Landscape and there are no reasonably practical alternative locations outside of these areas; while having regard to <u>applying</u> the matters in NFL-P3 and NFL-P4;
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.90	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose	Considers that the operational need is a relevant consideration. The values that should be considered are those that are identified for the relevant identified areas. The amendment inserting 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. The matters in NFL-P3, NFL-P4, ECO-P2, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6 and CE-P7 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). Policy REG-P5 correctly applies the mitigation hierarchy intended by the NZCPS for the coastal environment.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.106	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose in part	Delete references to 'operational need', and 'identified' values. Change 'allow' to 'only allow' or 'consider allowing'. Point 5 - Amend to include the same level of protection that ONFLs receive under the ONFL chapter. Amend a. to 'The activity is of a scale and nature ...'. Amend 'having regard to' the NFL policies to 'while applying'.	Amend REG-P5 (Small-scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins): Allow small scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, or coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment, where: ... 5. If located within an area identified in SCHED10 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes: <u>[Amend to include same level of protection as ONFLs receive under NFL chapter]</u> a. The activity is of a scale <u>and nature</u> that maintains or restores the identified values, including restoration and conservation activities and other adverse effects on these matters; [Clarify what is meant by restoration and conservation activities, and/or delete as it introduces different standard to ECO-P2] b. Outside the coastal environment significant adverse effects on the identified values are avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values are avoided, remedied or mitigated; c. Within the coastal environment any adverse effects on the identified values are avoided; and d. There is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be undertaken inside an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape and there are no reasonably practical alternative locations outside of these areas; while having regard to applying the matters in NFL-P5 and NFL-P6; [Correct references?]
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.91	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose	Considers that the operational need is a relevant consideration. The values that should be considered are those that are identified for the relevant identified areas. The amendment inserting 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. The matters in NFL-P3, NFL-P4, ECO-P2, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6 and CE-P7 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). Policy REG-P5 correctly applies the mitigation hierarchy intended by the NZCPS for the coastal environment.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.107	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose in part	Delete references to 'operational need', and 'identified' values. Change 'allow' to 'only allow' or 'consider allowing'. Point 6 - Amend to include the same level of protection that SNAs receive under the ECO chapter. Include the deleted SCHED 9. Amend a. to 'The activity is of a scale and nature ...' Clarify what is meant by 'including restoration and conservation activities'. Consider deleting as this introduces potentially different standard to ECO P2. Make the clause 'and other effects on these matters...' apply to both i and ii. Delete "operational need". Amend 'while having regard to' ECO policies, to 'while applying'. Notes the references appear incorrect.	Amend REG-P5 (Small-scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins): <u>Consider Allowing</u> small scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, or coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment, where: ... 6. If located within an area identified in SCHED9 – Significant Natural Areas of natural character in the coastal area. [Amend to include the same level of protection that SNAs receive under the ECO chapter, include reference to SCHED9] a. The activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values, including restoration and conservation activities; [<u>Clarify restoration and conservation activities</u>] b. Outside the coastal environment, significant adverse effects on the identified values are avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values are avoided, remedied or mitigated; c. Within the coastal environment: i. Adverse effects on the matters in Policy 11(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 are avoided <u>and other adverse effects on these matters are avoided, remedied or mitigated</u> ; and ii. Significant adverse effects on the matters in Policy 11(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 are avoided, and other adverse effects on these matters are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and d. There is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be undertaken inside a Significant Natural Area and there are no reasonably practical alternative locations outside of these areas; while having regard to <u>applying</u> the matters in ECO-P2, ECO-P7;
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.92	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose	Considers that the operational need is a relevant consideration. The values that should be considered are those that are identified for the relevant identified areas. The amendment inserting 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. The matters in NFL-P3, NFL-P4, ECO-P2, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6 and CE-P7 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). Policy REG-P5 correctly applies the mitigation hierarchy intended by the NZCPS for the coastal environment.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.108	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose in part	<p>Delete references to 'operational need', and 'identified' values. Change 'allow' to 'only allow' or 'consider allowing'.</p> <p>Point 7 - Apply policy to all areas of natural character in the coastal area. Delete "operational need". Amend "while having regard to" CE policies to "while applying."</p>	<p>Amend REG-P5 (Small-scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins):</p> <p><u>Consider Allowing</u> small scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, or coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment, where:</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. If located within an area identified in SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas, or a coastal margin or riparian margin within the coastal environment:</p> <p>a. The activity is of a scale that maintains or restores the identified values, including restoration and conservation activities;</p> <p>b. Any significant adverse effects are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated;</p> <p>c. The design and location of the activity is subordinate to and does not compromise the identified characteristics and values of the high coastal natural character area, or the coastal or riparian margin within the coastal environment; and</p> <p>d. There is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be undertaken inside a high coastal natural character area or within coastal or riparian margins within the coastal environment, and there are no reasonably practical alternative locations outside of these areas; while having regard to <u>applying</u> the matters in CE-P5, CE-P6 and CE-P7;...</p>
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.180	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site.</p> <p>Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.</p>	Opposes REG-P5 (Small-scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.181	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P5	Amend	<p>Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site.</p> <p>Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.</p>	Seeks that REG-P5 (Small-scale renewable electricity generation activities within Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) is amended to refer to the specific overlays of relevance.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P6	Support	Supports REG-P6 in its entirety.	Retain REG-P6 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone, General Industrial and Airport Zones, outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P6	Support	Considers provision for all scales of renewable electricity in all areas is necessary to give effect to the NPS-REG and to the Plan's REG and Strategic objectives.	Retain Policy REG-P6 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone, General Industrial and Airport Zones, outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.109	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P6	Support	Supports the policy as long as areas of natural character in the coastal environment are appropriately protected.	Retain REG-P6 (Community scale generation in certain zones outside sensitive areas) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P6	Support	Supportive of the policy due to its ambitious wording of "Provide" that aligns with the spirit of the Wellington regions long term sustainability goals and the amended REG-01 by demonstrating commitment to the development of Community Scale.	Retain REG-P6 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone...) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P6	Support	Supports REG-P6 as having particular regard to the location of the renewable electricity generation activity from existing sensitive activities (including educational facilities) and whether there is adequate separation and buffering provided to manage any effects on educational facilities and reduce reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain REG-P6 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone, General Industrial and Airport Zones, outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.182	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P6	Oppose in part	Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site. Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.	Opposes REG-P6 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone, General Industrial and Airport Zones, outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.183	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P6	Amend	Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site. Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.	Seeks that REG-P6 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone, General Industrial and Airport Zones, outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) is amended to refer to the specific overlays of relevance.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support	Supports REG-P7 in its entirety.	Retain REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and Overlays) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support in part	Considers provision for all scales of renewable electricity generation in all areas is necessary to give effect to the NPS-REG and to the Plan's REG and Strategic objectives. For consistency with Policy REG-P6, the words 'Only allow' should be amended to 'Provide for'. The list of circumstances given in the policy defines the situations where community-scale renewable electricity generation will be allowed. Considers the expression 'energy' should be replaced with 'electricity' which is the Plan's defined term.	Retain Policy REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and overlays) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Amend	Considers provision for all scales of renewable electricity generation in all areas is necessary to give effect to the NPS-REG and to the Plan's REG and Strategic objectives. For consistency with Policy REG-P6, the words 'Only allow' should be amended to 'Provide for'. The list of circumstances given in the policy defines the situations where community-scale renewable electricity generation will be allowed. Considers the expression 'energy' should be replaced with 'electricity' which is the Plan's defined term.	Amend Policy REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and overlays) as follows (or similar): Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and Overlays Only allow Provide for community-scale renewable energy electricity generation activities in other zones, locations and Overlays where: ...
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.110	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support in part	Point 5 - Amend to include the same level of protection that SNAs receive under the ECO chapter. Amend 'while having regard to' ECO policies to 'while applying'. Check ECO policies are correctly referenced.	Amend REG-P7 (Community scale generation in other zones and within sensitive areas): ... 5. If located on a site identified in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas: <u>Amend to include the same level of protection that SNAs receive under the ECO chapter, check ECO policy referencing</u> a. Outside the coastal environment, significant adverse effects on the identified values are avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values are avoided, remedied or mitigated; b. Within the coastal environment: i. Adverse effects on the matters in Policy 11(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 are avoided; and ii. Significant adverse effects on the matters in Policy 11(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 are avoided, and other adverse effects on these matters are avoided, remedied or mitigated; while having regard to applying the matters in ECO-P2, ECO-P3, ECO-P4 and ECO-P7;

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.93	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The matters in ECO-P2, ECO-P3, ECO-P4, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6, CE-P7, NFLP2, NFL-P4, NFL-P5 and NFL-P6 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.111	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support in part	Point 6 - Amend to apply to all areas of natural character in the coastal environment. Amend 'while having regard to' NFL policies, to 'while applying'. Amend a. to 'The activity is of a scale and nature ...'	Amend REG-P7 (Community scale generation in other zones and within sensitive areas): ... 6. If located within an area identified in SCHED12— High Coastal Natural Character Areas, or a coastal margin or riparian margin within the coastal environment, an area of natural character in the coastal environment any significant adverse effects are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated, while having regard to applying the matters in CE-P5, CE-P6 and CE-P7, and: a. The activity is of a scale and nature that maintains or restores the identified values, including restoration and conservation activities; and b. The design and location of the activity is subordinate to and does not compromise the identified characteristics and values;
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.94	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The matters in ECO-P2, ECO-P3, ECO-P4, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6, CE-P7, NFLP2, NFL-P4, NFL-P5 and NFL-P6 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.112	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support in part	Point 7 - Amend c. to 'The activity is of a scale and nature ...'. Amend 'while having regard to' NFL policies, to 'while applying'.	Amend REG-P7 (Community scale generation in other zones and within sensitive areas): ... 7. If located within an area identified in SCHED10 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes: a. Outside the coastal environment, significant adverse effects on the identified values are avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values are avoided, remedied or mitigated; b. Within the coastal environment, any adverse effects on the identified values are avoided; c. The activity is of a scale <u>and nature</u> that maintains or restores the identified values, including restoration and conservation activities; and d. The design and location of the activity is subordinate to and does not compromise the identified characteristics and values; while having regard to applying the matters in NFL-P5 and NFL-P6;
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.95	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The matters in ECO-P2, ECO-P3, ECO-P4, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6, CE-P7, NFLP2, NFL-P4, NFL-P5 and NFL-P6 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.113	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support in part	Point 8 - Amend 'while having regard to' NFL policies, to 'while applying'	Amend REG-P7 (Community scale generation in other zones and within sensitive areas): ... 8. If located on a site identified in SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes: a. Outside the coastal environment, any adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and b. Within the coastal environment, any significant adverse effects are avoided and any other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated; while having regard to <u>applying</u> the matters in NFL-P2 and NFL-P4.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.96	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The matters in ECO-P2, ECO-P3, ECO-P4, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6, CE-P7, NFLP2, NFL-P4, NFL-P5 and NFL-P6 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.114	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support in part	Point 9 - Considers the direction to allow these activities where effects are minimised is contrary to the requirement in s5(2)(c) that effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Effects might be 'minimised' but still be very significant. Amend to include more appropriate direction to create the least amount of effects, while also avoiding, remedying or mitigating.	Amend REG-P7 (Community scale generation in other zones and within sensitive areas): ... 9. If located within an area identified as ridgelines and hilltops, any adverse effects on visual amenity and landscape values are minimised; <u>[Amend to include more appropriate direction to create the least amount of effects, while also avoiding, remedying or mitigating]</u>
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.97	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The matters in ECO-P2, ECO-P3, ECO-P4, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6, CE-P7, NFLP2, NFL-P4, NFL-P5 and NFL-P6 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.115	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support in part	Point 11 - Considers it is not clear how this paragraph apply in relation to the previous paragraphs of this policy. Amend to clarify.	Amend REG-P7 (Community scale generation in other zones and within sensitive areas): ... 11. There is an operational need or functional need for the identified location and there are no reasonable alternatives; and <u>[clarify how this point applies to previous points]</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.98	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The matters in ECO-P2, ECO-P3, ECO-P4, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6, CE-P7, NFLP2, NFL-P4, NFL-P5 and NFL-P6 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.116	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support in part	Points 12 - Considers it is not clear how this paragraph apply in relation to the previous paragraphs of this policy. Amend to clarify. In terms of 12.k., opposes term 'adaptive management'. Opposes the phrase 'which may benefit the local environment or the community affected' as this introduces a different consideration to the offsetting and compensation principles in APP2 and APP3.	Amend REG-P7 (Community scale generation in other zones and within sensitive areas): ... 12. Adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated having regard to... <u>[clarify how this point applies to previous points]</u> k. Any adaptive management , offsetting measures or environmental compensation which may benefit the local environment or the community affected.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.99	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that it is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The matters in ECO-P2, ECO-P3, ECO-P4, ECO-P7, CE-P5, CE-P6, CE-P7, NFLP2, NFL-P4, NFL-P5 and NFL-P6 are matters to which regard should be had (not applied) in the consenting framework proposed by this Plan (consistent with s. 104 of the RMA). The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
350 Wellington	396.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Amend	<p>Considers that the wording in REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and Overlays) should be amended to be more permissive and less restrictive, in line with other REG policies, regarding community-scale generation projects outside of the General Rural Zone.</p> <p>The wording in REG-P7, "Only allow community-scale renewable energy generation activities", currently means that approval for these projects must prove why they should be allowed as opposed to being evaluated for if there is cause to disallow them or require amendments. This is in contrast with wording in the majority of REG policies which is to "provide for" various scale renewable energy generation projects. REG-P7 projects should have wording to "Provide for" them, unless through the consenting process it is found that they are at odds with the restrictions outlined.</p>	<p>Amend REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and Overlays) as follows:</p> <p>Only allow Provide for community-scale renewable energy generation activities in other zones, locations and Overlays where:</p> <p>...</p>
350 Wellington	396.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support in part	Support the restrictions in REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and Overlays) as outlined to protect natural and cultural environments from adverse affects of such projects.	Retain REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and Overlays) as notified, subject to wording changes suggested by this submission.
Ministry of Education	400.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Support	Supports REG-P7 as having particular regard to the location of the renewable electricity generation activity from existing sensitive activities (including educational facilities) and whether there is adequate separation and buffering provided to manage any effects on educational facilities and reduce reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and Overlays) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.184	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site.</p> <p>Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.</p>	Opposes REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.185	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Amend	<p>Considers that the policy should expressly state which overlays apply to the site.</p> <p>Based on the subparagraphs, it appears to be confined to overlays relating to the natural environment, historic and cultural values and natural hazards. There are, however, a number of other overlays within the plan that are captured by the broad use of the term "overlay" which are in no way relevant to the establishment of renewable electricity generation.</p>	Seeks that REG-P7 (Community-scale renewable electricity generation activities within other zones, locations and Overlays) is amended to refer to the specific overlays of relevance.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Support	<p>Supports REG-P8 in its entirety.</p> <p>Considers that it is important to ensure the maintenance and improvement of our renewable energy infrastructure.</p>	Retain REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Amend	Considers that REG-S11 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) allows only a 5m alteration of position it seems that many factors provided for in 3 have already been considered and dealt with (as already consented), but this may be explained by clarifying the relationship between REG-P8 and REG-P11.	Clarify the relationship between REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) and REG-P11 (Upgrading existing renewable electricity generation activities and providing for technological advances).
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Amend	Considers that as REG-S11 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) provides a definition of "Upgrade" which covers replacement, then use of the word "replacement" is unnecessary.	<p>Amend REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for the upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities, including replacing or upgrading wind turbines and their support structures and ancillary facilities within existing wind farms, where the activity:</p> <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.100	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Oppose	Considers that upgrading may necessarily (usually does) involve replacing turbine components.	Disallow
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Amend	Considers that it appears that “adverse effects” on neighbouring properties and the community has been left out, while only management or benefits to the “affected community” may be considered. Specific inclusion of adverse effects on neighbours and/or the local community needs to be included.	Amend REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as follows: 3. ... a. Landscape, visual or amenity values of the site and surrounding area <u>including adjoining sites and the local community</u> , having regard to: ...
Meridian Energy Limited	228.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Support in part	Supports in principle the approach of Policy REG-P8 in providing for upgrading. Considers that in any assessment of the effects of upgrading, it is important that the existing environment (as modified by the presence of the existing renewable electricity generation activity) is the baseline for assessment.	Retain Policy REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) with amendment.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Oppose	Changing the baseline assessment from that which existed when the original resource consent was granted, to a ‘modified’ baseline which includes the activity consented, is unreasonable and circular, especially when “upgrading” does not require new consents. M&P Trust strongly opposes the inclusion of the additional wording proposed by MEL.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Amend	Supports in principle the approach of Policy REG-P8 in providing for upgrading. Considers that in any assessment of the effects of upgrading, it is important that the existing environment (as modified by the presence of the existing renewable electricity generation activity) is the baseline for assessment.	Amend Policy REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as follows (or similar): Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities Provide for the upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities, including replacing or upgrading wind turbines and their support structures and ancillary facilities within existing wind farms, where the activity: 1. Avoids significant adverse effects and avoids, remedies or mitigates other adverse effects on the identified values of any Overlay or any adjacent Overlay, high coastal natural character area, or coastal margin or riparian margin in the coastal environment, <u>recognising the character of the existing environment</u> ; 2. Has a functional need or operational need for its location; and 3. Minimises adverse effects, including adverse cumulative effects, on: ...
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Oppose	Changing the baseline assessment from that which existed when the original resource consent was granted, to a ‘modified’ baseline which includes the activity consented, is unreasonable and circular, especially when “upgrading” does not require new consents. M&P Trust strongly opposes the inclusion of the additional wording proposed by MEL.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Support in part	Supports the policy with relief sought by the submitter and considers it can be combined with Policy REG-P11.	Seeks that police REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) and REG-P11 (Upgrading existing renewable electricity generation activities and providing for technological advances) are combined, ensuring that all of the matters listed in each is retained.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Support	Noting that MEL supports M&P Trusts request to remove “replacing” and add to 3(a) “including adjoining sites and the local community” after “surrounding area”.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.117	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Oppose in part	Amend 'provide for' to 'consider providing for'. Amend to ensure that this policy provides the same level of protection to natural and coastal values as is given by the relevant Natural Environment Values and Coastal Environment chapters. Point 1 - Support. However this needs amendment to give effect to the requirements of NZCPS policy 11(a) and 15(a).	Amend REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale generation activities): <u>Consider providing</u> for the upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities, including replacing or upgrading wind turbines and their support structures and ancillary facilities within existing wind farms, where the activity: <u>Amend to make policy provide same level of protection to natural and coastal values as Natural Environment Values and Coastal Environment chapters</u> 1. Avoids significant adverse effects and avoids, remedies or mitigates other adverse effects on the identified values of any Overlay or any adjacent Overlay, high coastal natural character area, or coastal margin or riparian margin in the coastal environment; <u>Amend to give effect to the requirements of NZCPS policy 11(a) and 15(a).</u>
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.101	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that the addition of 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. It is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event. The policy framework, as a whole, already gives effect to the NZCPS. Operational need is a relevant consideration.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.118	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Oppose in part	Amend to ensure that this policy provides the same level of protection to natural and coastal values as is given by the relevant Natural Environment Values and Coastal Environment chapters. Point 2 - Delete 'operational need'	Amend REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale generation activities): ... 2. Has a functional need or operational need for its location; and
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.102	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that the addition of 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. It is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event. The policy framework, as a whole, already gives effect to the NZCPS. Operational need is a relevant consideration.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.119	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Oppose in part	Amend to ensure that this policy provides the same level of protection to natural and coastal values as is given by the relevant Natural Environment Values and Coastal Environment chapters. Point 3 - The direction to provide for upgrading large scale generation activities where effects are minimised is contrary to the requirement in s5(2)(c) that effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Effects might be 'minimised' but still be very significant. Amend to include more appropriate direction to create the least amount of effects, while also avoiding, remedying or mitigating. Oppose 'adaptive management'. Also oppose the phrase 'which may benefit the local environment or the community affected' as this introduces a different consideration to the offsetting and compensation principles in APP2 and APP3.	Amend REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale generation activities): ... 3. Minimises adverse effects, including adverse cumulative effects, on: <u>Amend to include more direction to create the least amount of effects, while also avoiding, remedying or mitigating</u> ... while having regard to any adaptive management , offsetting measures or environmental compensation which may benefit the local environment or affected community.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Support	While the intent of the PDP and the REG chapter is to create an easier pathway for renewable energy generation, the underlying natural, coastal and ecological and cultural values need to be recognised and maintained. Wind turbines in particular are temporary structures and can be removed so retention and protection of the underlying landscape values should be supported where possible for future benefit. "Adaptive management" complicates the RMA s5(2)(c) requirement for effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and it's beneficial relationship to the "environment or affected community" limits the necessary considerations.	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.103	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P7	Oppose	Considers that the addition of 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. It is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event. The policy framework, as a whole, already gives effect to the NZCPS. Operational need is a relevant consideration.	Disallow
Ministry of Education	400.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P8	Support	Supports REG-P8 as having particular regard to landscape and visual effects and consideration of the separation of the proposed upgrades and existing sensitive activities.	Retain REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Support	Supports REG-P9 in its entirety.	Retain REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Oppose	Opposes Policy REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) and seeks amendment.	Opposes Policy REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) and seeks amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Amend	Opposes Policy REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) and seeks amendment.	Amend Policy REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as follows (or similar): New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins Provide for new large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone, including within the coastal environment, where: 1. They are located outside: a. Overlays (other than ridgelines and hilltops, and low and medium hazard areas within the Hazard Overlays); b. High coastal natural character areas identified in SCHED12; and c. Coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment; 2. 1. They have an operational need or functional need to locate where the renewable energy resources are available; ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Amend	Opposes Policy REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) and seeks amendment.	Delete Policy REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) with the amended Policy REG-P10 as follows: <u>New Large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural</u> <u>Enable new large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone including within the coastal environment, areas of Very High and High Coastal Natural Character where:</u> <u>1. significant adverse effects on coastal natural character and the values of Overlay areas and riparian margins are avoided; and</u> <u>2. other adverse effects on coastal character, the values of Overlay areas and riparian margins are minimised, recognising the functional needs and operational needs of renewable electricity generation activities.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.120	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Support in part	Support the intent to avoid sensitive areas. Amend 'provide for' to 'consider providing for'. Other areas of natural character in the coastal environment need to be included. Point 2 - Delete 'operational need'.	Amend REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins): <u>Consider providing for new large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone, including within the coastal environment, where: [Amend to include other areas of natural character in the coastal environment]</u> ... 2. They have an operational need or functional need to locate where the renewable energy resources are available;
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.104	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Oppose	Considers that the addition of 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. It is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event. The policy framework, as a whole, already gives effect to the NZCPS. Operational need is a relevant consideration.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.121	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Support in part	Support the intent to avoid sensitive areas. Other areas of natural character in the coastal environment need to be included. Point 4 - Needs amendment to give effect to NZCPS policy 11(a) and 15(a)	Amend REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins): ... 4. They avoid any significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate any other adverse effect on the identified values and qualities of any adjacent Overlay or high coastal natural character area; <u>[Amend to give effect to NZCPS policy 11(a) and 15(a)]</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.105	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Oppose	Considers that the addition of 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. It is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event. The policy framework, as a whole, already gives effect to the NZCPS. Operational need is a relevant consideration.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.122	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Support in part	Support the intent to avoid sensitive areas. Other areas of natural character in the coastal environment need to be included. Point 5 - The direction to provide for large scale generation activities where effects are minimised is contrary to the requirement in s5(2)(c) that effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Effects might be 'minimised' but still be very significant. Amend to include more appropriate direction to create the least amount of effects, while also avoiding, remedying or mitigating. Oppose 'adaptive management'. Oppose the phrase 'which may benefit the local environment or the community affected' as this introduces a different consideration to the offsetting and compensation principles in APP2 and APP3.	Amend REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins): ... 5. They minimise any adverse effects, including adverse cumulative effects, on: <u>[Amend to provide more direction to create the least amount of effects, while also avoiding, remedying or mitigating]</u> ... while having regard to any adaptive management , offsetting measures or environmental compensation which may benefit the local environment or the community affected.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.106	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Oppose	Considers that the addition of 'consider' adds no meaningful value to the policy. It is not necessary to include the same level of protection as in the ECO chapter because the objectives and policies of that chapter apply anyway. The requested 'direction' to create 'least amount of effects while avoiding, remedying or mitigating' doesn't make sense. Any proposed adaptive management which may benefit the local environment is a relevant consideration and will be considered in accordance with APP2 and APP3 in any event. The policy framework, as a whole, already gives effect to the NZCPS. Operational need is a relevant consideration.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Support	Supportive of the policy due to its commitment to the development of large scale renewable energy infrastructure that aligns with the Wellington region's long term sustainability goals and supports energy independence and security alongside the transition to net zero.	Retain REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone outside Overlays...) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P9	Support	Supports REG-P9 as having particular regard to landscape and visual effects and consideration of the separation of renewable electricity generation activities from existing sensitive activities.	Retain REG-P9 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone outside Overlays, high coastal natural character areas, and coastal and riparian margins) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P10	Oppose	Seeks discretionary activity provision for large-scale renewable electricity generation activities in all parts of the General Rural Zone.	Delete Policy REG-P10 (New large-scale renewable electricity generation activities in other zones, locations and Overlays) in its entirety.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P10	Amend	Seeks discretionary activity provision for large-scale renewable electricity generation activities in all parts of the General Rural Zone.	Replace Policy REG-P10 (New large-scale renewable electricity generation activities in other zones, locations and Overlays) with an enabling policy as follows (or similar wording to achieve the outcome of provision for large scale renewable electricity activities throughout the General Rural Zone): <u>New Large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural</u> <u>Enable new large scale renewable electricity generation activities in the General Rural Zone including within the coastal environment, areas of Very High and High Coastal Natural Character where:</u> <u>1. significant adverse effects on coastal natural character and the values of Overlay areas and riparian margins are avoided; and</u> <u>2. other adverse effects on coastal character, the values of Overlay areas and riparian margins are minimised, recognising the functional needs and operational needs of renewable electricity generation activities.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.123	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P10	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain REG-P10 (New large-scale renewable electricity generation activities in other zones, locations and Overlays) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P11	Support	Supports REG-P11 in its entirety. Considers that it is important to ensure the maintenance and improvement of our renewable energy infrastructure.	Retain REG-P11 (Upgrading existing renewable electricity generation activities and providing for technological advances) as notified.
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P11	Amend	Considers that it is unclear what the relationship between REG-P11 and REG-P8 is.	Clarify the relationship between REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) and REG-P11 (Upgrading existing renewable electricity generation activities and providing for technological advances).
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P11	Not specified	Considers that it is unclear what the difference is between "repowering" and "upgrading", and if different and REG-S11 is not relevant, this needs explanation and defining.	Seeks that if "repowering" is different to "upgrading" and if REG-S11 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) is not considered relevant, new considerations need to be provided.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P11	Support in part	Supports the policy with relief sought by the submitter and considers it can be combined with Policy REG-P8.	Seeks that police REG-P8 (Upgrading existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) and REG-P11 (Upgrading existing renewable electricity generation activities and providing for technological advances) are combined, ensuring that all of the matters listed in each is retained.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.124	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P11	Support in part	Include reference to the need to still manage adverse effects on natural values, even where those benefits are present.	Amend REG-P11 (Upgrading existing renewable electricity generation activities and providing for technological advances) to refer to the need to manage adverse effects on natural values even where those benefits are present.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.107	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P11	Oppose	Considers that it not necessary to refer to the need to protect natural values because other applicable policies already do this.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P12	Support	Considers that policy REG-P12 (Reverse sensitivity effects) is necessary to give effect to the NPS-REG and the Plan's REG and Strategic objectives.	Retain Policy REG-P12 (Reverse sensitivity effects) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.125	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P12	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain REG-P12 (Reverse sensitivity effects) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.126	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P13	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain REG-P13 (Energy efficient subdivision and development) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.104	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P13	Amend	Considers the District Plan going as far as it can to promote energy efficient design of buildings and developments, including alterations to have regard to Policy 11 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure the renewable electricity generation and subdivision provisions have regard to Policy 11 of Proposed RPS Change 1 such that the District Plan goes as far as it can to promote energy efficient design of buildings and developments and enable renewable energy generation. This could also include provisions in the zones chapters.
350 Wellington	396.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-P13	Amend	Considers that the wording in REG-P13 should be stronger in regards to encouraging responsible subdivision design enhancing sustainability of energy access in new subdivisions. Considers that the Council can take a stronger position towards incentivising responsible design of sustainable energy provision in subdivisions and other large scale development projects.	Amend REG-P13 (Energy efficient subdivision and development) as follows: Encourage Incentivise subdivision and development to be designed so that buildings can utilise energy and conservation measures, including by orientation to the sun and the use of energy efficient materials, to assist in improving energy efficiency and reducing energy consumption.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R1	Not specified	Meridian questions whether Rule REG-R1 (Maintenance and repair of existing renewable electricity generation activities) is necessary, because all existing renewable electricity generation activities (certainly existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) required and have obtained consents and their conditions of consent provide for maintenance and repair. The Plan proposes that community scale and large scale renewable electricity generation activities will all require consents. It is reasonable to expect the terms and conditions of consent to address maintenance and repair.	Seeks Rule REG-R1 (Maintenance and repair of existing renewable electricity generation activities)is revisited for its necessity, particularly in relation to large scale renewable electricity generation activities.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.127	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R1	Oppose in part	REG-R1.1 - Query why the note refers to operation and removal, when this PA is about maintenance and repair.	Amend REG-R1 (Maintenance and repair of existing renewable electricity generation activities): REG-R1.1 - Clarify why reference to operation and removal is included in the note.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.128	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R1	Oppose in part	REG-R1.2. PA within SNAS where S1 and 2 met. Oppose in part. Accept a level of vegetation removal for maintenance and repair. Point b - oppose 2m from each side of a road or track, as this allows for a very large amount of clearance. Amend to 1m. Support this being limited to existing facilities. Should be made clear that it is also limited to existing roads/tracks/fences. Refer to other submissions points regarding REG-S1 and S2 below. Considers it is not clear what policy provides the basis for maintenance and repair within SNAs. Consider including a new policy to provide this basis.	Amend REG-R1 (Maintenance and repair of existing renewable electricity generation activities): REG-R1.2 - Amend to allow a limited amount of vegetation removal as a Permitted activity.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.129	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R1	Oppose in part	REG-R1.3 - RDA within SNAs where S1 and 2 are not met. Oppose matters of discretion. The only reference is to P1 and P2, which are silent on the need to protect natural values. Amend the matters of discretion to refer to ECO policies. Add an exclusion from the RDA for policy 11(a) matters, and an accompanying non-complying rule.	Amend REG-R1 (Maintenance and repair of existing renewable electricity generation activities): REG-R1.3 - Amend matters of discretion to refer to relevant Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity policies. Add an exclusion from the RDA for policy 11(a) matters, and an accompanying non-complying rule.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.108	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R1	Oppose	Meridian agrees reference to the relevant ECO chapter policies has merit but opposes the requested exclusion for NZCPS Policy 11 matters and proposed non-complying activity status.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R2	Support	Meridian supports the permitted activity rule and standards for renewable electricity generation investigation activities and the standards proposed in REG-R2.1.	Retain REG-R2.1 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R2	Support	Meridian supports the restricted discretionary activity status and the proposed matters of discretion.	Retain REG-R2.2 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R2	Support	Supports the restricted discretionary activity status and the proposed matters of discretion relating to where standards are not met, and when within an overlay and scheduled area.	Retain rule REG-R2.3 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.130	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R2	Oppose in part	REG-R2.1 - Support in part. F&B has sought a general vegetation clearance rule to maintain biodiversity. We seek that compliance with vegetation removal rules is also required for this PA.	Amend REG-R2 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities): REG-R2.1 - Add requirement for compliance with REG-S1 (Trimming and removal of vegetation) for Permitted activity status.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.109	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R2	Oppose	Meridian does not oppose the request to add compliance with the vegetation clearance standard but notes the standard would need to be refined to also apply to investigation activities.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.131	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R2	Support in part	REG-R2.2 - Supported provided that REG-P1-3 are amended in the way sought by F&B submissions.	Retain REG-R2.2 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities) as notified, subject to other relief sought by submitter.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.132	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R2	Oppose in part	REG-R2.3 - Support matters of discretion referring to the relevant Natural Environment Values and Coastal Environment chapter policies. Ensure ECO policies are referenced correctly. An exclusion from the RDA is needed for policy 11(a) and 15(a) matters, and an accompanying non-complying rule. Oppose the prohibition on notification.	Amend REG-R2 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities): REG-R2.3 - Remove prohibition on notification. Add an exclusion for policy 11(a) and 15(a) matters, and add an accompanying non-complying rule.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.110	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R2	Oppose	Meridian opposes the proposed exclusion for NZCPS Policy 11 and Policy 15 matters and the proposed non-complying activity status	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.133	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R3	Support in part	REG-R3.1 - Support	Retain REG-R3.1 (Small scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.134	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R3	Support in part	REG-R3.2 - Support, but matters of discretion need to refer to ECO and other overlay/CE chapter policies, given that the assessment criteria in the standards require consideration of ecological/biodiversity values, other natural values, and the values of adjacent overlays.	Amend REG-R3 (Small scale renewable electricity generation activities): REG-R3.2 - Amend matters of discretion to refer to Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Coastal Environment (and any other relevant overlay) policies.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.135	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R3	Support in part	REG-R3.3 - Oppose matters of discretion. Seek instead a replication of the approach in REG-R2, which refers to the relevant policies in other chapters. An exclusion from the RDA is needed for policy 11(a) and 15(a) matters, and an accompanying non-complying rule.	Amend REG-R3 (Small scale renewable electricity generation activities): REG-R3.3 - Delete matters of discretion. Replace with matters of discretion listed in REG-R2.3. Add exclusion for policy 11(a) and 15(a) matters, and an accompanying non-complying rule.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R4	Support in part	Supports restricted discretionary activity provision for community scale and discretionary activity provision for large scale renewable electricity generation activities in all areas within the General Rural Zone (including within overlay areas).	Retain Rule REG-R4 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.136	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R4	Support in part	REG-R4.1 - General Rural Zone, General Industrial Zone, Airport Zone: RDA Support, but matters of discretion need to refer to ECO and other overlay/CE chapter policies, given that the assessment criteria in the standards require consideration of ecological/biodiversity values, other natural values, and the values of adjacent overlays.	Amend REG-R4 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities): REG-R4.1 - Amend matters of discretion to refer to Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Coastal Environment (and any other relevant overlay) policies.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.137	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R4	Support in part	REG-R4.2 - Above zones: Discretionary where RDA not met	Retain REG-R4.2 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.138	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R4	Support in part	REG-R4.3 - All other zones: Discretionary	Retain REG-R4.3 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.139	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R4	Support in part	REG-R4.4 -Sensitive areas: Discretionary. Support, provided that the policies in this chapter make clear that the policies from the natural values/CE chapters apply (as sought in above submissions). An exclusion from the discretionary rule is needed for policy 11(a) and 15(a) matters, and an accompanying non-complying rule.	Amend REG-R4 (Community scale renewable electricity generation activities): REG-R4.4 - Clarify that Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Coastal Environment (and any other relevant overlay) policies apply. Add exclusion for policy 11(a) and 15(a) matters, and an accompanying non-complying rule.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R5	Support in part	Supports in principle the restricted discretionary activity provision for upgrading of large scale renewable electricity generation activities and supports the matters of discretion. Considers that proposed standards REG-S9 and REG-S10 address matters that are addressed already under the relevant standard (NZS6808:2010) which is also a requirement of the rule.	Retain REG-R5 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) with amendments.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R5	Oppose	For Discretionary (Restricted) consideration, and respectful community engagement, it is imperative that compliance with these standards are explicitly retained.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R5	Amend	Supports in principle the restricted discretionary activity provision for upgrading of large scale renewable electricity generation activities and supports the matters of discretion. Considers that proposed standards REG-S9 and REG-S10 address matters that are addressed already under the relevant standard (NZS6808:2010) which is also a requirement of the rule.	Amend Rule REG-R5.1 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) by deleting the requirement to comply with Standards REG-S9 (Wind turbine noise limits) and REG-S10 (Wind turbine special audible characteristics (SAC's)).
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R5	Oppose	For Discretionary (Restricted) consideration, and respectful community engagement, it is imperative that compliance with these standards are explicitly retained.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R5	Support	Supports discretionary activity as the ultimate 'default' for renewable electricity generation activities that do not meet standards, including throughout the Rural General Zone and in all overlay areas.	Retain REG-R5.2 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.140	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R5	Support in part	REG-R5.1 - General Rural Zone and Brooklyn Turbine Zone RDA The matters of discretion need to refer to the ECO and other overlay/CE chapter policies, given that the assessment criteria in the standards require consideration of ecological/biodiversity values, other natural values, and the values of adjacent overlays.	Amend REG-R5.1 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities): Amend matters of discretion to refer to Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Coastal Environment (and any other relevant overlay) policies.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.111	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R5	Oppose	Considers that it is important that the rule does not allow for relitigation of effects on values (including values identified in the referenced chapters) that were settled through the consent process that established the facility. This rule addresses upgrading (not establishment).	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.141	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R5	Support in part	REG-R5.2 Accept provided that the policies in this chapter make clear that the policies from the natural values/CE chapters apply (as sought in above submissions).	Retain REG-R5.2 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) subject to relief sought on policies relating to the REG - Renewable Energy Generation chapter.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.112	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R5	Oppose	Considers that it is important that the rule does not allow for relitigation of effects on values (including values identified in the referenced chapters) that were settled through the consent process that established the facility. This rule addresses upgrading (not establishment).	Disallow
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R6	Support	Supports REG-R6 not allowing the development of new large-scale renewable electricity generation activities within any sites, areas, items and/or features identified in SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Retain REG-R6 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R6	Support	Supports REG-R6 not allowing the development of new large-scale renewable electricity generation activities within the root protection area of a tree identified in SCHED6 - Schedule of Notable Trees.	Retain REG-R6 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R6	Support	Supports REG-R6 not allowing the development of new large-scale renewable electricity generation activities within any area identified as SCHED10 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes.	Retain REG-R6 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R6	Support	Supports REG-R6 not allowing the development of new large-scale renewable electricity generation activities within any area identified as SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas.	Retain REG-R6 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.61	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R6	Oppose in part	Supports in principle discretionary activity provision REG-R6.1 for new large scale renewable electricity generation activities in all areas of the General Rural Zone (including in overlay areas).	Retain REG-R6.1 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.62	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R6	Oppose	Supports in principle the restricted discretionary activity provision for upgrading of large scale renewable electricity generation activities and supports the matters of discretion. Considers that proposed standards REG-S9 and REG-S10 address matters that are addressed already under the relevant standard (NZS6808:2010) which is also a requirement of the rule. Considers discretionary activity status will allow these matters to be considered in full where these effects are likely and a standard is not necessary (and may constrain full consideration by creating an inappropriate 'permitted baseline').	Amend Rule REG-R6.1 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities) by deleting the requirement to comply with Standards REG-S9 (Wind turbine noise limits) and REG-S10 (Wind turbine special audible characteristics (SAC's)).
M&P Makara Family Trust	F541.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R6	Oppose	For Discretionary (Restricted) consideration, and respectful community engagement, it is imperative that compliance with these standards are explicitly retained.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.63	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R6	Amend	Considers Non complying activity status is not necessary or appropriate, particularly in this Plan where the relevant objectives and policies provide clear guidance on the values to be protected and effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated within overlay areas.	Delete Rule REG-R6.2 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities) and re-number Rule REG-R6.3 as 'REG-R6.2'.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.142	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R6	Support in part	Support, but make clear in the REG policies that the ECO and other natural value/coastal environmental policies apply.	Amend REG-R6 (New large scale renewable electricity generation activities) to refer to Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Coastal Environment policies.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.143	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-R7	Support	Support and make clear in the REG policies that the ECO and other natural value/coastal environment policies apply.	Amend REG-R7 (Renewable electricity generation activities not otherwise provided for) to refer to Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Coastal Environment policies.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S1	Amend	Considers that increased protection should be given to ecological sites of importance, habitats for endangered species, and native biodiversity. Such sites need to be treated as the homes of animals and as crucial to the survival of our wildlife first and foremost, not just seen in terms of their development potential.	Clarify REG-S1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area) to specify this standard also applies to ecological sites of importance, habitats for endangered species, and native biodiversity. [Inferred decision requested].
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S1	Support in part	Considers that a new assessment matter should be added in order to ensure that fire risk mitigation is taken into account when assessing applications to trim or remove indigenous vegetation in areas subject to high fire risk.	Support REG-S1 (Trimming, pruning, removal of indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S1	Amend	Considers that a new assessment matter should be added in order to ensure that fire risk mitigation is taken into account when assessing applications to trim or remove indigenous vegetation in areas subject to high fire risk.	Amend REG-S1 (Trimming, pruning, removal of indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: ... <u>3. The degree to which the trimming or removal of affected vegetation will provide for the health and safety of people, property, and the environment through the management of fire risk.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.144	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S1	Support in part	REG-S1.1.b - Oppose 2m from each side of a road or track, as this allows for a very large amount of clearance. Amend to 1m. Support this being limited to existing facilities. Should be made clear that it is also limited to existing roads/tracks/fences. Delete assessment criteria 1. Amend to include assessment criteria 1. and 2. from ECO S1.	Amend REG-S1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area): ... 1. Trimming, pruning or removal of indigenous vegetation or trees within a significant natural area must be limited to: a. Within 2m of the existing renewable electricity generation activity building or structure, measured at ground level; b. 2 <u>1</u> m either side of any <u>existing</u> ancillary road or access track or fence; and ... Assessment criteria: 1. Operational needs, functional needs or other technical considerations; and 2. The effects on the identified ecological and biodiversity values of the significant natural area and the measures taken to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects and where relevant the ability to offset effects. <u>3. The extent to which the trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation limits the loss, damage or disruption to the ecological processes, functions and integrity of the significant natural area; and</u> <u>4. The effect of the vegetation removal on the identified biodiversity values.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.113	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S1	Oppose	Considers that the operational needs, functional needs and technical considerations are relevant considerations where non-compliance with the standard is being assessed.	Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of assessment criterion 1.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.105	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S1	Amend	Vegetation trimming standards and rules should be amended so that they also apply to both indigenous and non-indigenous vegetation. This would make it clear that all vegetation (aside from pest plants) is to be protected in these areas, except where otherwise specified for restoration or other purposes. Any non-indigenous plants within SNAs that are not pest plants may provide significant habitat for indigenous biodiversity such as birds, bats and lizards. This understanding is recognised in section 6(c) of the Act which directs the protection of the "significant habitats of indigenous fauna" not the significant indigenous habitats of indigenous fauna.	Seeks to amend standard (where relevant) to change 'indigenous vegetation' to 'vegetation'.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S1	Amend	Understanding of the importance of sustainable power infrastructure. However, it is important that this is done with respect to the cultural significance of the environment.	Requests the addition of cultural values to the list of assessment criteria where REG-S1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area) is infringed, as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Operational needs, functional needs or other technical considerations; and 2. The effects on the identified ecological, <u>cultural</u> and biodiversity values of <u>or within</u> the significant natural area and the measures taken to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects and where relevant the ability to offset effects.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.145	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S2	Oppose in part	Query the volume of earthworks allowed, which may need to have tighter limits. Is this intended to apply at the same time as the vegetation removal standard, i.e. would S1 first have to be met for removing vegetation, and then the volumes here would apply? Or where earthworks were done, would S1 be irrelevant? Delete the assessment criteria, and replace with the assessment criteria for ECO-S1, replacing 'trimming or removal of vegetation' with 'earthworks'.	Amend REG-S2 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) to reduce the volume of permitted earthworks. Clarify whether this standard applies in conjunction with REG-S1 or not. Delete assessment criteria, replace with: <u>1. The extent to which the earthworks limits the loss, damage or disruption to the ecological processes, functions and integrity of the significant natural area; and</u> <u>2. The effect of the earthworks on the identified biodiversity values.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.106	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S2	Amend	Considers that Policy 24 of the RPS directs councils to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values. The 'identified' qualifier limits the consideration of effects to those values identified within the SNA at the time of plan notification. The values of most SNAs have been identified only at a high-level, and often only through desktop analysis. The assessment required to identify the scope of effects may identify additional values and this should be part of the consideration of effects at the time consent is applied for.	Seeks to amend wording to remove 'identified' before 'significant biodiversity values' when referring to adverse effects caused by activities or maintenance of biodiversity values.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.114	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S2	Oppose	Considers that the relevant values are those identified in the Schedule	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.146	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S3	Support in part	Include ecological and biodiversity effects in the assessment criteria.	Amend REG-S3 (Renewable electricity generation investigation activities) to include "ecological and biodiversity effects" in the assessment criteria.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.147	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S5	Support in part	Include ecological and biodiversity effects in the assessment criteria, given the risks to birds from turbines.	Amend REG-S5 (Small scale renewable electricity generation activities - roof-mounted wind turbines) to include "ecological and biodiversity effects" in the assessment criteria.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S5	Amend	The reasoning behind limiting the number of roof mounted wind turbines seems extremely unclear, considering the increased risk to health and safety as well as character caused by constructing larger, broader turbines to generate the same power. Furthermore the standard discourages personal electricity generation through its limitations.	Amend REG-S5 (Small scale renewable electricity generation activities - roof-mounted wind turbines) as follows: 1. The wind turbine must not exceed: a. the permitted building height of the underlying Zone by more than 3m measured vertically; b. the permitted height in relation to boundary for the underlying Zone by more than 1m measured vertically; or c. a maximum rotor diameter of 2.5m. 2. There must be no more than one wind turbine per site.
Andrew Hodge	8.1	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S6	Amend	Considers that the current height and distance to buildings restrictions in REG-S6.2 will only allow freestanding wind turbines to be built on large rural properties. This will reduce wind energy generation potential in the Wellington District. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend REG-S6.2 (Small scale renewable electricity generation activities - freestanding wind turbines) as follows: ... 2. The wind turbine must not be located within the greater of: a. 60m of a habitable building on an adjacent site; or b. A distance of 10 times the wind turbine tower's height above ground level from any site boundary that is not held in the same record of title; <u>2. The wind turbine must not be located within 15m of a habitable building on an adjacent site.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.148	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S6	Support	Supports the standard.	Retain REG-S6 (Small scale renewable electricity generation activities - freestanding wind turbines) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.149	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S7	Support	Supports the standard.	Retain REG-S7 (Community scale wind turbines) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.64	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S8	Support in part	Considers that the 150m ² limit on the cumulative area of solar panels on a site (in Standard REG-S8) is too small to support meaningful community scale solar electricity generation and there need to be different controls for freestanding solar panels compared with those that will occupy the existing surface of a building.	Retain REG-S8 (Community scale freestanding solar panels) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.65	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S8	Amend	Considers that the 150m ² limit on the cumulative area of solar panels on a site (in Standard REG-S8) is too small to support meaningful community scale solar electricity generation and there need to be different controls for freestanding solar panels compared with those that will occupy the existing surface of a building.	Amend Standard REG-S8 (Community scale freestanding solar panels) as follows (or similar to increase the maximum area limit for solar panels): 1. Any structure must not exceed: a. The permitted height in relation to boundary for the underlying Zone; b. The permitted setback standards for the underlying Zone; or c. A maximum height of 6m above ground level; 2. The cumulative area of solar panels on the site must not exceed 150m² ; <u>a. The horizontal area of the building's roof, where the solar panels are fixed to a building roof; and</u> <u>b. 1,500m² where the solar panels are freestanding or fixed to the walls of buildings.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.150	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S8	Support	Supports the standard.	Retain REG-S8 (Community scale freestanding solar panels) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S8	Amend	Limitation of community scale solar panel operations goes against Wellington's long term sustainability goals. If restrictions are necessary then the standard could be rewritten to include them however the outwrite limitation seems senseless, particularly as the standard applies to cumulative area, preventing larger communities from exploring new areas for solar installations after their quota has been met.	Amend REG-S8 (Community scale freestanding solar panels) as follows: 1. Any structure must not exceed: a. The permitted height in relation to boundary for the underlying Zone; b. The permitted setback standards for the underlying Zone; or c. A maximum height of 6m above ground level; 2. The cumulative area of solar panels on the site must not exceed 150m².
Meridian Energy Limited	228.66	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S9	Oppose in part	Opposes proposed standards REG-S9. Considers REG-S9 is addressed already under the relevant standard (NZS6808:2010) Considers these matters will be better considered as discretionary matters rather than as standards where these effects are likely.	Delete standard REG-S9 (Wind turbine noise limits) in its entirety.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S9	Oppose	For Discretionary (Restricted) consideration, and respectful community engagement, it is imperative that compliance with these standards are explicitly retained.	Disallow
Ministry of Education	400.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S9	Support	Supports REG-S9 as the submitter supports the management of noise generated from wind turbines on any nearby noise sensitive activities, including educational facilities.	Retain REG-S9 (Wind turbine noise limits) as notified.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S9	Support	Not specified.	Allow

Energy, Infrastructure and Transport - Transport

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.67	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S10	Oppose in part	Opposes proposed standards REG-S9. Considers REG-S9 is addressed already under the relevant standard (NZS6808:2010) Considers these matters will be better considered as discretionary matters rather than as standards where these effects are likely.	Delete standard REG-S10 (Wind turbine special audible characteristics (SAC's)) in its entirety.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S10	Oppose	For Discretionary (Restricted) consideration, and respectful community engagement, it is imperative that compliance with these standards are explicitly retained.	Disallow
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S11	Amend	Considers that in order to remain discretionary (restricted), Point 2 should be amended to require a wind turbine to not exceed the existing height by more than 5%. 10% is an extra height allowance of 12.5m for existing large scale wind turbines in the rural area. Original resource consents for these turbines was predicated on visual amenity assessments provided for affected neighbouring properties, and an additional 12.5m height could significantly change some of these effects. In addition, noise levels at neighbouring residences are affected by line-of-sight - i.e. the more visible, the more likely there is to be more noise.	Amend REG-S11 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as follows (change 10% to 5%): ... 2. A replacement building or structure (including any wind turbine) must not exceed the height of the existing building or structure to be replaced by more than 10% 5%;
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.115	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S11	Oppose	Meridian considers the standards as notified are already conservative. The assessment criteria are appropriate.	Disallow
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S11	Amend	Considers that REG-S11 Assessment Criteria Point 9 should be removed as it is too broad a consideration. If compliance with the standard is impractical, the upgrade should not be allowed.	Amend REG-S11 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: ... 9. Whether there are topographical or other site constraints that make compliance with the standard impractical;
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.116	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S11	Oppose	Meridian considers the standards as notified are already conservative. The assessment criteria are appropriate.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.151	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S11	Support	Supports the standard.	Retain REG-S11 (Upgrading of existing large scale renewable electricity generation activities) as notified.
Aro Valley Community Council	87.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that while Aro Valley is included in the 10 minute walkable catchment from a rapid transit zone, 46% already use active transport to move around the city. The remainder find that public transport (the bus service) is unreliable, not accessible to differently abled people, or safe in all weather conditions.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.34	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Interprofessional Trust	96.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that car-parking should be by owners choice.	[Not specified]
M J & P B Murtagh	98.1	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that residents in rented properties are unable to find parking for their cars. Considers that vehicle traffic has increased each year.	Seeks that garaging is required in Mount Victoria. [Inferred submission point]
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Supports the emphasis on pedestrian and public transport access and the active prioritisation of this in development. Considers that students should be easily able to move around the City without cars	Supports that a range of transport options are accommodated to serve diverse transport needs, including active, public, taxis/ubers, and mobility vehicles.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the city should serve people first, not cars.	Not specified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Supports infrastructure that supports the prioritisation of public transport, pedestrians, and cyclists. Understands that accommodating pedestrians and cyclists can be difficult in some areas due to narrow roads or steep hills.	Seeks that the WCC aims to support the safety and accessibility of pedestrians and cyclists even in narrow road or steep hill areas.
Olivier Reuland	134.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the increased density of cars parked in streets, and traffic congestion, is not wholly a negative effect despite what the RMA would say. It can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets.	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as not wholly a negative effect.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Braydon White	146.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the traffic congestion and the increased density of cars parked on streets can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets by slowing down traffic, discouraging rat-running, and adding an extra nudge for those "on the fence" to maybe travel another way for those short trips.	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as an interim contributor to traffic calming and safer streets, and used tactically as such.
Braydon White	146.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, is prioritised for access to public transport.
Jill Ford	163.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that G99-G102 (External Storage) in the Residential Design Guide should be referenced in to specific Rules, Policies, and Objectives in the Transport chapter. [Inferred decision requested].
Amos Mann	172.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel is prioritised for access to public transport.
Patrick Wilkes	173.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the increased density of cars parked in streets, and traffic congestion, can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets by slowing down traffic	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as an interim contributor to traffic calming and safer streets.
Patrick Wilkes	173.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend objectives, policies and rules of the Transport Chapter to include reference to Residential Design Guide guidance GG 99-102 (external bike storage).
Pete Gent	179.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the increased density of cars parked in streets, and traffic congestion, is not wholly a negative effect despite what the RMA would say. It can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets.	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as not wholly a negative effect.
Pete Gent	179.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel is prioritised for access to public transport.
James Harris	180.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel is prioritised for access to public transport.
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that it is unclear how people will be incentivised to use other modes of transport instead of cars. Ngaio does not have a supermarket in easy walking distance. People still need to rely on cars to drive their kids to and from school, and other activities and amenities. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.
Sam Stocker & Patricia Lee	216.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that we live in a society that relies on cars and taking away street parking will make the historic area unliveable. The simple answer to making our neighbourhood more cycle and walking friendly is to lower the speed limit across the city. Considers that the neighbourhood needs to retain its carparks. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that new developments in historic areas include carparks.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Supports submission that seeks character precinct extensions in Newtown.	Allow
Tyers Stream Group	221.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that building on unbuilt or built legal roads providing access to Reserves including Tyers Stream Reserve should be non-complying.
Stratum Management Limited	249.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers the requirements apply to the City centre, Metropolitan, Local Centre, Neighbourhood and Mixed Use zones. Under the requirements, residential developments in these zones must provide for a minimum of 1 space per residential unit, and 1 short-stay space per 10 residential units. An apartment building of significant size will require substantial floor area for bicycle storage. This brings with it significant cost, impacting on the ultimate affordability of the apartment building. Assuming a requirement of 2.5m ² per bike in addition to associated access and circulation space, this would lead to an additional floor area requirement of some 300m ² , for a 100 unit apartment building. This would equate to an additional cost of \$3.9M. Not all apartment owners will utilise bike storage space. Therefore the requirement also risks a significant degree of sunk cost in meeting the standard. The provision of cycle parking is supported but Stratum opposes a requirement for such storage, and opposes the current requirement of 1 space per units. The residential requirement is also significantly above, in ultimate floor area requirements, those of other activity types in Table 7. Short stay, or visitor bike parking requirements are also opposed where they need to be provided on-site. The public realm remains an appropriate means of providing for visitor bike parking.	Seeks to remove the cycle and micromobility requirement for residential development (Table 7 TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces).
Richard Hovey	FS60.1	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	<p>Oppose the submissions from Stratum Management Limited on the basis that while developers may enjoy the cost reduction benefits that the removal of the requirement to provide car parks has brought they cannot simply privatise that gain and expect some sort of external transport storage solution to be provided for the residents of their developments.</p> <p>People in urban environments should have a choice of transport and bikes/e-bikes/e-scooters are a perfect match for everyday urban transport needs. They contribute to a healthier, happier and more appealing city.</p> <p>Developers should celebrate how much less space is required to facilitate bicycle storage than private motor vehicles and provide a reasonable level of space and facility for this purpose.</p> <p>While it may be presented simply as a 'cost' which some people may not wish to pay it should be seen as part of the investment in better residential development which will either be valued by those living there or rented out to others (in exactly the way car parks are).</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission arguing against a good level of bicycle storage being required for residential developments is disallowed.
Jane O'Loughlin	FS99.1	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	A minimum of 1 cycle park per residential unit should be required. The requirements for cycle and micromobility storage/parking is fundamental to achieve the mode shift required to achieve net zero carbon emissions, and has associated health and equity benefits. This is consistent with WCC's Te Atakura and mode shift goals.	Disallow / Seeks that a minimum of 1 cycle park per residential unit should be required.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.16	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	Oppose the submission that cycle and micro-mobility parking requirements for residential development be removed. WCCERG suggest the m2 requirement may be substantially less than suggested in many cases, and would draw attention to the bike racks used by WCC that allow two vertical layers of bike storage as one example of how bikes can be stored in smaller areas. The requirements for cycle and micro-mobility storage/parking is fundamental to achieve the mode-shift required to achieve the city's net zero carbon emissions, and has associated health and equity benefits.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support in part	Notes that as previously referenced under the feedback point for TR0R3, the standards within Table 9 may be insufficient for fire appliance access in certain circumstances.	Supports Table 9 - TR: Design of Driveways, with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Notes that as previously referenced under the feedback point for TR0R3, the standards within Table 9 may be insufficient for fire appliance access in certain circumstances.	Amend Table 9 - TR: Design of Driveways Classification: Driveway Level 1 Minimum Width (m) – Vehicles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 x 3.0 • Passing bays at 50m maximum spacing; • Clear line of sight between passing bays • <u>Where driveways will result in any building served from the driveway to be more than 70m away from a legal road, the site access and full length of the driveway must provide unhindered access for fire appliances in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.34	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.34	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Richard Hovey	280.1	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that E-Bikes and e-scooters are growing in popularity and require specific storage. E-Bikes and e-scooters can weigh from 25kg to 40kg and require storage, they can be used more when storage has charging capacity, and are high-value targets for theft. Lack of storage can be a barrier to entry for people using these vehicles. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that there is more definition regarding requirements and recommendations for provision of bike and micromobility device storage.
Johanna Carter	296.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that private vehicles will still be part of the fabric of the city for many years. For example, people need to be able to accommodate vehicles for work (trade vehicles), and to store private vehicles to access areas of NZ not accessible by public transport. Not all people are able to use public transport due to age, disability or they are a family with competing demands that public transport cannot cater for. To completely remove all parking requirements will result in more on street parking and where this is limited more competition for the parking that is available.	Seeks that the removal of all parking requirements is re-examined and revisited.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that cycle parking and charging facilities should be adequate to meet increasing demand for secure parking and charging facilities, to meet climate commitments, safety and mode shift goals.	Not specified.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support in part	Table 7 - TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces in the Transport chapter is supported, as it provides requirements for cycle parking in the listed zones. However, long stay cycle parking should also require a reduced number of charging facilities.	Retain Table 7 - TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces in the 'Transport' chapter, with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that Table 7 - TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces should be amended to require a reduced number of charging facilities in long stay cycle parking.	Amend Table 7 - TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces to include charging facilities for e-cycles in the 'Long stay (staff*, residents, students)' column.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provisions enable the importation of aggregate from other areas outside of the Wellington City Council jurisdiction.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.32	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	A number of submission points made by the Aggregate & Quarry Association (please see multiple points in their submission relating to the same theme) argue that "it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction."Elsewhere, they also say: "... the District Plan must not unreasonably curtail expansion of existing quarries and establishment of new quarries..." WCCERG disagree, on the basis of primary and secondary greenhouse gas emissions from quarrying, which are no longer tenable; and the opportunity to re-use existing materials (instead of sending them to landfill, as is currently the case).	Disallow / Seeks that instead of allowing new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use, WCC requires no expansion of any kind of mining or quarrying activities, and a second policy stating that these activities be phased out by (for example), 2030.
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the increased density of cars parked in streets, and traffic congestion, is not wholly a negative effect despite what the RMA would say. It can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets.	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as not wholly a negative effect.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that removing car parking requirements will allow more efficient use of the site and support the city's Carbon Zero goals. It could also contribute to the affordability of housing developments by removing a significant cost to provide the parking, provided this is not captured by developers. However, it will also make it harder for residents manage parking.	Not specified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Support	Retain Table 7 (Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.33	Part 2 / E nergy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Support	Submission point 349.9 partly supports FSNI submission 476.7 however FSNI seeks an amendment.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Support	Retain Table 8 (Classification of driveways) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Support	Retain Table 9 (Design of driveways) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Support	Retain Table 10 Parking Space dimensions) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose in part	Considers that due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, it is not necessary or practicable to apply the Table 7 minimum number of onsite cycling and micromobility device parking space requirements to retirement villages at the same rate as it is applied to other residential activities.	Opposes Table 7 (TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, it is not necessary or practicable to apply the Table 7 minimum number of onsite cycling and micromobility device parking space requirements to retirement villages at the same rate as it is applied to other residential activities.	Amend Table 7 (TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces) to Add "retirement villages" as a new activity with the following minimum number of onsite cycling and micromobility device parking spaces: - Not applicable for Short Stay (visitors); - Minimum 1, 0.1 per staff member*
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.107	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support in part	Supports the removal of on-site carparking required by the NPS-UD as it will mean a more proactive approach to managing on-street parking across the city than in the past. Also supports the requirement for the provision of cycling and micro-mobility parking as part of new development.	Not specified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Supports Table 7 - TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain Table 7 (TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces) in the Transport chapter as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support in part	The Transport strategic direction of the PDP is supported, as it seeks to reduce carbon emissions and effects on climate change through the use of renewable energy technologies.	Retain the Transport chapter with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.155	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Consider 200 vehicles per day to be a high number for any activity within the district plan. It was not clear from the support documents where this number has come from. Waka Kotahi seeks to work with Council to determine appropriate thresholds for specific activities accessing both the state highway and local roads	Seeks to Amend Table 8 (TR: Classification of driveways) to institute a threshold of 100 car equivalent vehicle movements per day where a proposal accesses the state highway, and lower thresholds where the safety of the transport network warrants it. Note – car equivalent movements are defined as (as noted in the New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 1 – Glossary): • 1 car to and from the property = 2 equivalent car movements • 1 truck to and from property = 6 equivalent car movements • 1 truck and trailer to and from property = 10 equivalent car movements
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.70	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support in part	The Transport chapter is generally supported, but needs provisions to enable EV charging stations. The submitter considers that the use of EVs to be a key utilisation of new renewable technologies that will help achieve Wellington's carbon reduction and climate change goals. INF-S18 provides for EV charging stations but only as optional ancillary infrastructure for when a new road is created (through Rule INF-R25 (New Roads)). EVs are also not defined in the PDP and there are no objectives, policies or rules that seek to enable the use of EVs, specifically through the provision of EV charging stations. As such, as it stands, the submitter notes that it appears that the only directly enabling EV provision is Standard INF-S18. There does not appear to be any other provisions in the PDP that recognise or enable EV charging stations and it is therefore assumed that where such EV charging is ancillary to a proposed or existing activity, the same activity status of the primary activity applies. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain the Transport chapter with amendment.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	This will help support provision for multiple modes.	Retain Table 7-TR (Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support in part	Generally supportive. However, the submitter has significant concerns about the declassification of Johnsonville as a rapid transport service and suggest this is amended as it is contrary to both the GWRC Regional Land Transport Plan and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development: this line enables high passenger capacity, meets the definition of 'rapid' in that at peak times it operates on a 12 minute schedule, and has potential, with additional loops, to become even more frequent as demand grows in the future. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel is prioritised for access to public transport.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.134	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose in part	The submitter does not believe that public or limited notification is necessary.	Opposes in part and requests amendment so that all Rules in the Infrastructure chapter are to include a notification preclusion statement for activities under Restricted Discretionary
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.28	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	Considers that the notification and preclusion required in the notified District Plan must be retained to give it teeth and make it effective.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.135	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that all rules in the Transport chapter should have a notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities. The technical nature of these breaches requires technical and/or engineering assessments, and public participation by way of limited or public notification will unlikely add anything to the consideration of the effects of these breaches.	Amend all Rules in the Transport chapter to include a notification preclusion statement for activities under Restricted Discretionary as follows: <u>Notification:</u> <u>Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A or section 95B of the RMA.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.44	Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	Considers it necessary to be notified of infrastructure activities adjacent to the rail corridor to ensure KiwiRail has the opportunity to be included in the planning assessment process. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.29	Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	Considers that the notification and preclusion required in the notified District Plan must be retained to give it teeth and make it effective.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.41	Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Stride supports notification being precluded from applications for resource consent under rules in the Transport chapter, which would appropriately reflect the technical rule of such rules and that public participation is unlikely to assist decisions on consents required under this chapter.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.41	Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Investore supports notification being precluded from applications for resource consent under rules in the Transport chapter, which would appropriately reflect the technical rule of such rules and that public participation is unlikely to assist decisions on consents required under this chapter.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the increased density of cars parked in streets, and traffic congestion, can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets by slowing down traffic	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as an interim contributor to traffic calming and safer streets.
Stephen Minto	FS100.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	<p>Submitter 394 seeks to have traffic congestion and inadequate parking viewed as positives. 'traffic calming and safer streets'</p> <p>This works against emergency services access e.g. fire service and ambulance. See Fire Service submission point number 273.201. There are not always bus lanes for emergency services to use. And congestion can encourage 'rat-running' (submitters terminology) into using bus lanes which would damage public transport flows and emergency services access.</p> <p>Congestion can impact public transport flow because there are not always bus lanes which tends to negate the submitters next point 472.10 about encouraging access to public transport.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 394.8]</p>	Disallow
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel is prioritised for access to public transport.
David Cadman	398.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the increased density of cars parked in streets, and traffic congestion, can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets by slowing down traffic	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as an interim contributor to traffic calming and safer streets.
Stephen Minto	FS100.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	<p>Submitter 398 seeks to have traffic congestion and inadequate parking viewed as positives. 'traffic calming and safer streets'</p> <p>This works against emergency services access e.g. fire service and ambulance. See Fire Service submission point number 273.201. There are not always bus lanes for emergency services to use. And congestion can encourage 'rat-running' (submitters terminology) into using bus lanes which would damage public transport flows and emergency services access.</p> <p>Congestion can impact public transport flow because there are not always bus lanes which tends to negate the submitters next point 472.10 about encouraging access to public transport.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 398.7]</p>	Disallow
David Cadman	398.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel is prioritised for access to public transport.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.186	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Clarify whether rules and standards will apply based on cumulative effects within a site or based on individual activities.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.187	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the Airport already generates a large volume of traffic, a consent would arguably be triggered for every new activity established, irrespective of the nature or scale of the activity.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.188	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Airports facilitate the movement of people to and from the District. Many of the activities undertaken at airports are purely intended to support this function and provide services for passengers, staff and “meters and greeters”. They are therefore not vehicle generating activities in themselves. For the purposes of implementing the relevant trip generation methods, it would be difficult to distinguish between what is a facilitating and what is a generating activity.	Clarify what is and isn't a vehicle generating activity.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.189	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that as the management of people to and from the airport and its environs is a role that WIAL oversees and accounts for as its role as airport operator.	Seeks that the Trip Generation provisions do not apply within the Airport Zone.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.88	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Supports the introduction text which outlines that matters concerning the operation, maintenance, repair and renewal, upgrading and development of the transport network and connections to the transport network are provided in the Infrastructure Chapter. This is an important message as district plans commonly contain provisions relating to vehicle crossing setbacks from level crossings and level crossing sightline restrictions, within transport chapters. KiwiRail support text which helps with plan-user navigation to all relevant parts of the Plan.	Retain the Transport chapter introduction as notified.
Emma Osborne	410.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that the increased density of cars parked in streets, and traffic congestion, is not wholly a negative effect despite what the RMA would say. It can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as not wholly a negative effect. [Inferred decision requested]
Stephen Minto	FS100.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	Submitter 410 seeks to have traffic congestion and inadequate parking viewed as positives. ‘traffic calming and safer streets’ This works against emergency services access e.g. fire service and ambulance. See Fire Service submission point number 273.201. There are not always bus lanes for emergency services to use. And congestion can encourage ‘rat-running’ (submitters terminology) into using bus lanes which would damage public transport flows and emergency services access. Congestion can impact public transport flow because there are not always bus lanes which tends to negate the submitters next point 472.10 about encouraging access to public transport. [Inferred reference to submission point 410.6]	Disallow
VicLabour	414.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Supports the sustainable transport hierarchy and a shift from private vehicles to active and public transport. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Retain reference to sustainable transport hierarchy in the transport chapter introduction as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Luke Stewart	422.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the traffic congestion and the increased density of cars parked on streets can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets by slowing down traffic, discouraging rat-running, and adding an extra nudge for those “on the fence” to maybe travel another way for those short trips.	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as an interim contributor to traffic calming and safer streets, and used tactically as such.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stephen Minto	FS100.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	<p>Submitter 422 seeks to have traffic congestion and inadequate parking viewed as positives. 'traffic calming and safer streets'</p> <p>This works against emergency services access e.g. fire service and ambulance. See Fire Service submission point number 273.201. There are not always bus lanes for emergency services to use. And congestion can encourage 'rat-running' (submitters terminology) into using bus lanes which would damage public transport flows and emergency services access.</p> <p>Congestion can impact public transport flow because there are not always bus lanes which tends to negate the submitters next point 472.10 about encouraging access to public transport.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 422.4]</p>	Disallow
Luke Stewart	422.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, is prioritised for access to public transport.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that Driveway Level 3 (7-20 dwellings) widths are excessive in Table 9 - TR Design of Driveways. Considers that this provision is inconsistent with the overall direction of the PDP attempting to reduce areas of sealed surfaces to minimise stormwater discharge and improve runoff quality. Considers that the 6m width required by this standard provides no traffic management benefits and it should be reduced to 4.5m as this provides enough space for firetrucks, passing vehicles, and encourages a safe speed environment.	<p>Amend Table 9 - TR Design of Driveways:</p> <p>Driveway Level 3: Footpath = 1 x 1.5 <u>1.0</u> Vehicles = 2 x 3.0 <u>1 x 4.5</u> Berm = 1 x 1.0 <u>or 2 x 0.5</u> Overall legal width = 8.0 <u>6.5</u></p>
Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, is prioritised for access to public transport.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that the traffic congestion and the increased density of cars parked on streets can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets by slowing down traffic, discouraging rat-running, and adding an extra nudge for those "on the fence" to maybe travel another way for those short trips.	Seeks that traffic congestion and parking effects are viewed as an interim contributor to traffic calming and safer streets, and used tactically as such.
Stephen Minto	FS100.1	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Oppose	<p>Submitter 472 seeks to have traffic congestion and inadequate parking viewed as positives. 'traffic calming and safer streets'</p> <p>This works against emergency services access e.g. fire service and ambulance. See Fire Service submission point number 273.201. There are not always bus lanes for emergency services to use. And congestion can encourage 'rat-running' (submitters terminology) into using bus lanes which would damage public transport flows and emergency services access.</p> <p>Congestion can impact public transport flow because there are not always bus lanes which tends to negate the submitters next point 472.10 about encouraging access to public transport.</p>	Disallow
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel is prioritised for access to public transport.
Ben Barrett	479.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	<p>Considers that the District Plan needs to recognise that Newtown's main roads are single lane roads, not major transport corridors.</p> <p>There are practical limitations to the intensification of actual road width that have been ignored by intensification planning to date.</p>	Seeks that the District Plan recognises that Newtown's main roads are single lane roads, not major transport corridors.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Catharine Underwood	481.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that there should be much more mandatory provisions for storage and charging for ebikes and personal storage lockers for other gear.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Support	Supports the removal of minimum parking requirements. Considers that we need to be moving to a situation where more households are car-less and this can be addressed through not forcing houses to have parking spaces.	Retain having no minimum parking requirements in the plan.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that the transport section is inadequate in terms of ensuring there is good pedestrian infrastructure.	Seeks that in the Transport chapter, any permitted activity is consistent with the NZTA guidelines (or equivalent standard).
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Amend	Considers that in Table 9 - TR Design of driveways, the 6 metre total width of driveways at the footpath is too wide and particularly with Driveway Level 3, the design speed is too high at 20km/h.	Seeks that Table 9 - TR Design of driveways should consider reducing both the width and speed of the driveways.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that growth in rural areas means roads should be upgraded with pedestrian footpaths	Rural roads in Wellington City should still have dedicated pedestrian space, particularly in areas that have been identified for further development
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / General TR	Not specified	Considers that growth in rural areas means roads should be upgraded with pedestrian footpaths	Shared paths should be a controlled or discretionary use in all cases.
Susan Rotto	63.1	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	MRZ-P8.4 (Achieve attractive and safe streets), MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) and MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) cannot work without provision for off-street parking. Lack of off-street parking drives parking on-street which packs up streets, which are unsafe and provide no space for workers.	Seeks that at least one off-street car park per residential unit on a site in the Medium Density Residential Chapter. [Inferred decision requested]
Susan Rotto	63.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	MRZ-P8.4 (Achieve attractive and safe streets), MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) and MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) cannot work without provision for off-street parking. Lack of off-street parking drives parking on-street which packs up streets, which are unsafe and provide no space for workers.	Seeks that 1 > off-street car parks is required on sites in the Medium Density Residential Zone that are used for non-residential purposes. [Inferred decision requested]
Tawa Community Board	294.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that due to the Central Governments lack of review of the Building Act, there are loop holes regarding accessibility that the PDP should address. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the PDP address accessibility for residents with mobility issues.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.108	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that additional policy direction would be required to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction (Policies CC.1 and CC.3) which directs the provision of infrastructure to promote the uptake of cycling as a means of transport. This direction would require the provision of cycle parking that is safe, convenient, and secure and end of journey facilities for staff such as showers and lockers.	Add a new Policy to the Transport chapter that provides more explicit direction regarding the support for cycle transport, as follows: <u>Encourage cycle transport through the provision of cycle parking that is sheltered, convenient, safe and secure and end-of-journey facilities for staff including showers, lockers and dedicated changing spaces.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.61	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on the RVA's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), the RVA considers that this provision should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / The RVA seeks that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this policy.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.61	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on Ryman's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), Ryman considers that this provision should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Ryman seeks that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this policy.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.109	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers it appropriate to include a new standard that sets out the minimum end-of-trip facilities for staff to support cycling as a means of transport. This can be based on the number of cycling spaces required to be provided. For example, 1 shower and 1 locker per 10 staff cycle parks. This standard should be linked with TR-S2 and Table TR-7. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are CC.1 and CC.3.	Add a new standard to that sets out the minimum end-of-trip facilities for staff to support cycling as a means of transport. This could relate to a minimum number of showers and lockers to be provided.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.62	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on the RVA's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), the RVA considers that this provision should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / The RVA seeks that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this policy.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.62	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and the requirements for care for staff and based on Ryman's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), Ryman considers that these various provisions should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Ryman seeks that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this objective.
Z Energy Limited	361.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers the use of electric vehicles (EVs) to be a key utilisation of new renewable technologies that will help achieve Wellington's carbon reduction and climate change goals. However, EVs are not defined in the PDP and there are no objectives, policies or rules that seek to enable the use of EVs, specifically through the provision of EV charging stations. The only exception being Standard INF-S18 in the Infrastructure chapter which is only applicable where new roads are created. In comparison, the Residential zone and Centre zone under the Operative District Plan contain objectives, policies and methods that look to specifically enable EV charging stations.	Add a new Rule in the Transport chapter as follows: <u>TR-R7 (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations)</u> <u>All Zones</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with TR-S7 is achieved; and</u> <u>b. Compliance with TR-S10 is achieved;</u> <u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>where</u> <u>a. Compliance with TR-R7.1 cannot be achieved</u> <u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>1. The matters in TR-P3; and</u> <u>2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with standard TR-S10 as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard;</u>
Z Energy Limited	361.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers the use of electric vehicles (EVs) to be a key utilisation of new renewable technologies that will help achieve Wellington's carbon reduction and climate change goals. However, EVs are not defined in the PDP and there are no objectives, policies or rules that seek to enable the use of EVs, specifically through the provision of EV charging stations. The only exception being Standard INF-S18 in the Infrastructure chapter which is only applicable where new roads are created. In comparison, the Residential zone and Centre zone under the Operative District Plan contain objectives, policies and methods that look to specifically enable EV charging stations.	Add a new standard in the Transport chapter as follows: <u>TR-S10 (Ancillary structures for electric vehicle charging)</u> <u>1. The structures (excluding poles and cables) must:</u> <u>a. Not exceed a maximum height above ground level of 3m; and</u> <u>b. Not exceed a maximum combined footprint of 5m2; and</u> <u>c. Comply with zone Boundary Setback standards.</u> <u>Assessment criteria when the standard is infringed:</u> <u>1. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; and</u> <u>2. Whether landscaping is required to mitigate streetscape and visual amenity effects.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.156	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers it appropriate that any change of land use involving direct access onto the state highway require consent, at least as a restricted discretionary activity, with discretion restricted to the matters in TR-P3.	Add a new Rule to the Transport chapter as follows: <u>Change of land use for activities having direct access to the state highway</u> <u>Restricted discretionary activity</u> <u>Discretion restricted to the matters in TR-P3.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.71	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that a new provision should be added to the Transport chapter to recognise or enable EV charging stations as a permitted activity in all zones, subject to compliance with specific standards. This rule would support a broader network of EV charging stations and therefore greater uptake of EV use in the district and would contribute to Wellington's carbon reduction and climate change goals. [See original submission for full reason]	Add new Rule in the Transport chapter as follows: <u>TR-R7 (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations)</u> <u>All Zones</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with TR-S7 is achieved; and</u> <u>b. Compliance with TR-S10 is achieved;</u> <u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where</u> <u>a. Compliance with TR-R7.1 cannot be achieved.</u> <u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>1. The matters in TR-P3; and</u> <u>2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with standard TR-S10 as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard;</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.72	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that a new provision should be added to the Transport chapter to provide height, boundary setbacks and amenity standards for EV charging stations. As the plan stands, EV charging stations are currently interpreted as an ancillary activity and ancillary structure(s) to a site's primary activity and would only subject to building and structure standards to ensure appropriate built form outcomes are achieved. [See original submission for full reason]	Add new Standard in the Transport chapter as follows: <u>TR-S10 (Ancillary structures for electric vehicle charging)</u> <u>1. The structures (excluding poles and cables) must:</u> <u>a. Not exceed a maximum height above ground level of 3m; and</u> <u>b. Not exceed a maximum combined footprint of 5m2; and</u> <u>c. Comply with zone Boundary Setback standards.</u> <u>Assessment criteria when the standard is infringed:</u> <u>1. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; and</u> <u>2. Whether landscaping is required to mitigate streetscape and visual amenity effects.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.136	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that Objective INF-O5 should be amended to be reviewed and moved to the Transport chapter.	Seeks that Objective INF-O5 (Transport network) be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.45	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.137	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that all transport-related provisions (objectives, policies, rules and definitions) in the Infrastructure chapter should be reviewed, amended and moved to the Transport chapter. Some provisions may be deleted in the process.	Seeks that transport related provisions be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.46	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.138	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that INF-P9 should be amended to be reviewed and moved to the Transport chapter.	Seeks that INF-P9 (Upgrading and development of the transport network) be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.47	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.139	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that INF-P10 should be amended to be reviewed and moved to the Transport chapter.	Seeks that INF-P10 (Classification of roads) be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.48	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.140	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that INF-P11 should be amended to be reviewed and moved to the Transport chapter.	Seeks that INF-P11 (Connection to roads) be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.49	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.141	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that all transport-related provisions in the Infrastructure chapter, including INF-R4, should be reviewed, amended and moved to the Transport chapter. Some provisions may be deleted in the process.	Seeks INF-R4 (New vehicle access tracks for infrastructure) be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.50	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.142	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that all transport-related provisions in the Infrastructure chapter, including INF-R24, should be reviewed, amended and moved to the Transport chapter. Some provisions may be deleted in the process.	Seeks INF-R24 (Connections to roads) be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.51	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.143	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that all transport-related provisions in the Infrastructure chapter, including INF-R25, should be reviewed, amended and moved to the Transport chapter. Some provisions may be deleted in the process.	Seeks INF-R25 (New roads) be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.52	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.144	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that INF-S12 should be amended to have less specific requirements.	Amend INF-S12 (Buildings, structures and activities in the National Grid Yard) as follows: 1. The building or structure must have a minimum vertical clearance of 10m below the lowest point of a conductor under all transmission line and building operating conditions; or 2. Must meet the safe electrical clearance distances required by New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001) ISSN 01140663 under all transmission line and building operating conditions. 3. The building or structure must be located at least 12m from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid transmission line tower or pole, except where it: a. Is a fence not exceeding 2.5m in height that is located at least: i. 6m from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid transmission line tower; or ii. 5m from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid transmission line pole. b. Is an artificial crop protection structure or crop support structure not exceeding 2.5m in height and located at least 8m from a National Grid transmission line pole that: i. Is removable or temporary to allow a clear working space of 12m from the pole for maintenance; and ii. Allows all weather access to the pole and a sufficient area for maintenance equipment, including a crane; or c. Meets the requirements of clause 2.4.1 of New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001) ISSN 01140663.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.53	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.145	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that all transport-related provisions in the Infrastructure chapter, including INF-S13, should be reviewed, amended and moved to the Transport chapter. Some provisions may be deleted in the process.	Seeks INF-S13 (Design of roads) be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.54	Part 2 / District-Wide Matters / Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport / Transport / New TR	Not specified	KiwiRail has an interest in the relief sought. District Plans throughout the country typically separate transport and infrastructure provisions into separate chapters. If this relief sought is approved, KiwiRail seeks to ensure that the introduction text, objectives, policies and methods are updated to keep the suite of provisions relating to the transport network together for accurate plan interpretation and implementation.	Amend
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.146	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that Table 1 - 6 in the Infrastructure chapter should be reviewed, amended and moved to the Transport chapter.	Seeks that Table 1 - 6 in the Infrastructure chapter be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.147	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	Considers that Figure 1 - 4 in the Infrastructure chapter should be reviewed, amended and moved to the Transport chapter.	Seeks that Figure 1 - 4 in the Infrastructure chapter be reviewed, amended and moved from the Infrastructure chapter to the Transport Chapter.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / New TR	Amend	The provision "Car sharing activities" has the same provision number (TR-R5) as TR-R5 "On-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring".	Amend the provision number and all references for "Car sharing activities" from TR-R5 to TR-R6.
Jill Ford	163.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-O1	Support	Supports TR-O1.4. as notified.	Retain TR-O1.4. (Purpose) as notified.
Patrick Wilkes	173.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-O1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain Objective TR-O1 (4) (New development provides appropriate on-site facilities for cycling and Micromobility users) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Peter Nunns	196.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Not specified	Considers that accommodating increased development within Wellington City's existing footprint will increase transport demand within the city and this will only be feasible if it is accompanied by a shift towards public and active transport.	Seeks that improved transport infrastructure and service provision is provided to support the shift towards public and active transport.
Stratum Management Limited	249.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Amend	Opposes the requirement of 1 bike parking space per residential unit in a city centre apartment is opposed. An amendment is sought to the objective to reflect that the cycle and micromobility parking requirement is proportionate to expected demand.	Amend TR-01 (Purpose) as follows: Land use and development is managed to ensure that: ... 4. New development provides for appropriate on-site facilities for cycling and micromobility users <u>to meet expected demand</u> ; and ...
Richard Hovey	FS60.2	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Oppose	Oppose the submissions from Stratum Management Limited on the basis that while developers may enjoy the cost reduction benefits that the removal of the requirement to provide car parks has brought they cannot simply privatise that gain and expect some sort of external transport storage solution to be provided for the residents of their developments. People in urban environments should have a choice of transport and bikes/e-bikes/e-scooters are a perfect match for everyday urban transport needs. They contribute to a healthier, happier and more appealing city. Developers should celebrate how much less space is required to facilitate bicycle storage than private motor vehicles and provide a reasonable level of space and facility for this purpose. While it may be presented simply as a 'cost' which some people may not wish to pay it should be seen as part of the investment in better residential development which will either be valued by those living there or rented out to others (in exactly the way car parks are).	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission arguing against a good level of bicycle storage being required for residential developments is disallowed.
Cycling Action Network	FS99.2	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Oppose	A minimum of 1 cycle park per residential unit should be required. The requirements for cycle and micromobility storage/parking is fundamental to achieve the mode shift required to achieve net zero carbon emissions, and has associated health and equity benefits. This is consistent with WCC's Te Atakura and mode shift goals.	Disallow / Seeks that a minimum of 1 cycle park per residential unit should be required.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Support	TR-01 is supported as it seeks to provide for a range of modes within the transport network, including requiring new development to provide facilities for cycling.	Retain the Objective TR-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Bruce Crothers	319.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Support	Supports TR-01 (4) with respect to the requirement for new development to provide on-site facilities for cycling and micromobility users.	Retains TR-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Joan Fitzgerald	323.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Support	Supports the Objective TR-01, especially subclause 4: New development provides appropriate on-site facilities for cycling and micromobility users;	Retain Objective TR-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Support	Support	Retain TR-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Oppose in part	Considers that the reference to 'effective' on-site parking is no longer considered relevant in light of the NPSUD direction to remove carparking minimums.	Opposes TR-01 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.44	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-01	Amend	Considers that the reference to 'effective' on-site parking is no longer relevant in light of the NPSUD direction to remove carparking minimums.	Amend TR-01 (Purpose) to replace the reference to 'effective on-site parking' to 'safe and functional on-site parking'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.157	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-O1	Support in part	Support this objective as it provides for the management on land use activities and development on the transport network.	Retain Objective TR-O1 (Purpose) with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.158	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-O1	Amend	Support this objective as it provides for the management on land use activities and development on the transport network.	Amend Objective TR-O1 (Purpose) as follows: ... <u>6. The proposal leads to a reduced reliance on fossil fuels over time</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-O1	Support	Provision for a range of transport modes, and reduced reliance on private vehicle use is important for the city both to achieve its carbon reduction targets, reduce congestion and improve the liveability of the city.	Retain TR-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-O1	Support in part	Supports TR-O1 in part, as it promotes an efficient and integrated transport network for the district that encourages mode shift.	Retain TR-O1 (Purpose), with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-O1	Amend	Seeks that TR-O1 be amended to ensure it reflects the NPS-UD which removed the minimum standards for on-site parking except for accessible spaces in District Plans for Tier 1 territorial authorities.	Amend TR-O1 (Purpose) as follows: Land use and development is managed to ensure that: ... <u>5. Safe and effective on-site accessible parking, loading, access and manoeuvring is provided.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.89	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-O1	Support	Supports policy that seeks to ensure the safety and effectiveness of the transport is not compromised by high trip generated activities, and that development provides safe and effective access and maneuvering.	Retain TR-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	Supports TR-P1 in its entirety.	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as notified.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	TR-P1 is supported as it seeks to provide for a range of modes within the transport network, including requiring new development to provide facilities for cycling.	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.14	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	Support	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.45	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support in part	Considers regulation of trip generation should be based on peak hour movements, not daily movements, as those determine capacity. Supports TR-P1 and its provision for high vehicle trip generating activities where they safely and effectively integrate with the transport network and provide for pedestrian and public transport modes. However, considers that due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, the TR-P1's requirement to provide for cycling and micromobility transport modes at the same rate as other residential activities is not practicable in the retirement village setting. Further, considers that the policy should recognise that trip generation from a site is an anticipated component of development and the focus of regulation should be on higher than anticipated trip generation.	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.46	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Amend	Considers regulation of trip generation should be based on peak hour movements, not daily movements, as those determine capacity. Supports TR-P1 and its provision for high vehicle trip generating activities where they safely and effectively integrate with the transport network and provide for pedestrian and public transport modes. However, considers that due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, the TR-P1's requirement to provide for cycling and micromobility transport modes at the same rate as other residential activities is not practicable in the retirement village setting. Further, considers that the policy should recognise that trip generation from a site is an anticipated component of development and the focus of regulation should be on higher than anticipated trip generation.	Amend TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as follows: Provide for high vehicle trip generating activities where they: 1. Safely and effectively integrate with the transport network, including planned network upgrades and service improvements; and 2. Provide for pedestrian, cycling, micromobility and public transport modes <u>at an appropriate scale to the nature of the high vehicle trip generating activity ; and</u> <u>3. Enable development that generates the same or less traffic than anticipated by the site zoning.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.47	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Oppose in part	Considers regulation of trip generation should be based on peak hour movements, not daily movements, as those determine capacity. Supports TR-P1 and its provision for high vehicle trip generating activities where they safely and effectively integrate with the transport network and provide for pedestrian and public transport modes. However, considers that due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, theTR-P1's requirement to provide for cycling and micromobility transport modes at the same rate as other residential activities is not practicable in the retirement village setting. Further, considers that the policy should recognise that trip generation from a site is an anticipated component of development and the focus of regulation should be on higher than anticipated trip generation.	Opposes TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Amend	Considers regulation of trip generation should be based on peak hour movements, not daily movements, as those determine capacity. Supports TR-P1 and its provision for high vehicle trip generating activities where they safely and effectively integrate with the transport network and provide for pedestrian and public transport modes. However, considers that due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, theTR-P1's requirement to provide for cycling and micromobility transport modes at the same rate as other residential activities is not practicable in the retirement village setting. Further, considers that the policy should recognise that trip generation from a site is an anticipated component of development and the focus of regulation should be on higher than anticipated trip generation.	Amend TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as follows: Provide for high vehicle trip generating activities where they: 1. Safely and effectively integrate with the transport network, including planned network upgrades and service improvements; and 2. Provide for pedestrian, cycling, micromobility and public transport modes <u>at an appropriate scale to the nature of the high vehicle trip generating activity ; and</u> 3. Enable development that generates the same or less traffic than anticipated by the site zoning.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.110	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support in part	Supports Policy TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development)	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development), subject to amendments.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.63	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on Ryman's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), Ryman considers that these various provisions should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Ryman seek that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from the changes sought, and granting the relief sought by Ryman in relation to TR-P1.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.63	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on Ryman's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), Ryman considers that these various provisions should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Ryman seek that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from the changes sought, and granting the relief sought by Ryman in relation to TR-P1.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.111	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically Policy CC.2. Proposed policy TR-P1 should be amended to ensure private vehicle use is minimised and active and public transport modes are maximised. The policy wording should be stronger than simply providing for these alternative modes. To have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.10, any high trip generating (as per TR-S1) activity or freight distribution activity should be required to provide a travel demand management plan and this be assessed as part of the consent process. Freight distribution activities should also be located where efficient freight movements can minimise greenhouse gas emission. Considers the requirement to provide a travel demand management plan should extend to activities associated with subdivision, larger commercial developments where they may not trigger non-compliance with the vehicle trip generation activity rule.	Seeks to amend TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as follows: Provide for high vehicle trip generating activities where they: 1. Safely and effectively integrate with the transport network, including planned network upgrades and service improvements; and <u>2a. Enable reductions in greenhouse gas emissions by locating activities with significant freight servicing requirements in proximity to efficient transport networks;</u> 2. Provide for <u>Enable the uptake of</u> pedestrian, cycling, micro-mobility and public transport modes; <u>and</u> 3. <u>Avoid or mitigate adverse effects through the implementation of a travel demand management plan where vehicle trip generation thresholds in TR-S1 are exceeded, which identifies measures to reduce travel demand, including reducing the number of vehicle trips, offering travel choices, and influencing modes</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.15	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendments which seek for the inclusion and requirement of a travel demand management plan in the District Plan	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.11	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	It is vital to consider potential efficiencies from land use transport integration in plan making. A travel demand management plan is a useful tool to mitigate the effects of high trip-generating activities.	Allow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.16	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Oppose	Stride is opposed to extending the requirement to provide a travel demand management plan as this has the potential to create additional administrative costs and unnecessary delays.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.16	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Oppose	Investore is opposed to extending the requirement to provide a travel demand management plan as this has the potential to create additional administrative costs and unnecessary delays.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.64	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on the RVA's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), the RVA considers that this provision should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / The RVA seeks that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this policy.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.64	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on Ryman's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), Ryman considers that these various provisions should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Ryman seek that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from the changes sought, and granting the relief sought by Ryman in relation to TR-P1.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Amend	Considers that the current thresholds for requiring restricted discretionary consent to infringe Rule TR-R2 will result in all new supermarkets requiring consent and the provision of an ITA. The matters of discretion refer only to Policy TR-P1 for consideration. Supermarkets will infringe the 8 per week heavy vehicle trip number by virtue of their general operation. The proposed amendment to Policy TR-P1 seeks to recognise that high vehicle trip generating activities should not be penalised when there are genuine functional and operational requirements for being considered a 'high vehicle trip generating activity'. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as follows: Provide for high vehicle trip generating activities where they: 1. Safely and effectively integrate with the transport network, including planned network upgrades and service improvements; and 2. Provide for pedestrian, cycling, micromobility and public transport modes; and 3. <u>Demonstrate functional and operational requirements commensurate with high vehicle trip generation.</u>
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	Stride supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. It is important to recognise that supermarkets and other large-format retail activities have functional requirements for generating high vehicle trips.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.7	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	Investore supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. It is important to recognise that supermarkets and other large-format retail activities have functional requirements for generating high vehicle trips.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.159	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	Support this policy as it protects the transport network and manage activities that do not meet standards.	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.48	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	This policy gives an important signal to traffic-generating activities to provide for multiple modes, which is necessary to achieve carbon reduction targets, reduce congestion and improve the liveability of the city	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.148	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	TR-P1 is generally supported.	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.33	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	Supports TR-P1 as it promotes the safe and efficient operation of the integrated transport network and provides for the safe and effective integration of high vehicle trip generating activities.	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.190	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Oppose	Opposes TR-P1. [See paragraphs 4.107 to 4.108 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.191	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Amend	Opposes TR-P1. [See paragraphs 4.107 to 4.108 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) is amended to exclude Airport Zone.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.90	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P1	Support	Supports that high trip generating use and on-site transportation facilities and driveways are required to be provided in a manner which does not compromise the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain TR-P1 (High trip generating use and development) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Support	Supports TR-P2 in its entirety.	Retain TR-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Support	Supports TR-P2 insofar as this seeks to enable on-site transport facilities and driveways that provide for the safe and effective use of the site and functioning of the transport network.	Retain TR-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Support	TR-P2 is supported as it seeks to provide for a range of modes within the transport network, including requiring new development to provide facilities for cycling.	Retain TR-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Support	Support	Retain TR-P2 (Enabled Activities) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Oppose in part	Considers that the reference to 'effective' on-site parking is no longer relevant in light of the NPSUD direction to remove carparking minimums.	Opposes TR-P2 (Enabled activities) and seeks amendment to refer to 'safe and functional on-site parking' only.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Amend	Considers that the reference to 'effective' on-site parking is no longer relevant in light of the NPSUD direction to remove carparking minimums.	Amend TR-P2 (Enabled activities) to refer to 'safe and functional on-site parking' only.
Waka Kotahi	370.160	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Amend	Considers that direct access onto the state highway has the potential to cause significant traffic and safety effects. Policy direction should reflect this by qualifying the enabled activities	Amend TR-P3 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable on-site transport facilities and driveways that: 1. Provide for the safe and effective use of the site and functioning of the transport network; 2. Meet the reasonable demands of site users; and 3. Promote the uptake and use of pedestrian, cycling, micromobility and public transport modes.; and 4. <u>Do not compromise the safe and efficient function of the state highway network.</u>
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.25	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the policy to require development to take into account the safety and efficiency of the state highway network. This is unnecessary in light of the existing measures to enable the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including designations, and it would be inappropriate.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.25	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the policy to require development to take into account the safety and efficiency of the state highway network. This is unnecessary in light of the existing measures to enable the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including designations, and it would be inappropriate.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.49	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Support	This policy gives an important signal to traffic-generating activities to provide for multiple modes, which is necessary to achieve carbon reduction targets, reduce congestion and improve the liveability of the city	Retain TR-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.149	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Support	TR-P2 is generally supported.	Retain TR-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.91	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Support	Supports that high trip generating use and on-site transportation facilities and driveways are required to be provided in a manner which does not compromise the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain TR-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P2	Amend	Considers that while everyone can walk (or use a wheelchair) not all people can use scooter and similar devices. Walking is also a far safer mode.	Clarify TR-P2.3. (Enabled activities) so that it promotes those modes that include physical activity. [Inferred decision requested]
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Support	Supports TR-P3 in its entirety.	Retain TR-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Amend	Following on from the change sought to Objective TR-O1 (Purpose), an equivalent change is proposed to TR-P3 (Managed activities).	Amend TR-P3 (Managed activities) as follows: Only allow on-site transport facilities and driveways that do not meet standards where: ... 4. The projected demand for loading spaces or cycling and micromobility parking will be lower than that required in the standards or can be accommodated by public, shared or reciprocal arrangements; ...
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Support	Supports TR-P2 insofar as this seeks to enable on-site transport facilities and driveways that provide for the safe and effective use of the site and functioning of the transport network, but requests amendment so that the policy refers to the appropriate firefighting standards.	Retain TR-P3 (Managed activities) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Amend	Supports TR-P2 insofar as this seeks to enable on-site transport facilities and driveways that provide for the safe and effective use of the site and functioning of the transport network, but requests amendment so that the policy refers to the appropriate firefighting standards.	Amend TR-P3 (Managed activities) as follows: ... 5. Safe and effective access for firefighting purposes is provided; and 6. There are site and topographical constraints that make compliance unreasonable; and 7. <u>Safe and effective access for firefighting is provided in accordance with NZS 4404: 2010 and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509: 2008.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.35	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.35	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Support	TR-P3 is supported as it seeks to provide for a range of modes within the transport network, including requiring new development to provide facilities for cycling.	Retain TR-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.16	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Support	Support	Retain TR-P3 (Managed Activities) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Oppose in part	Support TR-P3's acknowledgement that there are some instances where 'the projected demand for loading spaces or cycling and micromobility parking will be lower than that required in the standards'. However, considers the requirement for parking to be 'effective' in meeting the needs of the activity on-site is no longer considered appropriate in light of the NPSUD direction to remove carparking minimums. Also opposes (5) referring to safe and effective access for firefighting purposes as this matter is regulated under the Building Act.	Opposes TR-P3 (Managed activities) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	FS14.2	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Oppose	Fire and Emergency acknowledge that the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC) C5 specifies access and safety requirements for firefighting operations, where certain buildings must be designed and constructed so that there is a low probability of firefighters or other emergency services personnel being delayed or impeded from assisting in rescue operations and performing firefighting operations. Buildings must also be designed and constructed so that there is a low probability of illness or injury to firefighters or other emergency services personnel during rescue and firefighting operations. Of particular note, a performance requirement of C5 is that buildings must be provided with access for fire service vehicles to a hard-standing from which there is an unobstructed path to the building within 20m of the firefighter access into the building and the inlets to automatic fire sprinkler systems or fire hydrant systems, where these are installed (among other requirements). These performance requirements do however not apply to detached dwellings, within household units in multi-unit dwellings, or to outbuildings and ancillary buildings. Fire and Emergency are concerned that where pedestrian only access developments are sought, these will not be adequate for responders to efficiently access properties in the event of a fire or emergency or to use tools, equipment and appliances effectively, where required. This has the potential to significantly increase the risk to life and property. Until such time as there is a review of the NZBC to 'catch up' with the changing urban environment, Fire and Emergency consider that the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) needs to address this matter up front in order to manage the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, and for their health and safety in accordance with Section 5 of the RMA.	Disallow / Seeks that point 5, 'safe and effective access for firefighting purposes is provided' within TR-P3 is retained to support effective and efficient access and manoeuvring of crew and equipment for firefighting and emergency responses.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Amend	Support TR-P3's acknowledgement that there are some instances where 'the projected demand for loading spaces or cycling and micromobility parking will be lower than that required in the standards'. However, considers the requirement for parking to be 'effective' in meeting the needs of the activity on-site is no longer considered appropriate in light of the NPSUD direction to remove carparking minimums. Also opposes (5) referring to safe and effective access for firefighting purposes as this matter is regulated under the Building Act.	Amend TR-P3 (Managed activities) as follows: Only allow on-site transport facilities and driveways that do not meet standards where: 1. The transport facilities and driveways are effective safe and functional in meeting the operational needs and functional needs of the activity on the site; 2. The safety and effectiveness of the transport network is not compromised; 3. Public health and safety, including the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and micromobility users travelling through any parking areas, is not compromised; 4. The projected demand for loading spaces or cycling and micromobility parking will be lower than that required in the standards or can be accommodated by public, shared or reciprocal arrangements; <u>and</u> 5. Safe and effective access for firefighting purposes is provided; and 6.5. There are site and topographical constraints that make compliance unreasonable.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.112	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Support in part	Supports the management of activities that do not meet standards provided that the use of low or zero carbon, active or public transport modes are maximised, to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.2.	Retain TR-P3 (Managed activities), subject to amendments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.113	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Amend	Considers that Policy TR-P3 should be amended to include recognition of this and it be assessed in consent applications in restricted activity rules.	Amend TR-P3 (Managed activities) to allow activities that do not meet standards provided the use of low or zero carbon, active or public transport modes are maximised.
Waka Kotahi	370.161	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Support	Support this policy as it protects the transport network and manage activities that do not meet standards.	Retain TR-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.50	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Support	This policy provides for some flexibility within limits, and in light of Wellington's real geographic constraints is reasonable to include	Retain TR-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.92	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Support	Supports that high trip generating use and on-site transportation facilities and driveways are required to be provided in a manner which does not compromise the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain TR-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-P3	Amend	Considers that TR-P3 is unclear in its intent and what is trying to be achieved.	Clarify the intent of TR-P3 (Managed activities) and what it is trying to achieve.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R1	Support	Support	Retain TR-R1 (All activities except for trip generation, site access, on-site cycling and micromobility paths, and on-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R1	Oppose in part	Considers that TR-R1 covers all transport activities other than trip generation, site access, on-site cycling and micromobility paths, and on-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring.	Opposes TR-R1 (All activities except for trip generation, site access, on-site cycling and micromobility paths, and on-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R1	Amend	Considers that TR-R1 covers all transport activities other than trip generation, site access, on-site cycling and micromobility paths, and on-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring.	Amend TR-R1 (All activities except for trip generation, site access, on-site cycling and micromobility paths, and on-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i. TR-S2 (<u>not applicable to retirement villages</u>); ii. TR-S3 (<u>not applicable to retirement villages</u>); iii. TR-S8; and iv. TR-S9.
Ministry of Education	400.34	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R1	Support	Support TR-R1 as it promotes the safe and efficient use of the site and provides for alternative and public modes of transport outlined in standards TR-S2 and TR-S3.	Retain TR-R1 (All activities except for trip generation, site access, on-site cycling and micromobility paths, and on-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.192	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R1	Support	Supports TR-R1. Supports and provide opportunities for the use of alternative modes of transport to and from Wellington Airport. However, due to the characteristics of passengers (i.e. typically carrying luggage), the uptake of pedestrian, cycling and micromobility transportation is and will likely continue to be much lower than alternative vehicular options such as private car, taxi or bus in the Airport Zone. Supports the exclusion of the Airport Zone from Table TR-7, and thus TR-S2, TR-S3 not being relevant to the Airport Zone.	Retain TR-R1 (All activities except for trip generation, on site cycling and micro-mobility paths and on-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Amend	Oppose. Despite claiming to apply a threshold based on vehicle trip generation (rather than activity type), Rule TR-R2 has identified drive-through restaurant activities as requiring resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity in every instance. There are many other commercial activities that are equally reliant on private vehicle movements but are not subject to the same requirement to obtain a resource consent for trip generation in every instance, regardless of the actual trip generation characteristics of the activity.	Amend TR-R2 (Trip generation) as follows: TR-R2 Trip generation 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with TR-S1 is achieved; and b. The activity is not: i. a service station; or ii. a drive through activity.
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.1	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports this submission to remove the requirement for a resource consent due to trip generation of a drive-through activity. Many other activities rely on private vehicles and it is not appropriate to single out two land use activities while applying a threshold to others.	Allow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Support	Considers that retirement villages should not be regulated by the high vehicle trip generating classification of the District Plan in the same way as other activities. Acknowledges that resource consent for trip generation as a restricted discretionary activity under TR-R2 is appropriate, and an accompanying Integrated Transport Assessment in the typical scenario. The matters of discretion for high trip generating activities under TR-R2 are the matters in TR-P1. Overall, considers that TR-P1 needs amending to acknowledge that not all high trip generating activities have the same pedestrian, cycling, micromobility and public transport needs and recognise that trip generation from a site is an anticipated component of development and the focus of regulation should be on higher than anticipated trip generation.	Retain TR-R2 (Trip generation) and seeks amendment to either: exclude 'retirement villages' from the policy; or to ensure the different trip generation characteristics of retirement villages are considered appropriately.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Amend	Considers that retirement villages should not be regulated by the high vehicle trip generating classification of the District Plan in the same way as other activities. Acknowledges that resource consent for trip generation as a restricted discretionary activity under TR-R2 is appropriate, and an accompanying Integrated Transport Assessment in the typical scenario. The matters of discretion for high trip generating activities under TR-R2 are the matters in TR-P1. Overall, considers that TR-P1 needs amending to acknowledge that not all high trip generating activities have the same pedestrian, cycling, micromobility and public transport needs and recognise that trip generation from a site is an anticipated component of development and the focus of regulation should be on higher than anticipated trip generation.	Retain TR-R2 (Trip generation) and seeks amendment to either: exclude 'retirement villages' from the policy; or to ensure the different trip generation characteristics of retirement villages are considered appropriately.
Z Energy Limited	361.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Amend	Rule TR-R2 (Trip Generation) is unclear and should be clarified. The provision permits activities where the activity is not a service station (TR-R2.1(b)(i)). where compliance with Rule TR-R2.1 cannot be achieved, restricted discretionary consent is required. Rule TR-R2.1(b)(i) should be clarified on whether it relates to changes to existing operations, maintenance and upgrades of existing service stations. It is not considered appropriate to require resource consent for trip generation purposes for changes to existing operations, in particular where operations, maintenance and upgrades will not change the number of trips generated to / from an existing activity [submitter is neutral on provision [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend TR-R2 (Trip Generation) as follows: All zones 1. Permitted Where: a. Compliance with TR-S1 is achieved; and b. The activity is not: i. A <u>new</u> service station; or ii. A drive-through activity
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.12	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Oppose	Service stations are, by their nature, high trip-generating activities and lead to many cars crossing over the footpath to the adjacent land. Where a site is being upgraded, the site may be reconfigured and accesses moved. It would be appropriate to consider effects on other road-users and neighbouring sites from such a change	Disallow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.73	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Support in part	TR-R2 is supported but clarity and/or relief is sought in relation to Rule TR-R2 (Trip Generation).	Retain TR-R2 (Trip generation) with amendment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.74	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Amend	Considers that TR-S2 should be amended to clarify whether Rule TR-R2.1(b)(i) relates to changes to existing operations, maintenance and upgrades of existing service stations. where compliance with Rule TR-R2.1 cannot be achieved, restricted discretionary consent is required. It is not considered appropriate to require resource consent for trip generation purposes for changes to existing operations, in particular where operations, maintenance and upgrades will not materially change vehicle movements to / from an existing lawful activity. It is considered that sub-standard TR-R2.1(b)(i) need only apply to new service stations.	Amend TR-R2 (Trip generation) as follows: All Zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with TR-S1 is achieved; and b. The activity is not: i. A <u>new</u> service station; or ii. A drive-through activity
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.51	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Support	This rule gives an important signal to traffic-generating activities to provide for multiple modes, which is necessary to achieve carbon reduction targets, reduce congestion and improve the liveability of the city	Retain TR-R2 (Trip generation) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.35	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Support	Supports TR-R2 as it permits trip generation where the activity complies with the thresholds outlined in standard TR-S1. The submitter supports the activity flow to Restricted Discretionary where the permitted trip generation thresholds are exceeded. The Ministry considers these thresholds as well as the requirement to undertake an Integrated Transport Assessment (where thresholds are exceeded) to be reasonable. This will help provide for the safe and efficient function of the transport network for Educational Facilities [see original submission for full reason]	Retain TR-R2 (Trip generation) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.193	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Oppose	Opposes TR-P2. [See paragraphs 4.107 to 4.108 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes TR-R2 (Trip Generation) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.194	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R2	Amend	Opposes TR-P2. [See paragraphs 4.107 to 4.108 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that TR-R2 (Trip Generation) is amended to exclude Airport Zone.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R3	Support in part	Notes that Table 9 sets out minimum unhindered vehicle access widths and maximum gradients. The minimum widths and maximum gradients for Driveway Levels 1 and 2 (in part) would not be sufficient for fire appliances. A fire appliance requires, as a minimum, access which is 4m in width and 4min height clearance, with a maximum gradient of 15% (and accompanying transition ramps). Driveways classified under Levels 1 and 2 are access roads which could accommodate up to 60 light vehicle movements per day or four heavy vehicle movements per week and could therefore cater for a range of uses including multiple residential and non-residential units. Table 9 states that passing bays will need to be provided at a maximum spacing of 50m along driveways confirming that driveways in excess of 50m would be required to meet these standards. Typically, buildings more than 50m away from legal roads require site access to be designed to meet the Code of Practice to ensure fire appliances can access a fire. The proposed rules do not guarantee that adequate site access will be achieved via new driveways to access buildings that are in excess of 50m from the nearest legal road with an unhindered vehicular access width of 4m or more. Considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers. This would conflict with Policy TR-P3 which seeks to provide for safe and effective access for fighting purposes. Requests that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road be constructed to provide access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. Furthermore, in circumstances where the activity status would be restricted discretionary, matters of discretion are limited to matters in TR-P2. This would not require consideration as to whether safe and effective access for firefighting purposes is provided. At present, there does not appear to be a matter of discretion which links back to this consideration, currently contained within Policy TR-P3. In order for schemes to accord with the policy aims of TR-P3 in full, it is considered that both permitted activities and those requiring resource consent much ensure safe and effective access for firefighting purposes.	Supports TR-R3 (Site access) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R3	Amend	Notes that Table 9 sets out minimum unhindered vehicle access widths and maximum gradients. The minimum widths and maximum gradients for Driveway Levels 1 and 2 (in part) would not be sufficient for fire appliances. A fire appliance requires, as a minimum, access which is 4m in width and 4min height clearance, with a maximum gradient of 15% (and accompanying transition ramps). Driveways classified under Levels 1 and 2 are access roads which could accommodate up to 60 light vehicle movements per day or four heavy vehicle movements per week and could therefore cater for a range of uses including multiple residential and non-residential units. Table 9 states that passing bays will need to be provided at a maximum spacing of 50m along driveways confirming that driveways in excess of 50m would be required to meet these standards. Typically, buildings more than 50m away from legal roads require site access to be designed to meet the Code of Practice to ensure fire appliances can access a fire. The proposed rules do not guarantee that adequate site access will be achieved via new driveways to access buildings that are in excess of 50m from the nearest legal road with an unhindered vehicular access width of 4m or more. Considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers. This would conflict with Policy TR-P3 which seeks to provide for safe and effective access for fighting purposes. Requests that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road be constructed to provide access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. Furthermore, in circumstances where the activity status would be restricted discretionary, matters of discretion are limited to matters in TR-P2. This would not require consideration as to whether safe and effective access for firefighting purposes is provided. At present, there does not appear to be a matter of discretion which links back to this consideration, currently contained within Policy TR-P3. In order for schemes to accord with the policy aims of TR-P3 in full, it is considered that both permitted activities and those requiring resource consent much ensure safe and effective access for firefighting purposes.	Amend TR-R3 (Site access) as follows: Matters of discretion: ... <u>2. The matters in TR-P3.</u>
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.17	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R3	Amend	Considers that TR-R3 should be amended to require compliance with INF-S16. It is noted that: Table 8- TR sets out the vehicle movements each category of driveway allows for level 1 - up to 30 light/day + up to 2 heavy/week, level 2 - 31-60 light/day + 3-4 heavy/week, level 3 - 61-200 light/day + 5-6 heavy/week. Table 9- TR sets out the design requirements for each of the categories. However, neither here nor in the introductory 'other relevant district plan provisions' section is there a mention of Infrastructure as a relevant section, nor of the INF-S16 standard. Among other things, INF-S16 states (at 1) there is a maximum of 1 vehicle crossing per site, the where the site fronts more than 1 road the crossing must be to the less used road(at 6) and gives minimum distances from intersections (at 7 & referring to figure 2-INF).	Amend TR-R3.1 (Site access) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a) compliance with <u>INF-S16</u> , TR-S5 and TR-S6 is achieved and b) the access is not to a state highway.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.13	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R3	Support	For the plan to be clear, there should be a link between TR-R3 and INF-S16.	Allow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R3	Support	Support	Retain TR-R3 (Site access) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R3	Amend	Considers the notification status for this rule should preclude both public and limited notification.	Amend TR-R3 (Site access) to: Notification status: An application under Rule TR-R3 is precluded from being <u>either</u> publicly <u>or</u> limited notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.20	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R4	Support	Support	Retain TR-R4 (On-site cycling and micromobility paths) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.52	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R4	Support	This rule will help support provision for multiple modes, which is necessary to achieve carbon reduction targets, reduce congestion, improve the liveability of the city and redress the current imbalance favouring the private vehicle transport mode	Retain TR-R4 (On-site cycling and micromobility paths) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.36	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R4	Support	Supports TR-R4 as promotes the safe and efficient use of the site and provides for alternative and public modes of transport.	Retain TR-R4 (On-site cycling and micromobility paths) as notified.
McDonald's	274.5	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Support	Supports no minimum or maximum on-site vehicle parking requirements. Also supports the preclusion of public notification of an infringement.	Retain TR-R5 (On-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring), subject to amendment to fix typo as outlined in the submission point below.
McDonald's	274.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Amend	Supports the preclusion of public notification of an infringement to TR-R5 but notes that the rule incorrectly references TR-R4.	Seek that TR-R5 (On-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring is amended as follows: Notification status: An application under Rule TR-R4 TR-R5 is precluded from being publicly notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.21	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Support	Support	Retain TR-R5 (On-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.34	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Support	Submission point 349.21 partly supports FSNI submission points 476.8 - 476.10, however FSNI seeks some amendments.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Waka Kotahi	370.162	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Amend	Notes that there are two TR-R5s but are slightly different activities.	Seeks to correct the double TR-R5 in the Transport chapter.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.53	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Support	This rule will support reduced private vehicle ownership, and more efficient use of vehicles by vehicles able to be shared: this will help meet carbon reduction targets, reduce congestion, reduce 'parking clutter' in residential areas, and widen the transport choices available to Wellingtonians.	Retain TR-R5 (On-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Amend	Considers the notification status for this rule should preclude both public and limited notification.	Amend TR-R5 (On-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) to: Notification status: An application under Rule TR-R4 TR-R5 is precluded from being <u>either publicly or limited</u> notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Support	Supports that TR-R5 has no minimum or maximum on-site vehicle parking requirements and precludes of public notification of an infringement to TR-R5.	Retain TR-R5 (On-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) as notified, with amendments.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.9	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Amend	Supports that TR-R5 has the preclusion of public notification of an infringement to TR-R5. Notes that the provision incorrectly references TR-R4 instead of TR-R5.	Amend TR-R5 (On-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring) as follows: ... Notification status: An application under Rule TR-R4 TR-R5 is precluded from being publicly notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.10	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-R5	Support in part	The provision "Car sharing activities" has the same provision number (TR-R5) as TR-R5 "On-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring".	Retain TR-R5 (Car sharing activities) with amendment.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.18	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Amend	Considers that TR-1 should mention garages and reduce the amount of light vehicles considered to be associated with residential activity. 10 light vehicles seems a high, and not consistent with the methodology set out at b. and c. Allowing for different levels of use at weekdays and weekends, an average of 6 seems more likely, particularly considering efforts elsewhere in the plan to provide alternatives to private vehicle use.	Amend TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation) as follows: ... For the purpose of the above assessment : a. An on-site carpark <u>or garage</u> associated with a residential activity is considered to generate <u>6</u> 10 light vehicle movements per day;

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.22	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Amend	<p>Oppose.</p> <p>Considers that thresholds contained within Standard TR-S1 are too low. There are many activities that will have insignificant effects on the transport network that generate 200 or more light vehicle trips per day and Standard TR-S1 will lead to too many developments requiring resource consents in respect of this matter.</p> <p>Considers that an increase the thresholds to reflect a development of 100 light vehicles per hour. In Restaurant Brands' opinion, that is a more appropriate intensity of traffic effects to require a specific assessment of traffic capacity and safety.</p>	<p>Amend TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activities must not exceed <u>100 vehicle movements per hour</u>. the following maximum vehicle movement thresholds:</p> <p>[delete table in its entirety]</p> <p>For the purpose of the above assessment:</p> <p>a. ...</p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, it is not practicable to apply TR-S2 and the cycling and micromobility parking requirements to retirement villages at the same rate as it is applied to other residential activities.	Opposes content within Table 7 that is cross referenced in TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation). See amendment sought to Table 7 in the specific submission point.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.58	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Amend	Considers that due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, it is not practicable to apply TR-S2 and the cycling and micromobility parking requirements to retirement villages at the same rate as it is applied to other residential activities.	Seeks to amend content within Table 7 that is cross referenced in the standard. See amendment sought to Table 7 in the specific submission point.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.31	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Amend	Considers that thresholds in TR-S1 are unnecessarily low, onerous and complex and should be amended. The proposed thresholds are very low and lack any nuance in terms of activities and zones and it is considered that the resulting consenting requirements would be that for almost all activities within commercial zones an ITA would be required with an assessment against a baseline of only 200 light vehicle movements per day and eight heavy vehicle movements per week. Most large commercial activities will be required to prepare an ITA irrespective of if the activity is already contemplated in the PDP. A GFA approach is simpler, has more nuance, has been in practice in the Auckland Unitary Plan for over four years and is widely accepted.	Amend TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation) as shown in original submission (page 59).
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Support	Stride supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.8	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Support	Investore supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow
Woolworths New Zealand	359.32	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Support in part	The restricted discretionary activity status of infringing TR-S1 is supported, as well as the incorporated reference to the ITA being prepared in accordance with The Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency guidelines ("Research Report 422: Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines, November 2010").	Retain the Restricted Discretionary activity status in TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation) as notified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Support	Stride supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.9	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Support	Investore supports this submission point for the reasons provided by the primary submitter.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.163	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Oppose	Consider 200 vehicles per day to be a high number for any activity within the district plan. It was not clear from the support documents where this number has come from. Waka Kotahi seeks to work with Council to determine appropriate thresholds for specific activities accessing both the state highway and local roads	Seeks to Amend TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation) to institute a threshold of 100 car equivalent vehicle movements per day where a proposal accesses the state highway, and lower thresholds where the safety of the transport network warrants it. Note – car equivalent movements are defined as (as noted in the New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 1 – Glossary): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 car to and from the property = 2 equivalent car movements • 1 truck to and from property = 6 equivalent car movements • 1 truck and trailer to and from property = 10 equivalent car movements
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.17	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes any reduction in the vehicle trip generation threshold.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.26	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Oppose	Stride is opposed to applying a lower threshold for vehicle trip generation and associated transport assessments as this is inappropriate and will impose additional, unreasonable costs on smaller scale development.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.26	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Oppose	Investore is opposed to applying a lower threshold for vehicle trip generation and associated transport assessments as this is inappropriate and will impose additional, unreasonable costs on smaller scale development.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.150	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Support in part	TR-S1 is partially supported and various amendments are sought.	Retain TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.151	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Amend	Considers that TR-S1 should be amended to clarify the evidential basis for the assessment criteria.	Amend TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation) to clarify the evidential basis of the assessment criteria. Increase the light vehicle threshold as follows: 1. Activities must not exceed the following maximum vehicle movement thresholds: Type of vehicle Light 200 500 per day Heavy 8 per week ...
Ministry of Education	400.37	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S1	Support	Supports TR-S1 as it aims to identify and manage high trip generating activities to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the integrated transport network.	Retain TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation) as notified.
Amos Mann	172.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S2	Support	Supports the bicycle and micro-mobility device parking requirements for commercial and community facilities in the Centres and Mixed Use zones.	Retain TR-S2 (Micromobility device parking) as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S2	Support in part	TR-S2 is partially supported, but it is unclear whether it also applies to cycles, as the heading only refers to micromobility.	Retain TR-S2 (Micromobility device parking) with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S2	Amend	Considers that TR-S2 is unclear on whether it also applies to cycles, as the heading only refers to micromobility.	Amend the title of TR-S2 (Micromobility device parking) as follows: <u>Cycle and</u> Micromobility device parking
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.23	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S2	Support	Support	Retain TR-S2 (Micromobility device parking) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.38	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S2	Support	Supports TR-S2 as it promotes the safe and efficient use of the site and provides for alternative and public modes of transport.	Retain TR-S2 (Micromobility device parking) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.195	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S2	Support	Supports TR-S2 not being relevant in the Airport Zone.	Retain TR-S2 (Micromobility device parking) as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.41	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S2	Amend	Considers that in the absence of good provisions for micromobility and cycle parking at places like big box retailers, they end up parked on the footpath, locked to handrails or trees etc.	Seeks that Table 7 - TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces is adjusted so that the number of parks provided is also related to the number of carparks provided, not just to the size of the building. There should be at least one for every carpark.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.14	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S2	Support	It is appropriate to also link the number of cycle parking spaces with the number of on-site car parks (or the numbers in TR-Table7, whichever is the greater). The cycle parking should also be located close to the building entrance.	Allow
Jill Ford	163.6	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support in part	Supports TR-S3 with a suggested improvement.	Amend TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) to improve the Micromobility parking design to the 90th percentile for current e-bikes and cargo bikes.
Jill Ford	163.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Considers that TR-S3 should be amended to improve the Micromobility parking design to the 90th percentile for current e-bikes and cargo bikes, as the 2019 Waka Kotahi technical note does not provide adequate guidance for all new residential developments, include manoeuvring and charging.	Amend TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) to improve the Micromobility parking design to the 90th percentile for current e-bikes and cargo bikes.
Patrick Wilkes	173.12	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain Standard TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) with amendment.
Patrick Wilkes	173.13	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Considers that micromobility parking design to 90%-ile for current e-bikes and cargo bikes, as the 2019 Waka Kotahi technical note does not provide adequate guidance for all new residential developments,	Amend Standard TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) with amendment to include requirements for manoeuvring and charging.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support in part	TR-S3 is partially supported, but it is unclear whether it also applies to cycles, as the heading only refers to micromobility.	Retain TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Considers that TR-S3 is unclear on whether it also applies to cycles, as the heading only refers to micromobility.	Amend the title of TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) as follows: <u>Cycle and Micromobility parking design</u>
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Considers that TR-S3 should be amended, as cycle dimensions are also not sufficient to accommodate cargo cycles and some spaces should be larger so that all ages and abilities are provided for.	Amend TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) so that dimensions are appropriate for cargo bike parking.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.15	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support	Bike parks should be designed to provide for extra-large bikes. Cargo bikes may well become more common as e-bike prices become more affordable.	Allow
Bruce Crothers	319.7	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support in part	Considers that micromobility parking design to 90%-ile is required for current e-bikes and cargo bikes, as the 2019 Waka Kotahi technical note does not provide adequate guidance for all new residential developments, include manoeuvring and charging.	Retain TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design), with amendment.
Bruce Crothers	319.8	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Considers that micromobility parking design to 90%-ile is required for current e-bikes and cargo bikes. Considers that the Council must take action to ensure a deliberation reduction on economic activity, less cars, less planes, energy consumption reductions by using less heating and cooling, less wasteful consumption and a return to values of the past that put humans above money as the 2019 Waka Kotahi technical note does not provide adequate guidance for all new residential developments, include manoeuvring and charging.	Amend TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design), with reference to the 90th percentile. [Inferred decision requested]
Joan Fitzgerald	323.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Joan Fitzgerald	323.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	TR-S3 should be improved to 90%-ile for current e-bikes and cargo bikes and should be amended to include manoeuvring and charging. The 2019 Waka Kotahi technical note does not provide adequate guidance for all new residential developments.	Amend TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) to include manoeuvring and charging, as well as reach 90th percentile for current e-bikes and cargo bike.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.1	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Supports specific mention of people with mobility impairments and vision impairments as an at-risk group in terms of safety in micromobility parking spaces as determined in TR-S3(d)(ii). However, considers that the clause can be strengthened and notes that anyone traversing within a pedestrian space is at risk of encountering a person using a micromobility vehicle unsafely in any space, and not just people with mobility and vision impairments. Considers that amendments are required to this clause to strengthen the requirement. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Amend TR-S3(d)(ii) (Micromobility parking design) as follows: 1. Where short stay cycling and micromobility parking spaces are required to be provided by TR-S2 they must meet the following minimum specifications: ... d. Cycling and Micromobility parking facilities must be located: ... ii. So they do not impede pedestrian thoroughfares; <u>this will provide enhanced safety for all pedestrians, and this includes for at risk groups in terms of, for example, pedestrians with mobility and vision impairments, and children, etc. including areas used by people whose mobility or vision is restricted.</u> [Inferred decision requested]
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.18	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support	Support clarifying that micromobility use and parking do not impede pedestrian space and preferably are located off footpaths and other pedestrian public spaces.	Allow
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.2	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Considers that TR-S3 currently does not make any reference to licensing conditions to operate under trading bylaws and that there should be direct links made. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Seeks to amend TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) to link to relevant trading bylaws relating to micromobility vehicle trading and hiring. [Inferred decision requested]
Living Streets Aotearoa	FS130.19	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support	Support clarifying that micromobility use and parking do not impede pedestrian space and preferably are located off footpaths and other pedestrian public spaces.	Allow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.24	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support	Support	Retain TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.114	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Considers it is not clear whether the needs of increasing uptake of e-bikes, including cargo and multipassenger e-bikes have been provided for in the standards. E.g. sufficient dimensions for longer/wider e-bikes and electric charging points as per TR-S7 2 (d) relating to design requirements for on-site car parking spaces. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are CC.1 and CC.3.	Amend TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) to include provision for e-bikes in standards, including a requirement for charging stations.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.17	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Oppose	While Stride supports providing for micromobility, we consider that it is unnecessary to include specific requirements around e-bikes. These provisions are insufficiently flexible and are likely to become irrelevant as technology changes.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.17	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Oppose	While Investore supports providing for micromobility, we consider that it is unnecessary to include specific requirements around e-bikes. These provisions are insufficiently flexible and are likely to become irrelevant as technology changes.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Generally supportive but notes that the dimensions for a standard bike do not accommodate the current variety of bike sizes, as envisaged by G102 in the Residential Design Guide.	Amend TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) to reflect the 85th percentile for current e-bikes and cargo bikes. For comparison, the Auckland Plan Change 79 has the dimensions: 1.9 length x 1.25 height x 0.7m width
Ministry of Education	400.39	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support	Supports TR-S3 as it promotes the safe and efficient use of the site and provides for alternative and public modes of transport.	Retain TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.196	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Support	Supports TR-S3 not being relevant in the Airport Zone.	Retain TR-S3 (Micromobility parking design) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.42	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S3	Amend	Considers that TR-S3.1.d. should be amended to ensure that parking for micromobility devices is not on the footpath. This is important to help support walking.	Amend TR-S3.1.d. to ensure that parking for micromobility devices is not on the footpath. [Inferred submission meant 'cycling and micromobility devices' when it used 'vehicles'].
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S4	Support in part	TR-S4 is supported as it has a requirement to provide a ramp on one side of the stairs to allow for cycle access. However, the standard also needs to specify a maximum angle for the ramp so that this is usable.	Retain TR-S4 (On-site pedestrian, cycling and micromobility paths) with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S4	Amend	Considers that TR-S4 should be amended to specify a maximum angle for the wheeling ramp so that it is usable.	Amend TR-S4 (On-site pedestrian, cycling and micromobility paths) as follows: 1. On-site pedestrian, cycling and micromobility paths must achieve the following: ... e. If stairs are necessary between cycling and micromobility storage and the legal road, a <u>wheeling ramp</u> at least 300mm wide on one side of the stairs <u>that does not exceed a gradient of 50%</u> must be provided.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.25	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S4	Support	Support	Retain TR-S4 (On-site pedestrian, cycling and micromobility paths) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.115	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S4	Amend	Considers it is not clear whether the needs of increasing uptake of e-bikes, including cargo and multipassenger e-bikes have been provided for in the standards. E.g. sufficient dimensions for longer/wider e-bikes and electric charging points as per TR-S7 2 (d) relating to design requirements for on-site car parking spaces. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are CC.1 and CC.3.	Amend TR-S4 (On-site pedestrian, cycling and micromobility paths) to include provision for e-bikes in standards, including a requirement for charging stations.
Ministry of Education	400.40	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S4	Support	Supports TR-S4 as it promotes the safe and efficient use of the site and provides for alternative and public modes of transport.	Retain TR-S4 (On-site pedestrian, cycling and micromobility paths) as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.43	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S4	Amend	Considers that TR-S4 is unclear what the 1.8m minimum width refers to. If this is a footpath, it should be clearly stated.	Clarify TR-S4 (On-site pedestrian, cycling and micromobility paths) to state what the 1.8m minimum width refers to.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S5	Support	Support	Retain TR-S5 (Classification of driveways) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.164	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S5	Amend	The submitter requests the provisions be made clearer that, where there is a new activity, the driveway classification and design is relative to that new activity.	Seeks to clarify TR-S5 (Classification of driveways).
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.54	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S6	Support in part	As noted in the submission point on INF-S16, seeks to amend TR-S6 to provide sufficient access for firefighting appliances to sites in unreticulated areas, or areas where the driveway exceeds hose run distances.	Supports TR-S6 (Design of driveways) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.55	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S6	Amend	As noted in the submission point on INF-S16, seeks to amend TR-S6 to provide sufficient access for firefighting appliances to sites in unreticulated areas, or areas where the driveway exceeds hose run distances.	Amend TR-S6 (Design of driveways) as follows: ... <u>3. Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u> <u>a. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>b. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>c. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>d. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>e. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>f. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.36	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.36	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S6	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.27	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S6	Support	Support	Retain TR-S6 (Design of driveways) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.165	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S6	Amend	The submitter requests the provisions be made clearer that, where there is a new activity, the driveway classification and design is relative to that new activity.	Seeks to clarify TR-S6 (Design of driveways).
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.56	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Support in part	Notes that when a site is located in an unreticulated area or has a driveway greater than 50m in length, it is vital that fire appliances are able to access and manoeuvre through the site to effectively respond to an emergency onsite. Therefore seeks to amend TR-S7 to require onsite vehicle circulation and manoeuvring to provide for heavy rigid vehicles.	Supports TR-S7 (Design requirements for on-site vehicle parking, circulation and manoeuvring) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.57	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Amend	Notes that when a site is located in an unreticulated area or has a driveway greater than 50m in length, it is vital that fire appliances are able to access and manoeuvre through the site to effectively respond to an emergency onsite. Therefore seeks to amend TR-S7 to require onsite vehicle circulation and manoeuvring to provide for heavy rigid vehicles.	Amend TR-S7 (Design requirements for on-site vehicle parking, circulation and manoeuvring) as follows: 1. Where provided on a site, car parking spaces and associated circulation and manoeuvring areas must be designed to accommodate a 4.91m x 1.87m vehicle (85th percentile vehicle) as the minimum design vehicle, with 300mm clearance per side to obstructions and a minimum outside turning radius of 5.8m; <u>unless:</u> <u>a. The site is located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or the site access has a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants. Then circulation and manoeuvring areas must be designed to accommodate a heavy rigid vehicle as per AS2890.2.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.37	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.37	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.19	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Amend	Considers that TR-S7 should be amended to have an exception for streets with a steeper gradient than 12.5%. It is noted that given Wellington's topography and road layout, it may not be possible to meet the gradient requirements of 4. or to keep circulation and manoeuvring wholly outside the road reserve as required by 6. The provision is otherwise supported for later installation of electric vehicle charging at 2d. (rather than actual installation).	Amend TR-S7 (Design requirements for on-site vehicle parking, circulation and manoeuvring) as follows: ... 4. On-site circulation and manoeuvring areas must have a maximum gradient of 12.5% <u>except when connecting to a street with a steeper gradient than this, where the limit is set by the street gradient.</u> ...
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.28	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Support	Support	Retain TR-S7 (Design requirements for on-site vehicle parking, circulation and manoeuvring) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.152	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Support in part	TR-S7 is partially supported and amendments are sought.	Retain TR-S7 (Design requirements for on-site vehicle parking, circulation and manoeuvring) with amendment.
Design Network Architecture Limited	FS73.1	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Support	Agree that TR-S7 be amended in part. Seek clarification of TR-S7 2 (c) with regard to the car parking minimum height clearance of 2.3m. Is this height specifically for the parking space itself? Or is it also a requirement for the garage door height? Suggest clarification to ensure that garage door heights can be lower than this (to align with typical building construction methods).	Not specified / Seeks clarification of TR-S7 2 (c) with regard to the car parking minimum height clearance of 2.3m to ensure that garage door heights can be lower than this (to align with typical building construction methods).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.153	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Amend	Considers that design requirements in TR-S7 should be amended.	Amend TR-S7 (Design requirements for on-site vehicle parking, circulation and manoeuvring) as follows: 1. Where provided on a site, car parking spaces and associated circulation and manoeuvring areas must be designed to accommodate a 4.91m x 1.87m vehicle (85th percentile vehicle) as the minimum design vehicle, with 300mm clearance per side to obstructions and a minimum outside turning radius of 5.8m; 2. Car parking spaces must: a. Comply with the minimum dimensions of Figure 5 – TR: Parking and Table 10 – TR: Parking Space Dimensions; b. Have a maximum gradient of 5% in any direction; and c. Have a minimum height clearance of 2.3m; and d. For residential on-site car parking spaces, be electric vehicle charging ready by being serviced with an electrical cable conduit from the electricity supply to the edge of the carpark; ...
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.77	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the deletion of this standard as it inhibits the uptake of low or zero carbon private vehicles which is directed in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that TR-S7 is retained as notified.
Miriam Moore	433.11	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Support	Support 1 bicycle park per residential unit	Retain Transport - Table 7- TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces as notified
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.26	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S7	Amend	Considers that point 4 of this standard limits the gradient of on-site circulation and manoeuvring to a maximum of 12.5%. However, Table 9 allows a driveway to have a steeper gradient. Considers there may be confusion between a circulation route and a driveway in residential situations	Amend TR-S7 (Design requirements for on-site vehicle parking, circulation and manoeuvring) to: 4. On-site circulation (<u>excluding residential driveways</u>) and manoeuvring areas must have a maximum gradient of 12.5%;

Hazards and Risks - Contaminated Land

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.3	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S8	Oppose	Opposed to this standard that requires provision of an on-site loading area for buildings over 450m2 . There may be sites where it is impractical and unnecessary to provide on-site loading and this standard may unnecessarily constrain appropriate development.	Delete TR-S8 (Provision of on-site loading areas) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.29	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S8	Support	Support	Retain TR-S8 (Provision of on-site loading areas) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.59	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S8	Oppose in part	Considers that the requirement for at least one on-site loading area for buildings with a footprint of 450 m2 or more is not practicable when applied to a retirement village environment where it is common to have multiple buildings of this size. Because retirement villages are centrally operated, one on-site loading area is sufficient for the whole village. It is considered more appropriate to assess loading area requirements based on the activity being undertaken on the site.	Opposes TR-S8 (Provision of on-site loading areas) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.60	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S8	Amend	Considers that the requirement for at least one on-site loading area for buildings with a footprint of 450 m2 or more is not practicable when applied to a retirement village environment where it is common to have multiple buildings of this size. Because retirement villages are centrally operated, one on-site loading area is sufficient for the whole village. It is considered more appropriate to assess loading area requirements based on the activity being undertaken on the site.	Amend TR-S8 (Provision of on-site loading areas) as follows: 1. <u>No on-site loading areas are required for buildings with a building footprint of less than 450m2;</u> 2. <u>At least one on-site loading area must be provided for buildings with a building footprint of 450m2 or more; and</u> 3. <u>For retirement villages, one on-site loading area shall be provided. No on-site loading areas are required for buildings with a building footprint of less than 450m2.</u>
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.4	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S9	Oppose	Opposes TR-S9 and seeks that it is deleted because a design requirement based on a 8 x 2.5m truck, and a 4.5m height clearance is excessive and unnecessary to provide for loading requirements. This will constrain appropriate designs and have negative effects on streetscape and urban design. This is counter to the strategic direction of the Proposed District Plan and the objectives and policies of the City Centre Zone, particularly around promoting a walkable city (CCZ-P8, Sense of Place) and quality design outcomes (CCZ-P9, Quality design outcomes) as requiring oversized vehicle crossings and loading areas will reduce pedestrian amenity.	Delete TR-S9 (Design requirements for on-site loading, circulation and manoeuvring) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.30	Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Transport / TR-S9	Support	Support	Retain TR-S9 (Design requirements for on-site loading, circulation and manoeuvring) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.116	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / General CL	Support	Supports the approach taken on contaminated land, as this aligns with Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain the Contaminated Land chapter as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.75	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / General CL	Support	The Contaminated Land chapter is generally supported. The chapter contains objectives and policies for the assessment of resource consent applications required under the NESCS, noting that the NESCS only contains rules and standards. In terms of rules, it is considered that the NESCS provides appropriate land use controls for both land disturbance activities and changes of use in relation to contaminated soils. As such, given there are no rules in this chapter, this approach is supported.	Retain the Contaminated Land chapter as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.76	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / CL-O1	Support	CL-O1 is supported as drafted, as it seeks that contaminated land is identified and managed to protect human health.	Retain CL-O1 (Protection of human health from contaminants) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.197	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / CL-O1	Support	Considers that the Contaminated Land chapter does not contain methods. Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls such matters.	Retain CL-O1 (Protection of human health from contaminants) as notified

Hazards and Risks - Hazardous Substances

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.198	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / CL-O2	Support	Considers that the Contaminated Land chapter does not contain methods. Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls such matters.	Retain CL-O2 (Benefit of remediating contaminated land) as notified
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.199	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / CL-P1	Support	Considers that the Contaminated Land chapter does not contain methods. Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls such matters.	Retain CL-P1 (Benefit of remediating contaminated land) as notified
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.200	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / CL-P2	Support	Considers that the Contaminated Land chapter does not contain methods. Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls such matters.	Retain CL-P2 (Identification of contaminated and potentially contaminated land) as notified
Wellington Tenth's Trust	363.2	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / CL-P3	Support	Supports CL-P3 on the basis that it provides for the development of its future aspirations.	Retain CL-P3 (Management of contaminated land) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.77	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / CL-P3	Support	CL-P3 is supported as the wording is considered appropriate. Particular regard to management options and best practice remediation options that ensures risks to human health are minimised, whilst ensuring the land is suitable for its intended use is supported.	Retain CL-P3 (Management of contaminated land) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.62	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / CL-P3	Amend	Seeks clarification of the implementation of CL-P3.	Seeks that CL-P3 (Management of contaminated land) is amended to reflect Taranaki Whānui partnership opportunities in the assessment of contaminated land practices and restoration and recovery processes too.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.201	Hazards and Risks / Contaminated Land / CL-P3	Support	Considers that the Contaminated Land chapter does not contain methods. Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls such matters.	Retain CL-P3 (Management of contaminated land) as notified
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.117	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / General HS	Oppose	Considers the 2017 amendments to the RMA repealed the provisions of s30 and s31 relating to the function of regional councils and territorial authorities with respect to management of the use of, or use of land for, hazardous substances. This is no longer a function of either the WCC or Greater Wellington, and hazardous substance use is managed under the HSNO Act by the Environmental Protection Authority. Greater Wellington controls the discharge of hazardous substances only because they are a 'contaminant', and RMA s15 applies. Greater Wellington notes that the purpose of HSNO Act is to prevent or manage any adverse effects of hazardous substances, so there is no category of risk that is not managed under the HSNO Act	Seeks the consideration of the deletion of the chapter.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.78	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / General HS	Support in part	The approach to hazardous substances and the Hazardous Substances Chapter as set out in the section 32 report is supported. In particular, efforts to only control matters in relation to hazardous substances that are not covered by other more specific legislation including the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO) and the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 (HSWA).	Retain the Hazardous substances chapter as notified, with amendments.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.79	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / General HS	Support	Supports the introduction to the chapter.	Retain the introduction to the Hazardous Substances chapter. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Firstgas Limited	304.38	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / New HS	Amend	<p>Considers that a new rule should be added to the Hazardous Substances chapter. The Plan should adopt a precautionary approach to hazard risk management. The use of explosives (e.g. for quarrying purposes) near the Gas Transmission Network poses a health and safety, and environmental risk should the activity not be properly managed. It is sought that the Plan apply a new rule, which requires that the use of explosives within 100 metres of the Gas Transmission Network be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The reverse sensitivity effects from such activities are not specifically addressed under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO). In particular, there are no controls or rules around the use of explosives within the HSNO. There are also no controls around the use of explosives within proximity to pipelines. The use of a rule is consistent with HS-01 (Protection from unacceptable residual risk) which provides direction that the use of a rule would be appropriate in this circumstance.</p> <p>The gas network delivers significant benefits to people and communities, supporting their social and economic well-being, as well as providing for their health and safety. Potential degradation to the gas network, resulting from explosive activities, has the potential to result in risk to people and communities. Explosive activities which may result in potentially adverse effects on the integrity of the network, and consequently the health and wellbeing of people and communities, shall be required to demonstrate the residual risk can be avoided, remedied or mitigated to an acceptable level.</p>	<p>Add a new Rule to the Hazardous Substances chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>Restricted Discretionary Activities</u> <u>The use of explosives within 100 metres of the Gas Transmission Network</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p>i) <u>The risk of hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage;</u> ii) <u>Measures proposed to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects on the Gas Transmission Network;</u> iii) <u>Technical advice from the owner and operator of the Gas Transmission Network, including an assessment of the level of risk;</u> iv) <u>The outcome of any consultation with the owner and operator of the Gas Transmission Network;</u> <u>and</u> v) <u>Whether the use of explosives could be located a greater distance from the Gas Transmission Network</u></p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.58	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-01	Support	Supports the objective on the basis that the objective seeks to protect people, communities and identified areas from unacceptable residual risks associated with the handling of hazardous substances within appropriate facilities and activities.	Retain HS-01 (Protection from unacceptable residual risk) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.80	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-01	Support	HS-01 is supported, as it seeks to protect people and communities from unacceptable residual risks from facilities and activities involving the manufacture, use, storage, transportation or disposal of hazardous substances.	Retain Objective HS-01 (Protection from unacceptable residual risk) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.202	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-01	Support	<p>The Hazardous Substances chapter only seeks to manage the residual and cumulative risks associated with hazardous substances.</p> <p>Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls the storage, transportation and use of such substances.</p>	Retain HS-01 (Protection from unacceptable residual risk) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.81	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-02	Support	HS-02 is supported, as it seeks that sensitive activities are appropriately located to minimise reverse sensitivity effects and unacceptable residual risk from established hazardous facilities.	Retain Objective HS-02 (Protection of established facilities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.41	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-02	Support	Supports HS-02 to encourage sensitive activities, including educational facilities, to be located away from established hazardous facilities.	Retain HS-02 (Protection of established facilities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.203	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-02	Support	<p>The Hazardous Substances chapter only seeks to manage the residual and cumulative risks associated with hazardous substances.</p> <p>Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls the storage, transportation and use of such substances.</p>	Retain HS-02 (Protection of established facilities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.59	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P1	Support	Notes that fire stations and associated firefighting activities involve the use and storage of hazardous substances at quantities that are considered minor. However, there is sometimes a need temporarily store large quantities of product in an emergency. The policy allows the flexibility to utilise hazardous substances when and where necessary for operations and to ensure an effective response to a fire or other emergency.	Retain HS-P1 (Residual risk to people and communities) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.82	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P1	Oppose	HS-P1 is opposed as it extends to a range of matters which are not specific to hazardous substances and which would be better managed through provisions applicable to all activities affected by these specific areas or overlays (i.e. in their own chapters). HS-P1 could potentially conflict with these chapters including, for example, the Natural Hazards chapter which does not explicitly seek to avoid hazardous substances in natural hazard areas. Instead, hazardous substance activities would be more appropriately determined on a case-by-case basis depending on, for example, the specific activity's sensitivity to natural hazard risk.	Delete HS-P1 (Residual risk to people and communities) in its entirety and instead determine hazardous activities on a case-by-case basis.
CentrePort Limited	402.84	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P1	Amend	Considers that this is an avoid policy. Large parts of the Special Port Zone are within natural hazards areas especially the Wellington fault. CentrePort is a Major Hazard facility under the Health and Safety at Work (Major Hazard Facilities) Regulations 2016. The policy should recognise that there may be functional need or operational requirements for hazardous substances to be handled within these areas.	Amend HS-P1 (Residual risk to people and communities) as follows: 7. ... Unless <u>1. There is a functional need or operational requirement and there are no practicable alternatives;</u> <u>and</u> <u>2. it can be demonstrated that the residual risk to human health, people and communities or these identified areas and their values will be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, unacceptable risk is adequately mitigated.</u>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.204	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P1	Support	The Hazardous Substances chapter only seeks to manage the residual and cumulative risks associated with hazardous substances. Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls the storage, transportation and use of such substances.	Retain HS-P1 (Residual risk to people and communities) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.83	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P2	Support	HS-P2 is supported as it seeks to appropriately locate hazardous activities and facilities to mitigate individual and cumulative residual risk associated with multiple hazardous activities and facilities and to avoid unacceptable residual risks to people and sensitive activities by internalising effects through site layout and design.	Retain HS-P2 (Location of hazardous facilities and activities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.85	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P2	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain HS-P2 (Location of hazardous facilities and activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.205	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P2	Support	The Hazardous Substances chapter only seeks to manage the residual and cumulative risks associated with hazardous substances. Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls the storage, transportation and use of such substances.	Retain HS-P2 (Location of hazardous facilities and activities) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.84	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P3	Support	HS-P3 is supported as it seeks to avoid locating sensitive activities in close proximity to MHF where there is potential to be exposed to unacceptable residual risks and/or constrain the development, operation, upgrading or maintenance of an existing MHF.	Retain HS-P3 (Sensitive activities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.42	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P3	Support	Supports HS-P3 ensure sensitive activities, including educational facilities, are located away from established major hazardous facilities.	Retain HS-P3 (Sensitive activities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.86	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P3	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain HS-P3 (Sensitive activities) as notified.

Hazards and Risks - Natural Hazards

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.206	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-P3	Support	The Hazardous Substances chapter only seeks to manage the residual and cumulative risks associated with hazardous substances. Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls the storage, transportation and use of such substances.	Retain HS-P3 (Sensitive activities) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.85	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-R1	Support	HS-R1 is supported as it enables the manufacture, use, storage, transportation or disposal of hazardous substances as a permitted activity and provides an appropriate rule framework relating to new and existing MHFs and the requirements for Quantitative Risk Assessments (QRA) in specific situations (e.g. greater than a 10% increase in the volume of hazardous substances).	Retain HS-R1 (The manufacture, use, storage, transportation or disposal of hazardous substances) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.87	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-R1	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain HS-R1 (The manufacture, use, storage, transportation or disposal of hazardous substances) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.207	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-R1	Support	The Hazardous Substances chapter only seeks to manage the residual and cumulative risks associated with hazardous substances. Generally supports the approach taken within this chapter and considers that it is appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication where other legislation comprehensively and effectively controls the storage, transportation and use of such substances.	Retain HS-R1 (The manufacture, use, storage, transportation or disposal of hazardous substances) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.86	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-R2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HS-R2 (Existing major hazard facility) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.43	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-R2	Support	Supports HS-R2 as the submitter supports the Section 88 information requirements for existing major hazards facilities to consider any adverse effects on nearby sensitive activities (including educational facilities). The submitters considers that this will help to identify any risks to appropriately manage and mitigate them.	Retain HS-R2 (Existing major hazard facility) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.88	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-R2	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain HS-R2 (Existing major hazard facility) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.87	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-R3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HS-R3 (New major hazard facility) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.89	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-R3	Support in part	Considers that the Special Purpose Port Zone should be listed as a discretionary option under this rule for any proposal for a new major hazard activity as there is for the General Industrial Zone.	Retain HS-R3 (New major hazard facility), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.90	Hazards and Risks / Hazardous Substances / HS-R3	Amend	Considers that the Special Purpose Port Zone should be listed as a discretionary option under this rule for any proposal for a new major hazard activity as there is for the General Industrial Zone.	Amend HS-R3 (New major hazard facility) as follows: 1. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. The activity is located within the General Industrial Zone <u>or the Special Purpose Port Zone.</u> ...
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.37	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Not specified	Considers that community resilience is an incredibly important factor in terms of natural hazard response.	Seeks that infrastructure facilitates bringing people together.
Tyers Stream Group	221.28	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks stricter management of rules to restrict buildings and infrastructure in areas covered by the Stream Corridor Overlay, the Overland Flow Path Overlay and the Ponding Overlay.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.27	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	The submission seeking stricter rules to manage infrastructure in stated hazard areas is too uncertain. Infrastructure may need to be located in these areas such to operational need or functional need. The existing framework in the INF-NH chapter is considered to be satisfactory. Any provision for infrastructure should also be contained in the INF-NH chapter and not the general NH chapter to which the submission relates.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.41	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	The submission seeking stricter rules to manage infrastructure in stated hazard areas is too uncertain. Infrastructure may need to be located in these areas such to operational need or functional need. The existing framework in the INF-NH chapter is considered to be satisfactory. Any provision for infrastructure should also be contained in the INF-NH chapter and not the general NH chapter to which the submission relates.	Disallow
Tyers Stream Group	221.29	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Supports Natural Hazards chapter as it relates to the Tyers stream catchment	Retain Natural Hazards chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington City Council	266.65	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers there is a need to clarify and add detail in relation to sensitivity rating definitions.	Amend the first sentence of paragraph one of the introduction under 'Hazard Sensitivity' as follows: To assist with determining the consequences associated with natural hazards, buildings and activities have been allocated a sensitivity rating (see Definitions – <u>less hazard sensitive activities, potentially hazard sensitive activities, hazard sensitive activities</u>).
Wellington City Council	266.66	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers 'Sheppards Gully' is spelled incorrectly and should instead be 'Shepards Gully'.	Amend, in the introduction, the Natural Hazard Overlay title as follows: Sheppards <u>Shepards</u> Gully Fault Overlay Consequential re-naming of 'Sheppards Gully' in the following provisions: INF-NH-R60.1.a.iii NH-R5.1.b SUB-R17 (rule title) SUB-R18 (rule title) SUB- R18.1.1 SUB-R22 (rule title) Planning maps
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.5	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the provisions for landslide hazard mitigation in the earthworks section of the Proposed Plan are not sufficient, as they rely on individual assessments of sites and could be applied inconsistently. They also allow for developments which do not require earthworks in areas which are at risk of slope failure. Applying a Landslide Hazard overlay (such as the nonregulatory landslide overlay) and restricting development within high-hazard areas will preclude inconsistent application of earthworks rules and prevent subdivision and development on slopes prone to failure. Considers that while there is a restrictive disclaimer on the existing non-regulatory GNS Science SLIDE Geomorphology Map, the uncertainties in a landslide hazard overlay developed from this map can be managed through policy.	Seeks that objectives, policies and rules are developed in the Natural Hazards chapter to restrict hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in high risk land located as a new landslide hazard overlay.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.127	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Greater Wellington support the submitter's request for additional provisions to control development on land that is at higher risk of slope failure. By identifying and managing this risk, the risk to life, property and well-being of future urban intensification can be appropriately minimised. These changes would have regard to Proposed RPS Plan Change 1, specifically Policy 51.	Allow / Supports the submission in part and seeks additional controls on landslide hazards to manage landslide risk on steep land. Considers that some controls should apply to slopes from ~20-34°. Seeks that the matters of control for these areas include a site-specific geotechnical investigation to ensure slope failure hazards are appropriately managed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the terminology 'Fault Hazard Overlay' should be consistent with the MFE guidelines i.e. Fault Avoidance Zone, and that including the use of confined, unconfined, distributed and uncertain fault areas where appropriate. Considers that the supporting s32 information indicates that the Fault Hazard Overlay are the mapped Fault Avoidance Zones that are mapped in the supporting report; however, this is not explained in the s32. Considers that the description of 'fault hazard' needs to be clarified or amended to reflect how it is shown on the maps i.e., a band, which are at different widths on the map, which we assume reflects the certainty of the fault location.	Seeks that the term "Fault Hazard Overlay" in the Natural Hazards chapter is changed to "Fault Avoidance Zone" and include confined, unconfined, distributed, and uncertain fault areas.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.13	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Not specified	Considers that it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provisions do not rule out quarries along the faultline.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.33	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	A number of submission points made by the Aggregate & Quarry Association (please see multiple points in their submission relating to the same theme) argue that "it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction." Elsewhere, they also say: "... the District Plan must not unreasonably curtail expansion of existing quarries and establishment of new quarries..." WCCERG disagree, on the basis of primary and secondary greenhouse gas emissions from quarrying, which are no longer tenable; and the opportunity to re-use existing materials (instead of sending them to landfill, as is currently the case).	Disallow / Seeks that instead of allowing new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use, WCC requires no expansion of any kind of mining or quarrying activities, and a second policy stating that these activities be phased out by (for example), 2030.
David Karl	309.5	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that whanau's homes should not be unnecessarily impacted by inaccurate modelling. Further development should also not occur in areas that it should not. There is emotional pain and significant costs linked to Council holding information that is not publicly available and then requiring costly changes to building plans before providing approval.	Seeks that objectives, policies and rules relevant to Hazard zoning be drafted to ensure that the relevant zones (as shown on a map) can most easily be updated to reflect new information.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	The Natural Hazards chapter is missing emergency management requirements in the event of major earthquakes or disasters. The population will have a need for water and sewage disposal following a major earthquake, the Proposed District Plan should address this. Mount Cook is especially vulnerable in times of earthquake, as it has several major education facilities that could be cut-off from whānau. Residents that travel between the CBD and Mt Cook may also be cut-off from their home by impassable roads. Finally, the PDP should include provisions to ensure the population's safety in times of natural disaster, as this will focus the attention of Body Corporates on planning for emergency situations.	Seeks that the Natural Hazards chapter include provisions relating to emergency management in times of a major earthquake or natural disaster.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that Wellington City's water storage should be focused around the city to relieve pressure on emergency water supplies. Wellington's water supply could be disrupted for up to 100 days in the aftermath of an earthquake, as the pipes could all break. With up to 400,000 people relying on the network, the city should be making it easy, and in some cases compulsory, for householders to install potable water tanks that will make them self-sufficient for longer. 200 litre tanks are already available, subsidised by Wellington City Council. Kāinga Ora and WREMO both advise that individuals and households be responsible for their own water storage. However, some may not be able to comply and planning rules need to do more to make it easier to store more water privately and in public places.	Seeks that water storage capacity be increased in the City in preparation for a major earthquake.
Property Council New Zealand	338.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the natural hazard overlays (i.e. flooding, fault rupture, tsunami and coastal) should be included in the Council's LIM reports. Supporting and assessing risks in a way that is more proactive will result in restrictions on building in high-risk areas, with work arounds for the lower-risk areas (taking into account the sensitivity of the proposed activity).	Seeks that natural hazards overlays be included in LIM reports.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kimberley Vermaey	348.3	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that areas in the Fault Hazard Overlay are not well defined or understood. The objective, policy and rule frameworks for the fault hazards overlay need to be updated to reflect this differing understanding of the fault hazard overlays. In areas where there is a good understanding of the fault hazard location, there should be more restrictive objectives, policies and rules (similar to what is proposed in the draft plan). where there is a poorer understanding of the fault location, then less restrictive objectives, policies and rules should apply (for example a policy framework that requires the identification of the position of the fault and a corresponding permitted, controlled, or restricted discretionary activity status.	Seeks that where there is poorer understanding of the fault location then less restrictive objectives, policies and rules should apply. The new policy framework would require the identification of the position of the fault and a corresponding permitted, controlled, or restricted discretionary activity status. These provisions need to be drafted and included in the District Plan.
Kimberley Vermaey	348.4	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that rules relating to additions in the Coastal Hazards Overlay do not address alterations to existing buildings. There is the potential for alterations to increase the risk from the conversion of non-habitable buildings. There needs to be consideration as to whether it is appropriate for conversions to existing buildings to be covered. This is to ensure the rule frameworks are consistent with the additions framework.	Seeks that rules relating to additions in the Coastal Inundation Overlay address alterations to existing buildings.
Kimberley Vermaey	348.5	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that rules relating to additions in the Natural Hazards Overlay do not address alterations to existing buildings. There is the potential for alterations to increase the risk from the conversion of non-habitable buildings. There needs to be consideration as to whether it is appropriate for conversions to existing buildings to be covered. This is to ensure the rule frameworks are consistent with the additions framework.	Seeks that provisions relating to additions in the Natural Hazard Overlays address alterations to existing buildings.
Kimberley Vermaey	348.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the current coastal hazard framework does not have any consideration of the inundation depths. As a result, areas with 2m of inundation depth would be treated the same as areas with 0.1m of inundation depth. There may be a need to refine the policy and rule frameworks to recognise different inundation depths and this may have some implications of the hazard classification frameworks. (Option A)	Seeks that classification of inundation depths be reassessed for the Coastal Inundation Overlay.
Kimberley Vermaey	348.7	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the current coastal hazard framework does not have any consideration of the inundation depths. Alternatively, the hazard map overlays may be adjusted to remove inundation depths below a certain level as they will not reach a level that constitutes a hazard that warrants land use planning. Expert advice on this may be required as to what is the most appropriate depth, but it may be 0.15m and less. (Option B)	Seeks that the Coastal Inundation Overlay be adjusted to remove inundation depths below a certain low-hazard level.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.31	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Support	Retain NH – Ngā Mōrearea ā-Taiao - Natural Hazards as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.118	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that intensification in any flood hazard zone is not in line with regional, national or international direction on hazards or climate change, and would impact Greater Wellington's ability to discharge its flood risk management functions. Increasing densities within Wellington City area may result in an increase in the vulnerability of people and property to flood hazards, and there will also be a need to introduce more sophisticated flood forecasting and warning systems to the region.	Seeks that WCC continues to work with Greater Wellington to discuss the City's flood hazards in relation to the proposed intensification.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.20	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support natural hazard provisions based on current and accurate research. Continued collaboration between agencies is important to keep hazard information up to date and consistent across the region.	Allow
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Not specified	Considers that natural hazard such as flooding and slips are an important qualifying factor in determining future development.	Not specified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.88	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	The Natural Hazard chapter is supported for its intent, as it seeks to protect people, property and infrastructure from natural hazards. The chapter's 'risk-based approach' is also supported as it seeks to manage effects from natural hazards by classifying activities and providing separate provisions for these activities depending on their level of hazard sensitivity.	Retain the Natural Hazard chapter, with amendments.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.55	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	The Natural Hazards chapter' Introduction is supported, including the risk framework, the use of both buildings and activities, and the three focus areas of people, property and infrastructure.	Retain the Natural Hazards chapter's Introduction as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	Supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to natural hazards. Retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur, and therefore it would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to anticipate a protection or adaptation approach to climate change hazards. Argosy opposes hazard rankings being attributed to the various natural hazards. For example, the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay being identified as a 'high' risk. This is because the natural hazards overlays apply to all levels of risk either in the same way, or specific to the type of risk. It does not have a practical implication to attribute hazard rankings to the natural hazards and is inappropriate. Notes that the hazard overlays are wide ranging in terms of risk and feasible approaches to mitigate that risk. By including all the hazard overlays together the Proposed Plan applies the same risk and mitigation approach to all hazard overlays. This is inappropriate for some overlays, such as liquefaction and tsunami (discussed below), where the risk cannot be mitigated and the probability of an event is low	Delete "Natural Hazard Overlay" table in Introduction.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.1	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	High, medium and low risk ranking is important in assessing the level of activity appropriate in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.63	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers further engagement with Council is appropriate to ensure existing consents can be implemented without future impediment and to ensure the District Plan reflects the aspirations of Taranaki Whānui. Natural Hazard overlays are identified over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and Shelly Bay Taikuru.	Seeks that amendments that are most appropriate to address concerns around ensuring that Taranaki Whānui can implement existing consents around Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and Shelly Bay Taikuru without future impediment.
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.5	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford." It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Planning maps• He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter• Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter• Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter• Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter• Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter• Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter• Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.22	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.41	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.154	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	The inclusion of rules in relation to flood hazards is partially supported, as well as the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards. However, an amendment is sought.	Retain the Natural Hazards chapter with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.155	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that rules related to flood hazards should not be linked to static maps.	Amend the Natural Hazards chapter so that rules do not refer to static maps.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.51	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow

#NAME?

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.57	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.156	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	<p>The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed, despite the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards being generally supported. Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards and will create unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers. It is considered appropriate to include rules in relation to flood hazards but sought that the rules are not linked to static maps.</p> <p>The Auckland Unitary Plan (“AUP”) adopts a set of non-statutory flood hazard overlay maps which operate as interactive maps on the Council’s ‘Geo Maps’ website – a separate mapping viewer to the statutory maps. The advantage of this approach is the ability to operate a separate set of interactive maps which are continually subject to improvement and updates, outside of and without a reliance on the Schedule 1 process under the RMA.</p> <p>It is noted that there is no formal requirement for flooding overlay maps to be included within a district plan. It is also noted that the National Planning Standards 2016 – Mapping Standard Table 20 includes a number of specific overlay and other symbols, but none relate to flooding. The removal of the mapped flooding Natural Hazard Overlays from within the District Plan is sought. This should instead be included as a non-statutory, information only mapping layer that sits outside the Proposed District Plan and refer to “Natural Hazard Overlays” as “Natural Hazard Areas”.</p> <p>The mapping of other, non-flooding natural hazards to be incorporated into the District Plan maps, such as Liquefaction and Fault Hazards (in addition to Coastal Hazards) are otherwise supported, as these hazards are less subject to change.</p>	Seeks that natural hazard flooding overlays from the District Plan are deleted and that the information be held in non-statutory GIS maps instead.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.6	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.</p> <p>Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon’s catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).</p> <p>This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance.</p> <p>There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc.</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for included map].</p>	Disallow
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.52	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.32	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Considers that mapping flood hazards remains an important priority for residents.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.58	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.157	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	The term "Natural Hazard Overlays" is opposed and should be removed and replaced by a newly defined term "Natural Hazard Areas". Natural Hazard Overlays should instead be included as non-statutory, information-only mapping layer that sits outside the Proposed District Plan.	Delete all references to "Natural Hazard Overlays" and refer to the newly defined term of Natural Hazard Areas instead.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.7	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.</p> <p>Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon's catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).</p> <p>This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance.</p> <p>There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc.</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for included map].</p>	Disallow
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.53	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	MfE discussion paper on National Planning Standards: Zones and Overlays supports the use of the term 'overlay' to mean mapped areas which "introduce more restrictive built form controls than apply to the underlying zone". As this is the purpose of the WCC proposed plan's Natural Hazard Overlays, the term should be retained. Regulatory natural hazard overlays, including for flood, are an important tool to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk.	Disallow
Elliott Thornton	399.1	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that while the PDP regulates the location and sitting of buildings to be sufficiently flood-free, it does not address people trying to traverse flood waters, which is one of the primary causes of death or injury from flooding.	Seeks that the permitted depth for access is set at 0.3m, consistent with the Greater Wellington Regional Council's Flood Hazard Modelling Standard, and where not meeting that standard, a risk management approach which could consider matters such as the duration of the flood hazard, velocity, the ability for emergency vehicle access, or ability to provide alternative access during a major flood event.
CentrePort Limited	402.91	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Considers that there is a structural difficulty with Natural Hazards being included in the Infrastructure section when there is a separate and standalone chapter that specifically references Natural Hazards as well as coastal hazards included in the Coastal Environment. This creates uncertainty. For an infrastructure provider and for ease of plan usage these provisions should be in the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Seeks that Infrastructure Natural Hazards provisions are located within the Natural Hazards Chapter.
CentrePort Limited	402.92	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that there is a structural difficulty with Natural Hazards being included in the Infrastructure section when there is a separate and standalone chapter that specifically references Natural Hazards as well as coastal hazards included in the Coastal Environment. This creates uncertainty. For an infrastructure provider and for ease of plan usage these provisions should be in the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Seeks that Infrastructure Natural Hazards provisions are located within the Natural Hazards Chapter.
CentrePort Limited	402.93	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Supports policy INF-NH-P61 but considers that for ease of plan usage it should instead be included in the overarching Natural Hazard Overlays chapter.	Seeks that INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) is relocated to the Natural Hazards Chapter.
CentrePort Limited	402.94	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.95	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.28	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Retaining the infrastructure rules related to natural hazards in the INF-NH sub-chapter rather than the general NH Chapter is preferred to keep the INF provisions largely self-contained in one location.	Disallow
Powerco Limited	FS61.42	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Retaining the infrastructure rules related to natural hazards in the INF-NH sub-chapter rather than the general NH Chapter is preferred to keep the INF provisions largely self-contained in one location.	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.7	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan recognises the benefits of existing investment in the CBD in relation to natural hazards and coastal hazards.
Oyster Management Limited	404.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan applies appropriate provisions to reflect the probability and limitations in mitigating risks of liquefaction and tsunamis.
Oyster Management Limited	404.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provides consistency in the approach to potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Natural Hazards and Coastal Hazards Overlays.
Oyster Management Limited	404.10	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	The submitter's properties at 6 Hurring Place and 12 Newlands Road are partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay – Inundation Area and 6 Hurring Place is partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay – Overland Flowpath.	Retain the Natural Hazards Introduction as notified to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to natural hazards, with amendments. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].
Oyster Management Limited	404.11	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	The submitter's properties at 6 Hurring Place and 12 Newlands Road are partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay – Inundation Area and 6 Hurring Place is partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay – Overland Flowpath.	Not specified. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].
Oyster Management Limited	404.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Supports the Introductory text to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to natural hazards.	Retain NH (Natural Hazards) - Introduction as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.208	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Supports Natural Hazards chapter introduction. Supports the recognition of Wellington Airport within the introductory text.	Retain Natural Hazards chapter introduction as notified.
VicLabour	414.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	Supports restrictions on development in areas at risk of coastal inundation and tsunami with amendment as detailed in other submission point.	Retain coastal inundation and tsunami provisions with amendment.
VicLabour	414.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Not specified	Considers that the reality of sea level rise means Council must start considering a programme of managed retreat. Considers that Council must lay the groundwork now and begin the difficult conversations with communities about the longevity of their placement within areas susceptible to considerable risk from sea level rise	Seeks that the Council start considering a programme of managed retreat.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	<p>It is important that the Proposed Plan accurately conveys the probabilities of different natural hazards, and does not unduly create an impression of greater risk than is the case.</p> <p>The introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter identifies the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay with a 'High' hazard ranking. However, the provisions associated with the Liquefaction Overlay suggest that these are areas of lower hazard risk. We also note the natural hazards overlays apply to all levels of risk either in the same way, or in relation to the specific type of risk. Accordingly, Fabric seeks amendments to the introduction to remove the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay from the 'High' hazard ranking, to better reflect the risks associated with liquefaction and to achieve better consistency with the associated provisions.</p>	Option 1: Seeks that the introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter is amended to delete the hazard rankings from the table.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.10	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	High, medium and low risk ranking is important in assessing the level of activity appropriate in areas at risk from natural hazards. Deleting the rankings will undermine the risk-based approach that has been taken.	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.10	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	<p>It is important that the Proposed Plan accurately conveys the probabilities of different natural hazards, and does not unduly create an impression of greater risk than is the case.</p> <p>The introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter identifies the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay with a 'High' hazard ranking. However, the provisions associated with the Liquefaction Overlay suggest that these are areas of lower hazard risk. We also note the natural hazards overlays apply to all levels of risk either in the same way, or in relation to the specific type of risk. Accordingly, Fabric seeks amendments to the introduction to remove the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay from the 'High' hazard ranking, to better reflect the risks associated with liquefaction and to achieve better consistency with the associated provisions.</p>	<p>Option 2: If the hazards ranking table is not deleted from the Natural Hazards chapter introduction:</p> <p>Amend the Natural Hazards chapter introduction to remove the 'High' hazard ranking for the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.</p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.11	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Liquefaction is a hazard associated with earthquakes. Much of central Wellington is built on ground likely to liquefy in an earthquake, and the risk of earthquakes in Wellington is high. Liquefaction is a real risk that has already been experienced in Wellington (e.g. during the 2016 Kaikoura earthquake), and ignoring the liquefaction risk in Christchurch resulted in catastrophic damage and retirement of land. MBIE guidelines for development in areas at risk from liquefaction ³ recommend both land use planning to avoid more vulnerable activities in high risk areas and requiring liquefaction resistant foundations for those buildings which are appropriate to develop in medium and high risk areas.	Disallow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Amend	Considers here should be an additional objective in the Natural Hazards overlays which provides for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure. This would be consistent with Objective CE-O8 in relation to coastal hazards. It is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards to recognise that here is significant existing investment in the CBD and there are social and economic benefits to enabling development that does not increase risks arising from natural hazards.	<p>Add new objective NH-OX to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure</u></p>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Amend	Considers there should be an additional policy which recognises that development in the natural hazard overlays in the City Centre zone is appropriate in some instances. This would be consistent with Policies CE-921 and CE-P22. As noted above, it is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards.	<p>Add new policy NH-PX to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Natural Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public or the creation of vacant allotments</u></p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.2	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Oppose	Some areas within natural hazard overlays are not appropriate for development and the NH provisions in the plan are reflective of this.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.22	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Amend	Considers there should be an additional policy which recognises that development in the natural hazard overlays in the City Centre zone is appropriate in some instances. This would be consistent with Policies CE-921 and CE-P22. As noted above, it is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards.	Add new policy NH-PX to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows: <u>Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Natural Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that the activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property.</u>
Fabric Property Limited	425.11	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Amend	Considers that there should be an additional objective in the Natural Hazards overlays which provides for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure. This would be consistent with Objective CE-O8 in relation to coastal hazards. It is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards to recognise that there is significant existing investment in the CBD and there are social and economic benefits to enabling development that does not increase risks arising from natural hazards.	Add new Objective as follows: <u>NH-O5 (City Centre Zone):</u> <u>Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.119	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as follows: Subdivision, use and development within the Natural Hazard Overlays <u>minimises</u> reduce or do not increase the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.21	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.10	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.10	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.23	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Support	Supports the objective as it enables use and development within the Natural Hazard Overlays that do not increase the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.44	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Support	Supports NH-O1 to reduce risk to people, property, and infrastructure. The submitter acknowledges there are existing Educational Facilities within the Coastal Hazard Area and that any development of these would be subject to these provisions (if not designated).	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as proposed.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.50	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Support	Waka Kotahi supports providing for subdivision and development where this does not increase risk to people property and infrastructure.	Allow
CentrePort Limited	402.96	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.13	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Support	Supports NH-O1 to the extent that it enables use and development within the natural hazard overlays that do not increase the risk from natural hazards to people, property, and infrastructure.	Retain NH-O1 (Risks from natural hazards) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.209	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Oppose	Opposes NH-O1. Furthermore, and as set out in Objective SRCC-O2, the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance. [See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.210	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Amend	Opposes NH-O1. Furthermore, and as set out in Objective SRCC-O2, the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance. [See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 in original submission for full reason]	Submitter seeks either deletion of NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) or an amendment to NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as follows: Subdivision, use and development in the Natural Hazard Overlays <u>do not create an intolerable level of risk</u> or <u>does not increase the risk</u> to people, property, and infrastructure.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.91	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Oppose	Toka Tū Ake supports the suggestion that the concept of risk tolerance be included in natural hazard provisions. However, natural hazard risk tolerance is a concept which varies widely between people and communities, and it is impractical to include it in this instance as a comprehensive definition of 'tolerable' risk has not been developed, nor has one been offered. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.93	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1	Support	Supports the objective to provide for operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities while ensuring these activities do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.120	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O2	Amend	Supports the inclusion of "catchment management" in the objective as notified.	Retain NH-O2 (Planned natural hazard mitigation works), subject to amendments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.121	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O2	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than 'reduced', to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend NH-O2 (Planned natural hazard mitigation works) as follows: There is reduced risk The risk to people, property and infrastructure from flood hazards through planned mitigation works and catchment management is <u>minimised</u> .
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.22	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O2	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow
CentrePort Limited	402.97	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O2	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-O2 (Planned natural hazard mitigation works) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.60	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O3	Support	Supports the policy as it seeks to protect natural features that reduce the susceptibility of people, communities, property and infrastructure from damage by natural hazards. Such natural features could include fire breaks which can comprise a natural physical barrier against the spread of fire from or into any area of continuous flammable material.	Retain NH-O3 (Natural systems and features) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.122	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O3	Support	Considers the wording of this objective is generally consistent with the expectations of Greater Wellington in respect of natural features and RPS direction.	Retain NH-O3 (Natural systems and features) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.98	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O3	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-O3 (Natural systems and features) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.123	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O4	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate	Retain NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.99	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O4	Support	Support specific objective for Port Activities.	Retain NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.211	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O4	Oppose in part	Opposes NH-O4. The activities listed have operational and functional constraints which ultimately govern the location of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities.	Opposes NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.212	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O4	Amend	Opposes NH-O4. The activities listed have operational and functional constraints which ultimately govern the location of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities.	Submitter seeks either deletion of NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) or an amendment to NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: NH-O4 Airport , Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities Airport , Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities do not <u>create an intolerable level of increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.124	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	Supports a risk-based approach to manage subdivision use and development within the identified areas, specifically sensitivity to impacts and the hazard posed to lives and wellbeing. This aligns with RPS direction on natural hazards. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as notified.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.51	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	Waka Kotahi supports a risk-based approach in providing for subdivision and development based on the likelihood and consequence to people property and infrastructure.	Allow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.24	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	Supports the policy in that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood and consequences of different natural hazard events.	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.45	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support in part	Support NH-P1 in part.	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.46	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Amend	Seeks that NH-P1 be amended. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards pose to hazard sensitive activities. However the submitter seeks that this policy be amended so that an operational need for the Ministry to locate educational facilities in natural hazard areas to serve existing communities can be considered when managing development in natural hazard areas.	Amend NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as follows: Identify natural hazards within the District Plan and take a risk-based approach to the management of subdivision, use and development based on: 1. The sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards; and 2. The hazard posed to people's lives and wellbeing, property and infrastructure, by considering the likelihood and consequences of natural hazard events; and 3. <u>The operational need for some activities to locate in natural hazard areas.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.78	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	WIAL supports the intent of this relief to the extent that it is consistent with the outcomes sought from its primary submission.	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.
Oyster Management Limited	404.14	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	Supports NH-P1 to the extent that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood, or consequences of different natural hazard events.	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.213	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Oppose	Opposes NH-P1. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.214	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Amend	Opposes NH-P1. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) is amended to introduce the concept of tolerability.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.18	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	Supports the risk-based approach within the policy.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.61	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	Supports the policy as the policy makes an allowance for buildings or activities in the low, medium and high hazard areas where mitigation measures are incorporated to address the impacts from the relevant natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure. A number of established fire stations are located in either the low, medium or high hazard areas and it is supported that an opportunity exists for future additions or site layout amendments.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.125	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows: Subdivision, use and development minimises reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure by:...
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.23	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.11	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.11	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.25	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose in part	Consider NH-P2.1 is restrictive to allow only low occupancy or low replacement value development within the Natural Hazard Overlays. The Liquefaction Hazard Overlay applies to approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy does not appropriately recognise this context and existing built environment. Considers NH-P2.2 is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from natural hazards. This will not always be possible or practical. Further, Policy NH-P.2 should apply in all hazard areas. Considers NH-P2.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to high hazard areas under the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. Policy NH-P2.3 should apply to the Fault Hazard Overlay only, and also recognise functional need in this location. Notes that all activities except emergency service facilities are permitted within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. The policy should be consistent with the level of risk reflected in the rules	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows: Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure by: 1. Allowing for those buildings and activities that have either low occupancy or low replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays; 2. Requiring buildings and activities to reduce or not increase mitigate the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure in the low hazard, and medium and high hazard areas within the Natural Hazard Overlays; and 3. Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Fault Hazard Overlays unless there is a functional an exceptional reason for the building or activity to be located in this area and the activity mitigates the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.
Ministry of Education	400.47	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support in part	Support NH-P2 in part.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.48	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	Seeks that NH-P2 be amended. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards pose to hazard sensitive activities. However the submitter considers that, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter to locate educational facilities in these areas to serve existing communities. The submitters seeks an amendment so that this need can be considered when managing development in natural hazard areas, whilst also requiring natural hazard risk to be mitigated through any new development.	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows: Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure by: ... 3. Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays unless there is an exceptional reason or operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and the activity mitigates the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.52	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	Waka Kotahi supports a risk-based approach in providing for subdivision and development, and only in circumstances where there is an operational need provide for activities to be undertaken in the high hazard area.	Allow
CentrePort Limited	402.100	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support in part	Considers that the area within the Special Purpose Port Zone has a number of hazard risks including those categorised as high. However this policy seeks to only allow buildings and activities in exceptional circumstances rather than recognising there may be a functional need or operational requirement for the building or activity.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.101	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	Considers that the area within the Special Purpose Port Zone has a number of hazard risks including those categorised as high. However this policy seeks to only allow buildings and activities in exceptional circumstances rather than recognising there may be a functional need or operational requirement for the building or activity.	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows: ... 3. Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays unless there is an there is a functional need or operational requirement or other exceptional reason for the building or activity to be located in this area, and the activity mitigates the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.79	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	WIAL supports the intent of this relief to the extent that it is consistent with the outcomes sought from its primary submission.	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.215	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	<p>Opposes NH-P2.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes NH-P2 (Levels of risk) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.216	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	<p>Opposes NH-P2.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that NH-P2 (Levels of risk) is either deleted or amended to introduce the concept of tolerability.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.92	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	<p>Toka Tū Ake supports the suggestion that the concept of risk tolerance be included in natural hazard provisions. However, natural hazard risk tolerance is a concept which varies widely between people and communities, and it is impractical to include it in this instance as a comprehensive definition of 'tolerable' risk has not been developed nor has one been offered. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.</p>	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that NH-P2.1 is very restrictive to allow only low occupancy or low replacement value development within the Natural Hazard Overlays. The Liquefaction Hazard Overlay applies to approximately half of the CBD. This policy does not appropriately recognise this context and exacerbates the undue representation of risk.</p> <p>Considers that NH-P2.2 is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from natural hazards because mitigation will not always be possible or practical. Further, Policy NH-P.2 should apply in all hazard areas.</p> <p>Considers that NH-P2.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to high hazard areas under the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. Policy NHP2.3 should apply to the Fault Hazard Overlay only, and also recognise functional need in this location.</p> <p>Notes that all activities except emergency service facilities are permitted within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. The policy should be consistent with the level of risk reflected in the rules.</p>	Opposes NH-P2 (Levels of risk) in part.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.13	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	<p>Considers that NH-P2.1 is very restrictive to allow only low occupancy or low replacement value development within the Natural Hazard Overlays. The Liquefaction Hazard Overlay applies to approximately half of the CBD. This policy does not appropriately recognise this context and exacerbates the undue representation of risk.</p> <p>Considers that NH-P2.2 is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from natural hazards because mitigation will not always be possible or practical. Further, Policy NH-P.2 should apply in all hazard areas.</p> <p>Considers that NH-P2.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to high hazard areas under the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. Policy NHP2.3 should apply to the Fault Hazard Overlay only, and also recognise functional need in this location.</p> <p>Notes that all activities except emergency service facilities are permitted within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. The policy should be consistent with the level of risk reflected in the rules.</p>	<p>Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. Allowing for those buildings and activities that have either low occupancy or low replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays.</p> <p>1. 2- Requiring buildings and activities to reduce or not increase mitigate the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure in the low, and medium and high hazard areas within the Natural Hazard Overlays;</p> <p>2. 3- Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Fault Hazard Overlays unless there is a functional or operational or exceptional reason for the building or activity to be located in this area and the activity mitigates the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.</p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.12	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	The WCC proposed district plan liquefaction hazard overlay is based on the high and very high liquefaction zones shown in the GWRC liquefaction hazard maps, and it is appropriate to require low occupancy development and mitigation of the impact of natural hazards in this area and within all other Natural Hazard Overlays. Liquefaction is a real risk that has already been experienced in Wellington (e.g. during the 2016 Kaikoura earthquake), and ignoring the liquefaction risk in Christchurch resulted in catastrophic damage and retirement of land. MBIE guidelines for development in areas at risk from liquefaction recommend both land use planning to avoid more vulnerable activities in high risk areas, and requiring liquefaction resistant foundations for those buildings which are appropriate to develop in medium and high risk areas.	Disallow
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P3	Support	Supports the risk-based approach within the policy NH-P3 (Less hazard sensitive activities).	Retain NH-P3 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.126	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P3	Support	Supports for allowing for less hazard sensitive activities within certain areas is considered appropriate, where the risks are acceptable and flowpaths and stream corridors will be managed in accordance with this policy. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain NH-P3 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.5	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support	Supports NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) to the extent that it "provides for" additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area.	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.62	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.63	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	<p>Amend NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.127	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support	Supports where buildings containing hazard sensitive activities are located within the inundation flood hazard overlay, it is appropriate to allow additions to these buildings in certain circumstances and where the risks are acceptable. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.26	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support	Supports this policy to the extent that enables additions to buildings that accommodate potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.15	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support	Supports NH-P4 to the extent that it enables additions to buildings that accommodate potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.64	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Support NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.65	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.128	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Support	Supports this approach.	Retain NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.28	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Oppose in part	Opposes in part to Policy NH-P5.3 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays). Policy NH-P5.3 only allows additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within overland flowpaths and stream corridors where overland flowpaths and stream corridors are “unimpeded, and unobstructed to allow for the conveyancing of flood waters”.	Opposes Policy NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) in its current form and seeks amendment.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.29	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Amend	Seeks to amend Policy NH-P5.3 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays). Considers that the intention is that additions to buildings will allow for the conveyancing of flood waters, but the current wording of the policy is impractical. Considers that the terms “unimpeded, and unobstructed” may be restrictive that no additions would be allowed within overland flowpaths and stream corridors under this policy (with the effect that it could become a de facto avoidance policy). where an addition to a building is proposed to be constructed in an overland flowpath, the overland flowpath is likely to be obstructed to some extent. Seeks for this policy to be amended to allow for additions to buildings in overland flowpaths and stream corridors that allow for the conveyance of flood waters.	Amend Policy NH-P5.3 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Only Allow additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors, where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The risk from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood event is low due to either the: a. Proposed mitigation measures; b. Size of the addition; or c. Nature of the activities undertaken within the addition; and 2. The risk to people and property is reduced or not increased from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood; and 3. Overland flowpaths and stream corridors or other mechanisms are unimpeded, and unobstructed to allow for the conveyancing of flood waters.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Oppose	Supports NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as it provides for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area.	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.66	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Support NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.67	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.129	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Provide subdivision development and use for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to ensure the risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is minimised not increased or is reduced.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.24	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.12	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.12	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.27	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support	Supports this policy to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.49	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support	Supports NH-P6 and its requirement for mitigation measures to be incorporated into the development of hazard sensitive activities in inundation areas of flood hazard overlays.	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.16	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support in part	Supports NH-P6 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.17	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Oppose in part	Supports NH-P6 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant risk is posed to people and property.	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) to: Provide <u>for</u> subdivision, development and use for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to ensure the <u>that significant</u> risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is not increased or is reduced.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.18	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Amend	Supports NH-P6 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant risk is posed to people and property.	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) to: Provide <u>for</u> subdivision, development and use for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to ensure the <u>that significant</u> risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is not increased or is reduced.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.66	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Oppose	The submission does not make it clear what constitutes a “significant risk”, and the level of risk deemed significant may vary between communities. While the level of risk may vary within the flood inundation overlay, it is appropriate to require mitigation measures for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities throughout the zone. Any risk (not just significant risk) to people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.68	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.69	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.130	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths by: 1. Incorporating mitigation measures that <u>minimise the reduce or avoid an increase</u> in risk to people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood; ...
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.25	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.13	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.13	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ministry of Education	400.50	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Support	Supports NH-P7 and the management of development in overland flow paths of the flood hazard overlays as proposed, in order to reduce the impacts of natural hazards on hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Support in part	Supports NH-P7 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	Retain NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Oppose in part	Supports NH-P7 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant risk is posed to people and property.	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Incorporating mitigation measures that reduce or avoid an increase in <u>significant</u> risk to people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood;
Oyster Management Limited	404.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Amend	Supports NH-P7 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant risk is posed to people and property.	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Incorporating mitigation measures that reduce or avoid an increase in <u>significant</u> risk to people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood;
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.67	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Oppose	The submission does not make it clear what constitutes a “significant risk”, and the level of risk deemed significant may vary between communities. Unimpeded overland flowpaths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede, and development within them should be restricted. Any risk (not just significant risk) to people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.70	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.71	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.61	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Oppose in part	Considers that the use of both ‘avoid’ and ‘unless it can be demonstrated’ in NH-P8 is contradictory, and that the policy should be amended to be enabling when standards are met, rather than restrictive when standards are not met.	Opposes NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.62	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Amend	Considers that the use of both ‘avoid’ and ‘unless it can be demonstrated’ in NH-P8 is contradictory, and that the policy should be amended to be enabling when standards are met, rather than restrictive when standards are not met.	Amend NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: Avoid Enable subdivision development and use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors, unless where it can be demonstrated that: ...
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.131	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: Avoid subdivision development and use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors, unless it can be demonstrated that: ... 2. Mitigation measures are incorporated that minimise the reduce or avoid an increase in risk to people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability Flood; ...
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.26	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.14	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.14	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ministry of Education	400.51	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Support	Supports NH-P8 as the submitter acknowledges the risk which flood hazards can pose to people and property. However the submitter considers, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter to locate educational facilities in flood hazard overlays to provide for existing communities. The submitter therefore supports the provision as proposed.	Retain NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.72	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Support	Supports the policy insofar as it seeks to avoid the development of new emergency facilities within the liquefaction overlay, unless it can be demonstrated that the facility will be able to maintain functionality following an earthquake and emergency vehicles will be able to service the impacted community.	Supports NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay).
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.73	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.74	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.132	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Amend	Considers there is a risk here from allowing critical infrastructure in liquefaction prone areas. It is important to specify that the foundations are designed to the highest standard to minimise the risk that the building will be able to operate after an event. Good geotechnical design is able to achieve this and the clause would not add an unreasonable burden to the development design and makes it clear what is required. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) to add a clause to say that the foundation designs must be designed and certified by qualified Geotech engineer in order to prevent liquefaction induced deformation of the building and in doing so maintains its post event functionality.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.27	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support requiring a qualified geotechnical engineer to certify foundation designs for emergency facilities within the liquefaction hazard overlay, to increase resilience of the building and maintain post-event functionality.	Allow
CentrePort Limited	402.102	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Amend	The equivalent definition is Emergency Service Facilities which should be used here as Emergency Facility may be subject to interpretation.	Amend NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) as follows: Only allow new emergency <u>service</u> facilities within the Liquefaction Overlay where it can be demonstrated that: 1. <u>The emergency service facility will be able to maintain post disaster functionality following an earthquake; and</u> 2. <u>...</u>
CentrePort Limited	402.103	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Support in part	The equivalent definition is Emergency Service Facilities which should be used here as Emergency Facility may be subject to interpretation.	Support NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.67	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Amend	Considers policy needs to be amended for clarity and consistency.	Amend NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay)as follows: Manage subdivision, development or use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities, including additions to existing buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay by ensuring that: 1. The activity is located more than 20m of <u>from</u> the Wellington Faultline or Ohariu Faultline; and ...
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.75	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) with amendment:
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.76	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.133	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Manage subdivision, development or use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities, including additions to existing buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay by ensuring that: ... 3. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people, property and infrastructure is <u>minimised</u> reduced or not increased ; or ...
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.28	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.56	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Amend	Considers that NH-P10 should be clarified, namely the 20 meter rule. It is assumed 20m is meant to be a buffer and amended wording is proposed to reflect this.	Amend NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Manage subdivision, development or use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities, including additions to existing buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay by ensuring that: 1. The activity is located more than 20m of <u>from</u> the Wellington Faultline or Ohariu Faultline; and 2. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people, property and infrastructure is reduced or not increased.
Ministry of Education	400.52	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Support	Supports NH-P10 and the management of development in the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay as proposed.	Retain NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.104	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.77	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Retain NH-P11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.7	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residential dwellings able to be located within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. References the MfE guidelines for planning around an active fault that advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential) structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (≤2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC I and II (2000 – 3500 years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	Amend NH-P11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay Avoid subdivision, development or use associated with hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay unless it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity is located more than 20m from the Wellington Faultline or Ohariu Faultline, or 2. The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has a operational and functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option; and 3. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased; or 4. For additions to existing buildings, the change in risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.63	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Oppose in part	Considers that the use of both 'avoid' and 'unless it can be demonstrated' in NH-P11 is contradictory, and that the policy should be amended to be enabling when standards are met, rather than restrictive when standards are not met.	Opposes NH-11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.64	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Amend	Considers that the use of both 'avoid' and 'unless it can be demonstrated' in NH-P11 is contradictory, and that the policy should be amended to be enabling when standards are met, rather than restrictive when standards are not met.	Amend NH-11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Avoid Enable subdivision, development or use associated with hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay unless where it can be demonstrated that:
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.134	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Avoid subdivision, development or use associated with hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay unless it can be demonstrated that... 3. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is minimised reduced or not increased; or 4. For additions to existing buildings, the change in risk from fault rupture to people and property is minimised reduced or not increased.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.29	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.57	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Amend	Considers that NH-P11 should be amended, as it appears to allow for single residential buildings to be constructed on existing sites. Such as for a replacement dwelling or possibly in accordance with new rules allowing for infill housing on a single site. It may be prudent to not allow any new housing even on existing sites so that over time the fault lines are de-populated, reducing the risk of loss of life, reducing future insurance burdens and ultimately providing for more green corridors within the city.	Amend NH-P11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single <u>existing</u> residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay Avoid subdivision, development or use associated with hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single existing residential dwelling on an <u>existing</u> site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay.
Ministry of Education	400.53	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Support	Supports NH-P11 as the submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards can pose to people and property. However the submitter considers that, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter to locate educational facilities in fault overlays to provide for existing communities. The Ministry therefore supports the provision as proposed.	Retain NH-P11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.78	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Retain NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.79	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.135	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) as follows: Allow for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay with the exception of educational facilities, health care facilities and emergency facilities, where it can be demonstrated that the activity is more than 20m from either the Sheppard's Fault or Terawhiti Fault and the development incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is <u>minimised</u> reduced or not increased.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.30	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow
Ministry of Education	400.54	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Support in part	Supports NH-P12 in part.	Retain NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.55	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Amend	<p>Seeks that NH-P12 be amended. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards can pose to people and property. However, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter to locate educational facilities in fault overlays to provide for existing communities.</p> <p>The submitter therefore requests an amendment to this policy to provide for development in fault overlays where there is an operational need to locate there.</p> <p>The submitter notes that this would still require resource consent as a Discretionary Activity, which is considered appropriate and is supported.</p>	<p>Amend NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>Allow for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay with the exception of educational facilities, health care facilities and emergency facilities (<u>unless it can be demonstrated that these facilities have an operational need to be located in these areas</u>), where it can be demonstrated that the activity is more than 20m from either the Sheppard's Fault or Terawhiti Fault and the development incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	FS14.5	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Support	Fire and Emergency may have an operational and functional need to locate in the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay to ensure Fire and Emergency can maintain efficient and effective emergency response times to growing / changing communities.	Allow
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P13	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residential dwellings able to be located within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. MfE guidelines for planning around an active fault advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential) structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (≤2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC I and II (2000 – 3500 years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	<p>Amend NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay.) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for subdivision, development and use associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities, within the Wellington Fault Overlay, where the subdivision, development and use does not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities or any members of the public, <u>and where it can be demonstrated that the activity is located more than 20 m from the Wellington Fault.</u></p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.136	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P13	Support	Considers this provision is appropriate.	Retain NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.105	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P13	Oppose	Opposes NH-P13 as it is considered unnecessary. Large parts of the Port Operations including the Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the fault overlay. A policy limitation to 10 passengers or 10 employees would therefore render large parts of the Special Purpose Port Zone unusable for these activities.	Delete NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) in its entirety.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.94	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P13	Support	Supports policy that provides for and manages subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay.	Retain NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residential dwellings able to be located within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. MfE guidelines for planning around an active fault advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential) structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (≤2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC I and II (2000 – 3500 years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	<p>Amend NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>Manage subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay where the subdivision, development and use involves the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities by ensuring that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation measures are incorporated that avoid an increase in risk to people, property and infrastructure from the fault rupture of the Wellington Fault; <u>and</u> <u>Where it can be demonstrated that the activity is located more than 20 m from the Wellington Fault.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.137	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay where the subdivision, development and use involves the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities by ensuring that: 1. Mitigation measures are incorporated that <u>minimises the</u> avoid an increase in risk to people, property and infrastructure from the fault rupture of the Wellington Fault.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.31	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
CentrePort Limited	402.106	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Oppose	Opposes NH-P14 as it is considered unnecessary. Large parts of the Port Operations including the Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the fault overlay. A policy limitation to 10 passengers or 10 employees would therefore render large parts of the Special Purpose Port Zone unusable for these activities.	Opposes NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) and seeks amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.107	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Amend	Opposes NH-P14 as it is considered unnecessary. Large parts of the Port Operations including the Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the fault overlay. A policy limitation to 10 passengers or 10 employees would therefore render large parts of the Special Purpose Port Zone unusable for these activities.	Amend NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay where the subdivision, development and use involves the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities by ensuring that: 1. Mitigation measures are incorporated that avoid an increase in risk to people, property and infrastructure from the fault rupture of the Wellington Fault.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.95	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Support	Supports policy that provides for and manages subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay.	Retain NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.138	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P15	Support	Considers it is essential to provide for the maintenance and enhancement of natural systems and features where these features reduce the risk of the hazard. This aligns with operative RPS direction (Policies 51 and 52). Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain NH-P15 (Natural systems and features) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.58	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P15	Support	NH-P15 is supported, as natural systems and features have multiple benefits including for carbon sequestration, amenity value, attractiveness, cost-effectiveness and supporting biodiversity and ecosystems	Retain NH-P15 (Natural systems and features) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.139	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P16	Amend	Considers that NH-P16 as notified implies that the mitigation works will be hard-engineering based. This may not be the case, but it would be good to clarify in the policy that the mitigation works could consist of a range of options as outlined in NH-P17 and Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P16 (Natural hazard mitigation works) as follows: Enable natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works undertaken by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Overlays where <u>there is no other practicable option and</u> these will significantly decrease the existing risk to people’s lives and wellbeing, property and infrastructure.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.53	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P16	Support	Waka Kotahi supports enabling hazard mitigation or stream and river management works within the Natural Hazard Overlay where this will decrease the risk to people's lives and wellbeing, property and infrastructure.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.140	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P17	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend for consistency with Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the Proposed RPS Change directs consideration of, which aren't captured by green infrastructure. We therefore seek for this policy to be broadened. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P17 (Green infrastructure) as follows: Encourage the use of green infrastructure, non-structural, soft engineering or Mātauranga Māori approaches when undertaking natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Overlays.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.59	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P17	Amend	Considers that NH-P17 should be amended so that Green Infrastructure is the default choice for undertaking natural hazard mitigation, with other options considered in circumstances where green infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable, or are prohibitively expensive.	Amend NH-P17 (Green Infrastructure) as follows: Encourage <u>Require</u> the use of green infrastructure when undertaking natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Overlays <u>unless green infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable or are prohibitively expensive.</u>
Wellington City Council	266.68	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R1	Amend	Considers amendment needed for clarity and consistency.	Amend NH-R1 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas) as follows: Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas <u>Natural Hazard Overlays</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.103	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission as it is not consistent with the Kāinga Ora's primary submission.	Disallow
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R1	Support	Supports the provision of a permitted rule for activities within hazard areas.	Retain NH-R1 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.141	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R3	Amend	Considers there appears to be a numbering error in respect of the discretionary activity rule for green infrastructure.	Seeks to amend numbering to state '2', not '1' as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.7	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	Supports NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) and in particular supports the Permitted activity status, and the Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings in the inundation area and overland flow paths where the permitted activity status is not achieved.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.69	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Amend	Considers amendment needed for clarity and consistency.	Amend NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) as follows: Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor within the Flood Hazard Overlay
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.104	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission as it is not consistent with the Kāinga Ora's primary submission.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.80	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support in part	Subject to the relief sought for NH-P4 (which forms a matter of discretion where permitted conditions are infringed), is supportive of this rule which seeks to provide for additions to buildings in the Ponding Area and Overland Flow path as permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities. Notes that additions within a Stream Corridor would amount to a non-complying activity. The submitter has an existing fire station within a Stream Corridor which may need to be extended in the future and therefore seeks a discretionary activity status under such circumstances	Supports NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.81	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Amend	Subject to the relief sought for NH-P4 (which forms a matter of discretion where permitted conditions are infringed, is supportive of this rule which seeks to provide for additions to buildings in the Ponding Area and Overland Flow path as permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities. Notes that additions within a Stream Corridor would amount to a non-complying activity. The submitter has an existing fire station within a Stream Corridor which may need to be extended in the future and therefore seeks a discretionary activity status under such circumstances	Amend NH-R4.3 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) as follows: 3. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.a cannot be achieved. b. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.c cannot be achieved but there is a functional and operational need for such an infringement.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Amend	Considers that NH-R4 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab". There should also be some provision to allow small additions to be built at the existing floor level. It may be impractical and very likely serve no purpose to have the addition built at a higher level if the entire ground floor of the dwelling is subject to inundation as the result of extreme rain events.	Amend NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. When located within a inundation area, the finished floor levels of the addition for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities are demonstrated to be above the <u>level of 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab and an allowance for freeboard</u> ; or b. The additions are not located within an overland flowpaths; or c. The additions are not located within a stream corridor <u>or where the floor area of the extension is no more than 30m².</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.89	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	NH-R4 is supported as it permits additions to all buildings in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay where the finished floor levels of the addition for Hazard Sensitive and Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities are located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level. This rule is supported as it would enable minor upgrading and maintenance works where those works will have minimal effect on the flood bearing capacity of the land.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.30	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support in part	Supports additions to buildings in an inundation area to be permitted where they comply with NH-R4.1a and restricted discretionary if they do not comply. Considers that these are appropriate controls.	Retain rule NH-R4.1a (Construction of new buildings and structures) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.31	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Oppose in part	Seeks that the provisions for NH-R4.2 are amended to be restricted discretionary. Considers that it is inappropriate for additions to existing buildings to trigger a discretionary process, where the existing building is already subject to an overland flowpath. Considers it would be more appropriate for additions to buildings within an overland flowpath to be a restricted discretionary activity, which would still give a consent authority appropriate discretion to consider natural hazard risks.	Opposes Policy NH-R4.2 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area or overland flowpaths) in its current form and seeks amendment.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.32	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Amend	Seeks that the provisions for NH-R4.2 are amended to be restricted discretionary. Considers that it is inappropriate for additions to existing buildings to trigger a discretionary process, where the existing building is already subject to an overland flowpath. Considers it would be more appropriate for additions to buildings within an overland flowpath to be a restricted discretionary activity, which would still give a consent authority appropriate discretion to consider natural hazard risks. The amendments sought by Southern Cross would apply a consistent approach to inundation areas and overland flowpaths. These features can intersect, and do in this case, and it would be practical to take the same approach (which still allows for appropriate risk assessment by the Council).	Amend NH-R4.2 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.a and <u>NH-R4.1.b</u> cannot be achieved.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.33	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is inappropriate for additions to existing buildings to trigger a discretionary process, where the existing building is already subject to an overland flowpath.</p> <p>Considers it would be more appropriate for additions to buildings within an overland flowpath to be a restricted discretionary activity, which would still give a consent authority appropriate discretion to consider natural hazard risks.</p> <p>The amendments sought by Southern Cross would apply a consistent approach to inundation areas and overland flowpaths. These features can intersect, and do in this case, and it would be practical to take the same approach (which still allows for appropriate risk assessment by the Council).</p>	<p>Amend NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as follows:</p> <p>....</p> <p>2. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1 b cannot be achieved.</p> <p>...</p>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.28	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	Supports the direction of this rule to enable additions to buildings within a Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area as a permitted activity or restricted discretionary activity.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, the overland flowpaths, or the stream corridor) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.22	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	Supports the direction of this rule to enable additions to buildings within a Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area as a permitted activity where compliance with NH-R4.1 cannot be achieved.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.14	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	Supports NH-R4 and in particular supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings in the Inundation Area where the permitted activity status is not achieved.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.70	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R5	Amend	Considers it necessary to fix a drafting error where both matters of discretion in NH-R5 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) refer to potentially hazard sensitive activities.	<p>Amend NH-R5.2 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. For additions to potentially hazard sensitive activities - the matters in NH-P11; and 2. For additions to potentially hazard sensitive activities - the matters in NH-P10.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.82	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R5	Support in part	Supports this rule as it seeks to provide for additions to buildings for hazard-sensitive activities within a Fault Overlay as permitted or restricted discretionary activity. Notes that emergency service facilities are considered a hazard-sensitive activity and, as such, seeks the addition of a permitted activity standard which allows additions to buildings within a Fault Overlay when there is a functional and operational need to do so.	Supports NH-R5 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.83	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R5	Amend	Supports this rule as it seeks to provide for additions to buildings for hazard-sensitive activities within a Fault Overlay as permitted or restricted discretionary activity. Notes that emergency service facilities are considered a hazard-sensitive activity and, as such, seeks the addition of a permitted activity standard which allows additions to buildings within a Fault Overlay when there is a functional and operational need to do so.	<p>Amend NH-R5 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>....</p> <p>d. The additions do not increase the Gross Floor Area of a Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activity in Wellington Fault Overlay or the Ohariu Fault Overlay by more than 30m²; <u>or</u></p> <p>e. <u>There is a functional and operational need for the activity in the Fault Overlay.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.10	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R6	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residential dwellings able to be located within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. MfE guidelines for planning around an active fault advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential) structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (≤2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC I and II (2000 – 3500 years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	Amend NH-R6-1 (Construction of a residential unit or conversion of any non-residential building into a residential unit in the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The development involves the construction of no more than one additional residential unit on a site; and b. The total number of residential units on a site is no more than two; <u>and</u> c. <u>It can be demonstrated that the unit is more than 20 m away from the Wellington or Ohariu Faults.</u>
Kimberley Vermaey	348.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R6	Amend	Considers that due to the hazard and potential impacts presented by the Wellington fault, the maximum number of permitted dwellings should be limited to 1 instead of the proposed 2 dwellings. Any proposals involving more than 1 dwelling should be a non-complying activity within the fault hazard overlay.	Amend NH-R6 (Construction of a residential unit or conversion of any non-residential building into a residential unit in the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlays) to allow only 1 residential unit per site. More than one dwelling per site should be assessed as a non-complying activity .
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.84	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Support in part	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Supports NH-R7 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.85	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Amend	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Amend NH-R7 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 3. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The development does not involve the establishment of either: i. Educational facilities; ii. Health care facilities; or iii. Emergency service facilities.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.11	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Amend	Considers that hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities should be located 20m away from the Sheppard or Terawhiti Faults. References the MfE guidelines for planning around active faults which indicate to avoid hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities within 20 m of RIC III faults. Considers that no hazardous activities should be permitted within 20 m of either fault trace given Shepherd's Gully Fault is RIC III (3500 – 5000 years), and the Terawhiti fault has not yet had its recurrence interval calculated, no hazardous activities should be permitted within 20 m of either fault trace.	Amend NH-R7-1 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: <u>a. It can be demonstrated that the activity is more than 20 m away from the Shepherd's Gully or Terawhiti Fault; and</u> <u>b. The development does not involve the establishment of either:</u> i. Educational facilities; ii. Health care facilities; or iii. Emergency service facilities; <u>or</u> <u>iv. Hazardous facilities and Major Hazardous Facilities.</u>
Ministry of Education	400.56	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Support in part	Support NH-R7 in part. In particular, the submitter supports the Discretionary Activity status for educational facilities and considers it to be appropriate.	Retain NH-R7 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.57	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Amend	Seeks that NH-R7 be amended. The submitter seeks changes to this rule to more accurately reflect the policy direction outlined in NH-P12.	Amend NH-R7 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The development does not involve the establishment of either: iv. Educational facilities; v. Health care facilities; or vi. Emergency service facilities; <u>and</u> <u>b. The activity is located more than 20 m away from either the Sheppard's Fault or Terawhiti Fault;</u> <u>and</u> <u>c. The development incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased.</u> 2. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R7.1.a, <u>b or c</u> cannot be achieved.
CentrePort Limited	402.108	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R8	Support in part	Support subject to submission points on NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) and NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay). Large parts of the Port are subject to Natural Hazards.	Retain NH-R8 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified, subject to amendments sought relating to NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) and NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay).
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.96	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R8	Support	Supports the ability to undertake operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities as a permitted activity.	Retain NH-R8 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support	Supports NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as it provides for all activities except emergency service facilities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to occur as a permitted activity.	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.86	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support in part	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Supports NH-R9 (Activities in the liquefaction hazard overlay) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.87	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Amend	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Amend NH-R9 (Activities in the liquefaction hazard overlay) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. It involves a less hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activity, or b. It involves a hazard sensitive activity that is not an emergency service facility.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.29	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being permitted in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the liquefaction hazard overlay) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.58	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support	Supports NH-R9, in particular the permitted activity status for the establishment of educational facilities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.15	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support	Supports NH-R9 as it provides for all activities except emergency service facilities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to occur as a permitted activity. This is appropriate and proportionate to the risk level and ability to mitigate that risk.	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support in part	Supports NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay), as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Permitted activity where conditions around floor levels are met.	Retain NH-R10.1 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.10	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support in part	Supports the Restricted Discretionary status for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with the conditions of NH-R10.1.	Retain NH-R10.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Amend	Considers that NH-R10 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab".	Amend NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. When located within a Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the finished floor levels of the building for the potentially hazard sensitive activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab <u>and an allowance for freeboard.</u> ...
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.90	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	NH-R10 is supported as it enables Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a permitted activity where the finished floor levels of the building for the Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level. This approach is supported in principle, which (in accordance with Policy NH-P6) seeks that measures be incorporated to ensure the risk to people, property and infrastructure both on the site and on adjacent properties is not significantly increased by Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities.	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.30	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports the direction of this rule to enable potentially hazard sensitive activities within a Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area as a permitted activity, or restricted discretionary activity if NH-R10.1 cannot be achieved.	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.23	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports direction of this rule to enable potentially hazard sensitive activities within a Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area as a permitted activity, or restricted discretionary activity if NH-R10.1 cannot be achieved.	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.31	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports the provisions setting permitted and restricted discretionary activity status. Considers that this provides for an appropriate balance of risk management while retaining appropriate discretion to address natural hazard risks. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.16	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support in part	Supports NH-R10, as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Permitted activity where conditions around floor levels are met. The commercial activities carried out at Fabric's properties are potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-R10.1 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.17	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support in part	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with the conditions of NH-R10.1. The restricted discretionary activity status provides for an appropriate balance of risk management while retaining appropriate discretion to address natural hazards.	Retain NH-R10.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.1	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports permitting potentially sensitive activities in the Flood Inundation overlay with mitigation (as outlined in NH-R10).	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.15	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports the Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay being a Permitted Activity, as the commercial activities at the Johnsonville Town Centre are potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-R10.1 (potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.16	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for activities not complying with the conditions of NH-R10.1. (potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay)	Retain NH-R10.2 (potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.88	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Flood Hazard Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Supports NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.89	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Flood Hazard Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Amend NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: Matters of discretion are: 1. The impact from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood is low due to either the: a. Implementation mitigation measures; b. The shallow depth of the flood waters within the building; or c. Type of activity undertaken within the building; and 2. The risk to people and property is reduced or not increased; <u>and</u> 3. <u>There is a functional and operational need for the activity in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard overlay</u>
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.22	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers that NH-R11 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab".	Amend NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. When located within a Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the finished floor levels of the building for the hazard sensitive activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, <u>plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab and an allowance for freeboard.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.91	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support	NH-R11 is supported, as it enables Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a restricted discretionary activity where the finished floor levels of the building for the Hazard Sensitive Activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level. This rule is supported for the same reason as NH-R10.	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.34	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	Supports hazard sensitive activities in inundation areas being restricted discretionary where the finished floor levels of the building are located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level (including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab.)	Retain rule NH-R11.1 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.35	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose in part	Seeks for the activity status for hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area that do not comply with Rule NH-R11.1 be discretionary. The activity status of non-complying may overstate the risk of locating such activities in an inundation area. It is appropriate for a consent authority to use its full discretion to undertake an assessment of the activity with the benefit of a consent application, and an assessment under s 104D of the Resource Management Act 1991 is not required.	Opposes Policy NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) in its current form and seeks amendment.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.36	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Seeks for the activity status for hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area that do not comply with Rule NH-R11.1 be discretionary. The activity status of non-complying may overstate the risk of locating such activities in an inundation area. It is appropriate for a consent authority to use its full discretion to undertake an assessment of the activity with the benefit of a consent application, and an assessment under s 104D of the Resource Management Act 1991 is not required.	Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 2. Activity Status: <u>Discretionary Non-Complying</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NHR11.1. a cannot be achieved.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.158	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose in part	NH-R11 is opposed, as identified flooding inundation areas carry the lowest risk of natural hazard potential and are more than capable of being mitigated.	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with amendment.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.8	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.</p> <p>Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon's catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).</p> <p>This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance.</p> <p>There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc.</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for included map].</p>	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.159	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to have a permitted activity pathway. Identified flooding inundation areas carry the lowest risk of natural hazard potential and are more than capable of being mitigated. Therefore it is considered that a permitted activity pathway should be available for development that achieves the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, including allowance for freeboard.	<p>Amend NH-R11.1 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and its title as follows:</p> <p>Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard <u>Overlay Area</u></p> <p>1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. When located within a Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard <u>Overlay Area</u>, the finished floor levels of the building for the hazard sensitive activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The impact from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood is low due to either the:-</p> <p>a. Implementation mitigation measures;</p> <p>b. The shallow depth of the flood waters within the building; or</p> <p>c. Type of activity undertaken within the building; and</p> <p>2. The risk to people and property is reduced or not increased.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.9	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.</p> <p>Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon's catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).</p> <p>This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance.</p> <p>There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc.</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for included map].</p>	Disallow
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.54	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	<p>It is not appropriate for hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the flood inundation hazard overlay to have permitted status. Flooding is the most common natural hazard faced in Aotearoa, and repeated flooding events can have severe effects on properties and the wellbeing of residents. As the depth of expected flood inundation and thus risk varies within the overlay, restricted discretionary status allows for restriction of development within higher risk areas of the overlay. As discussed elsewhere, regulatory hazard overlays for flooding should remain in the district plan.</p>	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.78	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	<p>Greater Wellington oppose a permitted activity for hazard sensitive activities in the Flood Hazard Overlay as it does not allow sufficient oversight of development in natural hazard areas.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that NH-R11 is retained as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.160	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	<p>Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to have a permitted activity pathway. Identified flooding inundation areas carry the lowest risk of natural hazard potential and are more than capable of being mitigated. Therefore it is considered that a permitted activity pathway should be available for development that achieves the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, including allowance for freeboard.</p>	<p>Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot be achieved.</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>1. The degree to which the impact from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood is low due to either the:</u></p> <p><u>a) Implementation of mitigation measures</u></p> <p><u>b) The shallow depth of the flood waters within the building; or</u></p> <p><u>c) Type of activity undertaken within the building</u></p> <p><u>2. The extent to which the risk to people and property is reduced or not increased.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.10	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.</p> <p>Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon's catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).</p> <p>This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance.</p> <p>There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc.</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for included map].</p>	Disallow
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.55	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard.	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.24	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support	Supports the direction of this rule that hazard sensitive activities (e.g. emergency service facilities) are a RD activity within the Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.32	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	<p>Supports in part, as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.</p> <p>Considers that the non-complying status where the restricted discretionary rule cannot be met is too onerous. Considers that a discretionary activity status is more appropriate and would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).</p>	Retain NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.33	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers that the non-complying status where the restricted discretionary rule cannot be met is too onerous. Considers that a discretionary activity status is more appropriate and would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	<p>Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity Status: Non-Complying Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot be achieved.</p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.41	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people and property at risk from flood hazard.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	405.34	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	<p>Supports in part, as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.</p> <p>Considers that the non-complying status where the restricted discretionary rule cannot be met is too onerous. Considers that a discretionary activity status is more appropriate and would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).</p>	Retain NH-R12.2 (Potentially Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.35	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers that the non-complying status where the restricted discretionary rule cannot be met is too onerous. Considers that a discretionary activity status is more appropriate and would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	<p>Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity Status: Non-Complying Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.42	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Potentially hazard sensitive activities, which include commercial activities, offices, and retail activities, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people and property at risk from flood hazard.	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.18	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	Supports NH-R11.1 in part, as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.	Supports NH-R11.1 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay), with amendment.
Fabric Property Limited	425.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Seeks amendments to NH-R11.2 to make the default activity status Discretionary within the Inundation Area for Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NHR11.1, rather than Non-Complying. Considers this would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	Amend NH-R11.2 as follows: 1. Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot be achieved.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.17	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	Supports in part NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay), as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a Restricted Discretionary.	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified, with amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.18	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Seeks amendments to NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) to make the default activity status Discretionary within the Inundation Area for Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NH-R11.1, rather than Non-Complying. Considers that this would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot be achieved
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.81	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard.	Disallow
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.11	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Support in part	Supports NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay) in part, as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the overland flow path overlay as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.	Not specified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	Seeks amendments to NH-R12.2 to make the default activity status Discretionary within the overland flow path for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NH-R12.1, rather than Non-Complying. This would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the overland flow path overlay (as provided in rule NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths of the Flood Hazard Overlay)).	Amend NH-R12.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.23	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab".	Amend NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. When located within an overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the finished floor levels of the building for the potentially hazard sensitive activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab and an allowance for freeboard.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.161	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Support in part	NH-R12 is supported for its general approach that impacts on hazard sensitive activities should be mitigated in medium risk areas in accordance with NH-P2. On this basis rule NH-R12.2 needs to be amended as overland flowpaths are identified as a medium risk area in the chapter introduction.	Retain NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.162	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to have a discretionary activity status. Overland flowpaths are identified as a medium risk area in the chapter introduction. Consequently, it is sought that the consent status of NH-R12 be made discretionary rather than non-complying as non-complying status is generally utilised for avoidance rather than mitigation.	Amend NH-R12.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.56	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the overland flowpath area of the flood hazard overlay should remain non-compliant when freeboard levels are not met. Unimpeded overland flowpaths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.79	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the discretionary pathway suggested by the submitter as this undermines the risk-based approach adopted in the Proposed District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks that NH-R12 is retained as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.25	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose in part	Supports restricted discretionary activity status for NH-R12.1, but considers that if RD status is not achieved, the activity status should become Discretionary rather than NC.	Amend NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) to: 2. Activity status: Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved
Oyster Management Limited	404.26	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Support in part	Supports restricted discretionary activity status for NH-R12.1, but considers that if RD status is not achieved, the activity status should become Discretionary rather than NC.	Retain NH-R12.1 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.27	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	Supports restricted discretionary activity status for NH-R12.1, but considers that if RD status is not achieved, the activity status should become Discretionary rather than NC.	Amend NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 2. Activity status: Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.68	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Potentially hazard sensitive activities, which include commercial activities, offices, and retail activities, within the overland flowpath area of the flood hazard overlay should remain non-compliant when freeboard levels are not met. Unimpeded overland flowpaths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Impeded overland flowpaths may also lead to larger effects on the environment, such as contaminated flood water from commercial activities affecting water quality and human and environmental health. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Support in part	Supports in part NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Overland Flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.	Retain NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified, with amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	Seeks amendments to make the default activity status Discretionary within the Overland Flowpath overlay for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NH-R12.1, rather than Non-Complying. Considers that the risks from activities within an overland flowpath overlay can be appropriately assessed as a Discretionary Activity. Considers that a Discretionary status would also be consistent with the activity status for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Overland Flowpath as set out in NH-R13.	Amend NH-R12.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 2. Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.82	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Potentially hazard sensitive activities, which include commercial activities, offices, and retail activities, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard.	Disallow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.37	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Oppose in part	Seeks that hazard sensitive activities within an overland flowpath are a restricted discretionary activity. This would be more consistent with Policy NH-P1 to take a risk-based approach to subdivision, use and development based on the hazards posed. It would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to take a consistent approach to assessing hazard sensitive activities in overland flowpaths and inundation areas. While we appreciate that the Council has identified overland flowpaths and inundation areas as having different hazard rankings, the level of risk arising from the hazard will depend on the actual activity. This rule relates to the risk to people involved in hazard sensitive activities, and the risks are similar to people involved in hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area to hazard sensitive activities in an overland flowpath.	Opposes NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) in its current form and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.38	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Amend	<p>Seeks that hazard sensitive activities within an overland flowpath are a restricted discretionary activity. This would be more consistent with Policy NH-P1 to take a risk-based approach to subdivision, use and development based on the hazards posed.</p> <p>It would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to take a consistent approach to assessing hazard sensitive activities in overland flowpaths and inundation areas.</p> <p>While we appreciate that the Council has identified overland flowpaths and inundation areas as having different hazard rankings, the level of risk arising from the hazard will depend on the actual activity. This rule relates to the risk to people involved in hazard sensitive activities, and the risks are similar to people involved in hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area to hazard sensitive activities in an overland flowpath.</p>	<p>Amend NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary</p>
Ministry of Education	400.59	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Support	Supports NH-R13 as it enables the establishment of educational facilities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Discretionary Activity. The submitter considers this to be appropriate.	Retain NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.28	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Amend	Considers that this rule should provide a tiered approach to activity status, specifically where compliance with the floor level (as per NH-12.1.a) is a RD activity.	<p>Amend NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is achieved.</u></p> <p>2. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is not achieved.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.69	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the overland flowpath area of the flood hazard overlay should remain discretionary. Unimpeded overland flowpaths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Impeded overland flowpaths may also lead to larger effects on the environment, such as contaminated flood water from commercial activities affecting water quality and human and environmental health. Amending this to restricted discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area.	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.29	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Oppose in part	Considers that this rule should provide a tiered approach to activity status, specifically where compliance with the floor level (as per NH-12.1.a)) is a RD activity.	<p>Amend NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is achieved.</u></p> <p>2. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is not achieved.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Investore Property Limited	405.36	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Support	Supports the Discretionary activity status for Hazard Sensitive Activities.	Retain NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.

Historical and Cultural Values - Historic Heritage

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Support	Supports NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay).	Retain NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.60	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R15	Support	Supports NH-R15 as the submitter considers that the non-complying activity status for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay is appropriate.	Retain NH-R15 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R16	Amend	Considers that residential units should be included as hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. References the MfE guidelines for planning around an active fault that advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential) structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (≤2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC I and II (2000 – 3500 years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	Amend NH-R16-1 (Hazard sensitive activities (excluding a single residential unit) within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Hazard sensitive activities (excluding a single residential unit) within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay 1. Activity status: Non-Complying
Ministry of Education	400.61	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R16	Support	Supports NH-R16 as the submitter considers that non-complying activity status for hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay is appropriate.	Retain NH-R16 (Hazard sensitive activities (excluding a single residential unit) within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.
James Coyle	307.3	Historical and Cultural Values / General point on Historical and Cultural Values / General point on Historical and Cultural Values	Support	Supports Heritage and Culture as they give a sense of place. Projects that retain elements of heritage should be supported and encouraged.	Retain the Historical and Cultural Values chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.60	Historical and Cultural Values / General point on Historical and Cultural Values / General point on Historical and Cultural Values	Support in part	Generally supportive.	Not specified.
Andrew Haddleton	23.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Considers that in other cities, such as Auckland and Christchurch, councillors have pushed back to protect their heritage. WCC should do the same. Wellington is famous for its heritage housing and appearance. Allowing more concrete and glass buildings will ruin the tourist appeal of the city.	Not specified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	[No reasons given other than decision]	Supports Historic Heritage Introduction with amendment.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.2	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.14	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that as Appendix 1 (Historic Heritage Advice Notes) contains reference to the NZ Archaeological Association data base and the role of HNZPT with regards to archaeological sites, it would also be beneficial for plan users reading the Historic Heritage chapter to be reminded of the provisions which apply to both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites.	Amend the introduction section of the Historic Heritage Chapter where it refers to APP1 - Historic Heritage Advice Notes as follows: ... APP1 - Historic Heritage Advice Notes contains useful information on assessing effects on heritage values and the different ways in which historic heritage is addressed by regulation and advocacy. <u>APP1 also contains reference to the provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 which protect all archaeological sites.</u> ...
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of 134 Brougham Street within the Moir Street Heritage Area (Item 44 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas). 134 Brougham Street (The property) is not a heritage example of Edwardian or character housing. Relevance to the Moir family home has been lost because of significant alterations to the property. Structure and weather proofing of the property is deteriorating and heritage area status makes repairs and development difficult. John Moir only lived in the property for <5 years. Most of the Heritage Assessment Criteria do not specifically or reasonably apply to the property. Heritage Area status will reduce ability to densify Mt Victoria and maximise the development potential of this particular site. [See original submission for further detail]	Seeks that 134 Brougham Street is excluded from the Moir Street Heritage Area (Item 44 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas).
Turi & Jane Park	73.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that there was insufficient correspondence from the Council on the proposed inclusion of 134 Brougham Street within the Moir Street Heritage Area and that they have been let down by the Council	[Not specified]
Oliver Sangster	112.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Opposed to the inclusion of the Gordon Wilson Flats on SCHED1-Heritage buildings (# 299). Considers that the flats are an embarrassing and sorry sight in a time when there is a growing problem of homelessness and high rents in Wellington. Considers that the flats need to be demolished to make way for more housing near our city centre and Victoria University. Considers that because they already have Heritage New Zealand protection, further protection under the district plan is unnecessary.	Seeks that the demolition or alteration of any kind of Item 299 (Gordon Wilson Flats) on SCHED1- Heritage Buildings be a permitted activity.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sophie Kahn	161.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	[Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that only public owned structures should listed as heritage in the Proposed District Plan, unless privately owned property has the agreement of an owner.
Ian Attwood	FS16.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Privately-owned, independent suburban homes should not be included in the Plan unless within a recognised precinct or with the agreement of the owner.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.33	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	The further submitter supports the view in relation to private and isolated homes. Notes that it is unfair to burden private homeowners so significantly and discount and dismiss the impact of their economic wellbeing and property rights.	Allow / Seeks that Item 520 (Khan House) be removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings. The Council does not list private homes in SCHED1 without owners consent. Especially in the case where these are homes are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct or area that can be appreciated by the public.
Sophie Kahn	161.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the Council should offer to purchase those homes it proposed to list when owners are not supportive of listing.	[None specified].
Ian Attwood	FS16.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	If Council wishes to preserve architectural heritage to the benefit of citizens and community and without owners incurring losses, then it should be required to acquire the properties and/or financially support the retention and maintenance.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	The further submitter supports council offering to purchase homes proposed for listing. Notes that the point the original submitter makes is aligned with the section titles "No nonregulatory incentive options for protection have been considered" on page 47 of our submission and "The Council is naturally incentivised to over-provide Heritage" on page 21. Notes that requiring the Council to compensate owners for the heritage services they mandate, or for them to purchase properties where owners are opposed, would provide important balance and restraint to their incentives to over procure heritage as they bear no cost of doing so.	Allow / Seeks that the Council offer to purchase homes proposed for listing when the owners are opposed. Seeks that the Council investigate other non-regulatory incentive schemes (as expected under the RMA) including enduring rates remissions for private owners providing heritage services to the city.
Historic Places Wellington	182.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the HH - Historic Heritage chapter with amendment.
Historic Places Wellington	182.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Supports continuing to promote seismic strengthening of heritage places.	Not specified.
Historic Places Wellington	182.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose in part	Considers the chapter has become too permissive in its drafting and opposes it to this degree.	Seeks that the chapter takes a more mandatory, conservation and preservation focus.
Parliamentary Service	FS48.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as it does not recognise that in some circumstances, a mandatory focus on conservation and preservation is not appropriate and cannot enable the sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington	182.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Opposes facadism as an outcome for heritage buildings.	Add a new policy or rule to the HH - Historic Heritage Chapter to make it clear that only in exceptional instances will facadism be appropriate, and only if consistent with ICOMOS guidelines.
Mike Camden	226.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that HH rules are very "Enabling".	Seeks that the Historic Heritage chapter is amended to support more reuse, refurbishment and conservation.
Mike Camden	226.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendments to the Historic Heritage chapter for protection for stained and decorative heritage glass windows in Heritage Buildings.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that historic elements in the Wellington Botanic Gardens (e.g. Talavera Cable Car Station) should be given heritage protection. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that heritage protection is extended in the Botanic Gardens.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that Hay Street has heritage values, as evidenced in the report titled 'Hay Street Heritage Area - Heritage Assessment' included with the submission.	Seeks that development in Hay Street is restricted due to the heritage values (as a qualifying matter).
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.86	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	The submitter oppose points 237.2, 237.3, & 237.5 to restrict development due to 'qualifying matters' and retain Hay Street as MRZ. Qualifying Matters are set out in s771 of the RMA Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act 2021. Hay Street itself does not have any qualifying matters. Site specific limitations are addressed in a s88 RMA report Assessment of Environmental Effects. While Oriental Bay's special character has been addressed in the special Precinct Height Control's (PREC-03) overlay, it is not a Qualifying Matter. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
Cherie Jacobson	251.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that heritage is given inadequate weight in the PDP. The heritage policies have a focus on enabling works as opposed to enabling conservation. There is a lack of evidence indicating that the existing heritage and character provisions in the District Plan are affecting the housing market in Wellington. Heritage and character can make a significant contribution to Wellington's climate change goals by reducing emissions and waste through sustainable resource use.	Not specified.
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that when Salisbury Garden Court was listed as a heritage area, at the initiative of owners and residents, the key heritage feature sought to be protected was historic connectedness. The heritage controls imposed are, in practice, too heavy and go well beyond what is sought to be protected. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Item 24 (Salisbury Garden Court) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas) is exempt from all Heritage Zone Controls except HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) and HH-R1 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures).
Wellington City Council	266.71	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers minor amendment necessary for consistency. In addition it is considered that this section makes no mention of the recognised heritage values of buildings.	Amend Historic Heritage Introduction as follows: (...) Sustainable long-term use One of the best ways to protect <u>the recognised heritage values of</u> built heritage is to ensure that it remains in a sustainable long term <u>long-term</u> use.
Property Council New Zealand	338.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	Supports heritage as a qualifying matter. Retaining genuine heritage in Wellington is critical in maintaining a high quality, desirable and liveable building environment. It is however important that the Council ensures Wellington has sufficient development capacity when engaging with property owners on proposed new heritage listings.	Not specified.
Parliamentary Service	375.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	The Historical Heritage chapter introduction is generally supported, but wording in the Sustainable long-term use objective should be amended. The objective needs to more clearly recognise the need to ensure heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way – "sustainable long-term use" does not adequately capture the concept of ensuring buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.	Retain the Historic Heritage Introduction with amendments.
Parliamentary Service	375.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that the Sustainable long-term use objective needs to more clearly recognise the need to ensure heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way – "sustainable long-term use" does not adequately capture the concept of ensuring buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.	Amend the Historic Heritage Chapter Introduction to acknowledge that it is important to ensure that built heritage can continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.31	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Supports the Introduction to the extent that it recognises that 'reuse' (defined as "changing the use of a building or object from that which it was originally constructed for") of a heritage building can be appropriate and facilitated by additions or alterations. This is important to balance the importance of retaining heritage values while enabling appropriate use of heritage buildings	Retain HH - Introduction as notified.
Parliamentary Service	FS48.1	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission because "reuse" and "appropriate use" may facilitate works which enable the continued practicable and functional use of heritage buildings.	Allow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that within the 'Cross references to other relevant District Plan provisions' that it is amended to include Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.65	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that chapter includes appropriate rules to ensure protection of SASMs in or near identified Historic Heritage sites.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.123	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Greater Wellington support the inclusion and protection of SASM.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.163	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose in part	The Historic Heritage chapter is partially opposed as it is unclear which rules apply to a scheduled heritage building, a non-scheduled contributing building, and a non-scheduled non-contributing buildings.	Opposes the Historic Heritage chapter and seeks amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.164	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that the Historic Heritage chapter should be amended to provide further clarification and should define contributing and non-contributing buildings, scheduled and non-scheduled building. It is not clear which rules apply to a scheduled heritage building, a non-scheduled contributing building, and a non-scheduled non-contributing buildings. Amendments are required throughout the chapter to provide clarity to when rules apply to respective buildings in Historic Heritage chapter.	Seeks amendments to the Historic Heritage chapter to provide clarity in provisions applying to: - Scheduled heritage buildings, - Non-scheduled heritage buildings considered to be contributing buildings; and - Non-scheduled heritage buildings that are non-contributing.
Murray Pillar	393.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	Supports the heritage rules but notes that they are very "enabling" i.e. permissive.	Not specified.
Murray Pillar	393.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Supports the heritage rules but notes that they are very "enabling" i.e. permissive.	Seeks that the heritage rules are drafted to support more conservation.
Parliamentary Service	FS48.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as it does not recognise that in some circumstances, a focus on conservation is not appropriate and cannot enable the sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Considers that there is a lack of evidence to support the heritage content of the PDP, including for the following reasons: - The provisions lack a reliable evidence base and a qualitative report on the effectiveness of the operative plan provisions in necessary. - There is little evidence to support claims that the provisions are working as intended - There is little evidence that the heritage and character provisions are affecting the housing market in wellington. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.31	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that Wellington has struggled to retain its historic heritage and continues to lose listed and unlisted heritage of national significance.</p> <p>Considers that the city centre only retains a small pool of representative heritage from its past, and this is dominated by public buildings and clusters of commercial buildings. Many of Wellington's surviving historic buildings have been significantly altered, partially demolished or incorporated into larger buildings.</p>	Not specified
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.32	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	<p>Considers that some of the heritage and plan content does not reflect best practice.</p> <p>Considers that the heritage policies have a focus on enabling works as opposed to enabling conservation, based on an assumption that heritage protection has prevented necessary development.</p> <p>Opposes more permissive rules for historic heritage and considers that finite environmental values like historic heritage need discretion through consent processes</p> <p>Considers that this is a fundamental misunderstanding of ICOMOS New Zealand charter and the principles of heritage conservation.</p>	Not specified.
Parliamentary Service	FS48.5	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as it does not provide for appropriate activities or recognise that a focus on conservation may prevent works that enable the sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.33	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	<p>Considers concern that if the plan as proposed is implemented, historic heritage and character which is of significance to current and future Wellingtonians, will be lost or altered.</p> <p>Considers concern that the proposed plan's more permissive rules for historic heritage, the inadequacy of the schedule in reflecting Wellington's heritage, and the reductive approach to character areas.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Not specified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	<p>Considers that there is little reliable evidence that the current district plan has been effective at preventing or mitigating the loss of Wellington's historic heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the move in the PDP towards making more activities permitted is likely to result in adverse effects on historic heritage.</p> <p>Considers that finite environmental values like historic heritage need discretion through consent processes. As such, we are concerned that the more permissive rules in the proposed district plan for historic heritage will not adequately provide for the protection of historic heritage as a matter of national importance under section 6f of the RMA and will not achieve objective HH-02 Protecting Historic Heritage.</p>	Seeks that more historic heritage related activities need the activity status of discretionary. [Inferred decision requested].
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.35	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that it is not necessary to refer to partial demolition as a way of facilitating sustainable long term use as it is captured by 'alterations' and suggests partial demolition applications would be welcome, whereas they should be discouraged.	Amend the introduction to the Historic Heritage chapter as follows: ... Both ongoing use and reuse can be a sustainable long term use for built heritage and can be facilitated by compatible additions and alterations, and/or carefully done partial demolition.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.36	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that the reference to 'continuity of buildings and structures' as it relates to heritage areas is not clear. Some significant heritage areas are not 'continuous' and contain gaps where non-contributing buildings are located.	[inferred decision requested] clarify the meaning of 'continuity of buildings and structures' under the description of heritage areas.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that the 'sustainable long term use' section should explicitly allow for stabilisation and mothballing. This section is very focussed on 'use' as the be all and end all. However, if there isn't a reasonable use right now that doesn't mean the only other option is demolition.	Amend the section on sustainable long term use to explicitly allow for stabilisation and mothballing.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Parliamentary Service	FS48.6	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as it does not provide for appropriate activities or recognise that a focus on conservation may prevent works that enable the sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.38	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	<p>Considers that the description of Heritage areas should be explicit (like the current District Plan) that it is 'because of their contribution to the value of the heritage area the contributor buildings warrant the same treatment and control as listed heritage items'.</p> <p>Considers that the values of contributing buildings in heritage areas should be protected to the same degree as individual heritage buildings in heritage areas to ensure that the heritage values of the area as a whole are maintained.</p> <p>Considers that there is not reliable evidence in the s32 report to support this change.</p>	Amend the introduction to the Historic Heritage chapter description of heritage areas to be explicit that it is 'because of their contribution to the value of the heritage area the contributor buildings warrant the same treatment and control as listed heritage items'.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that In line with submission point on EW-S10reference to the application of the earthworks chapter should be removed for scheduled archaeological sites, as HH-P20, HH-R18 provide a more nuanced approach to assessing the effects of earthworks on scheduled archaeological sites	Amend the 'Cross references to other relevant district plan provisions' note so that scheduled archaeological sites are not referenced and accordingly not managed by the earthworks provisions.
VicLabour	414.22	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Supportive of more flexible heritage building protections to allow for more sustainable changes to be made.	Not specified
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that Council has misinterpreted their obligations to provide for the protection of heritage under the purpose of the RMA. Incentives for the Council to protect heritage are unbalanced and without proper diligence to the Section 32 evaluation may not actually be delivering a net benefit to society that is simply assumed. Council has interpreted Section 6(f) to mean that heritage is a fait accompli and trumps other societal value. However, a High Court ruling stated that "the consent authority must ensure its consideration is founded upon an assessment of whether or not destruction of historic heritage is a balanced response, and a fair, appropriate and reasonable outcome".</p> <p>Council has focused on regulatory solutions alone and has dismissed any consequences or costs of their regime as inconsequential. There is no confidence that there are net benefits to society from the heritage listing at 28 Robieson St, because Council did not fully identify the effects of their proposal or take quantitative assessment to a required level of detail that is proportional to the scale and significance of the regulatory intervention.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	Not specified.
Ian Attwood	FS16.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	The veracity of Council claims about heritage value and societal benefits are questioned.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that Heritage listings would have a direct impact of \$319 million. This indicates the order of magnitude of the scale and significance of the proposal and should not be diminished or dismissed. It requires that the Council apply a level detail and rigour that is proportional. It requires them to invest more effort. Council will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to owners to meet quotas that have little merit of basis.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that heritage and building evaluation and classification from Council is weak. The evidence base for historic heritage section of the Section 32 evaluation is lacking in transparency and accountability.</p> <p>Futhermore, many modern buildings are not recorded as modern by the Council due to a lack of any robust classification system or process.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Seeks that Council use a more robust and transparent heritage assessment and classification system. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ian Attwood	FS16.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Process of identification seems arbitrary and inequitable impacting some and not others. Regrettably precedence where to be consistent any home designed by an award-winning architect should be considered heritage and scheduled.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers modern movement architects have a long history of contributing to public debate around affordable housing design, social housing, urban planning, and heritage. Many, including Bill Toomath and the Architecture Centre wrote or contributed to sustainable housing manifestos for architectural interest groups. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the Council does not know how many of the existing scheduled heritage listings are private homes. The existing heritage inventory was analysed, and it is estimated that 224 private homes have individual heritage protection. In the District Plan, the Council has proposed the inclusion of 52 new heritage listings, of which half are homes (26 homes), and 11 new heritage areas which affects 350 homes. This is on top of the existing 224 individual homes listed and the 100 homes within the existing heritage areas. Character areas impact another 5000 homes in Wellington. Considers it is notable that Wellington has nearly three times the number of houses protected relative to the total housing stock in Auckland. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the council is proposing to expand homes with heritage protection from about 324 homes to about 700. This increase is an additional 376 homes and means under the proposal, almost 1% of all the homes in Wellington will be protected and have their development restricted, in the suburbs and within walking distance of the city centre and transport hubs. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers the council is naturally incentivised to over-provide Heritage protection, and interest groups have similar incentives to Council. Considers no non-regulatory mechanisms or options were considered in the Proposed District Plan which misses an opportunity to rethink and rebalance how incentives work to better deliver on the requirement in the RMA to treat the protection of heritage with importance. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the Council is failing its responsibilities under the RMA . Their level of rigour, policies, approach to identification, evaluation frameworks, consideration of options, and level of performance assessment against heritage objectives are all lacking in the context of national importance prescribed within the Act. For instance, Section 6(f) of the RMA has been misinterpreted by Council. Furthermore, it is considered that there is an implicit expectation of access when closely interpreting the definition of historic heritage in the RMA. This would reasonably remove or reduce the heritage value of isolated private suburban homes compared to publicly accessible heritage buildings and landmarks. Considers that it seems likely that when the RMA was drafted in 1991 and heritage was defined, policy makers had not envisioned isolated homes from the 1960's, with no real stand out qualities form others on the street, no public access, and limited visibility, would be targeted for heritage protection. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the Council better identify, evaluate, consider and assess heritage objectives in the context of national importance prescribed within the Act, particularly in regard to heritage listing specific properties. [Inferred decision requested]
Ian Attwood	FS16.5	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Not specified.	Allow / Seeks that all privately-owned, independent suburban homes not in an identified heritage precinct removed from the District Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sophie Kahn	FS76.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	<p>The Submitter (415) points to the implicit expectation of public access to Historic Heritage when the RMA was drafted. This calls for an independent evaluation of the WCC's justification for the inclusion of private homes that will never be accessible to the public (and in many cases are not at all or barely visible to the public) onto the Plan.</p> <p>The submission (415) points out that is highly probable originators of the RMA would not have imagined that Councils of the future would interpret their document to mean homes like 28 Robieson St and Kahn House which are inaccessible and barely visible should be targeted for protection.</p> <p>The Submitters (415) query what the Council is trying to achieve by placing private homes that are visually unremarkable in their surrounds and that are outside any recognised heritage precinct on the Plan and submit that this achieves none of the objectives of the NPS-UD and DP regarding efficient use of land and housing supply.</p>	<p>Amend / Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings</p> <p>Seeks that Council: -seek and make publicly available an independent legal evaluation of the the RMA's expectation of access, and if the proposed WCC's inclusion of inaccessible private homes are aligned with the independent evaluation</p>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	415.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers that there is a significant power imbalance between the Council and isolated homeowners in regard to heritage listings. Considers the powers granted to consent authorities under the RMA to regulate are significant. Considers individuals and isolated homeowners have less voice, weight, time, or energy, to stand up for themselves. Considers the Council has both direct authority to regulate property owners, access to better information, and greater resources. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	Not specified.
Sophie Kahn	FS76.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	<p>The Submitters express their concern regarding the significant imbalance of power that exists in this process. Refer to submission for their detailed illustrations of this point.</p> <p>The further submitter agrees with their concern and has taken all reasonable steps to attempt to minimise the devastating effects of this power imbalance during my opposition to the listing of the Kahn House, including many attempts to engage with Council staff. The Submitters imply that an independent review needs to be carried out to ensure WCC acts fairly and reasonably with the extreme power they possess over Wellington's homeowners. The further submitter concurs.</p>	<p>Amend / Delete Item 514 (28 robieson St) from SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>- Appoint an independent body to assess that Council are acting fairly and reasonably with owners of private homes</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	<p>Considers that the Council needs to be cognisant of the selection biases they have imbedded in their identification processes for historic heritage. by selecting 10 streets at random and checking every building on them for any historic significance. Such an approach might generate a fairer and more representative list of buildings for historic consideration, the same way randomisation is embedded in medical trials to prevent biases. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	<p>Seeks that the Council amend its heritage identification process to include more randomisation, so as to prevent bias. [Inferred decision requested]</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	<p>Considers the evaluation of the effectiveness and performance of the current regulatory settings is extremely limited in regard to heritage protection. Considers that the heritage protection regime needs to find a balance heritage protection required by the RMA, the desire to identify historic heritage, the value of heritage to the wider community, the performance of an operative plan, and the cohesive integration with other policies.</p> <p>It is considered that the Council has dismissed the burden imposed on private property owners of proposed heritage listings, which is not aligned with the intent of the RMA.</p> <p>The heritage protection regime does not incentivise documentation, identification, nomination or preservation of historic heritage. It does not educate owners of heritage properties, and instead incentivises owners of unlisted properties to remove, destroy or significantly alter unknown heritage value to preserve monetary value, and even accelerate destruction prior to any proposed listing. Financial incentives are also considered inadequate. It is considered that there are significant issues with the current heritage protection regime. Considers that no evaluation of the effectiveness of the current regime against objectives and principles has taken place. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	<p>Seeks that the current regime's effectiveness be evaluated against objectives and principles and this be used to inform a future regime, which should find a balance between the importance of heritage protection in the Resource Management Act, the desire to identify historic heritage, the value of heritage to the wider community abnd other factors such as teh burden imposed of private property owners of heritage listings. [Inferred decision requested, refer to original submission]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the council has only considered a narrow set of high-level options to protect heritage in their section 32 report. Considers that there is a singular focus on a regulatory approach, and costs relating to owners on newly listed properties has been dismissed. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.19	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers there are issues with the Heritage Issues and Options report including that it contains unsubstantiated claims, disputes findings within the paper e.g. that categorisation of buildings is not appropriate, and considers the state of some of the report content is very poor. Considers a heritage database of unlisted items as referred to in the report should be made public. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that no non-regulatory incentive options for heritage protection have been considered. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the council considers non-regulatory incentive options for heritage protection [Inferred decision requested]
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.21	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that no options for a collaborative or regional approach to heritage protection have been considered [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the council considers options for a collaborative or regional approach to heritage protection [Inferred decision requested]
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.22	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that digital heritage protection should be considered by Council. Having historic heritage digitally preserved provides many benefits over physical protection and may increase collective heritage value to society. Knowing a physical structure is already digitally preserved also changes the interpretation of what is an appropriate or inappropriate physical modification. A digital approach is less costly to society and would offer real value and convenience in the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, so people can interact, and experience natural and physical resources virtually, without any impact on the resources themselves. Good examples of digital heritage protection are provided by Google Street View Time Machine and CityViewAR. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Council considers digital heritage protection techniques.[Inferred decision requested]
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.23	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the digital innovation team at Wellington City Council should get in touch with the Heritage Team at the Council to collaborate on options regarding digital preservation and integration of heritage into the Wellington digital twin programme. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that digital heritage preservation be integrated into the Wellington digital twin programme.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.24	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the Council has failed to effectively consider cost and benefits of protection of heritage, which is required under Section 32 of the RMA. The responsibility in 'providing for' the protection of heritage does not require scheduling of buildings, it does not preclude incentive regimes, and it does not rule out the Council establishing a voluntary regime. Considers that section 32 evaluations must contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Ian Attwood	FS16.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	No evidence presented by WCC of the costs and benefits of heritage protection for 28 Robieson Street.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Sophie Kahn	FS76.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	The Submitters contend that an accurate and professional-level cost:benefit analysis be required in the case of Heritage. The Submitters point out that no such analysis has been done by the WCC and that given the scale and significance of the economic, social and cultural outcomes this is unjustifiable. The further submitter fully support this position and echo this point for the Kahn House. A detailed cost:benefit analysis is required under Section 32 of the RMA. As this has not been carried out and provided to homeowners, all private homes without owner support should be removed from the plan.	Amend / Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings. Seeks to remove all privately-owned homes from the list where the owner is opposed to listing as no analysis on the costs owners will face has been performed. Seeks the decision that private homes cannot be listed without appropriate considerations of the cost and benefits, as required in the RMA.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.25	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers the Council has failed to identify the full range of effects and describe their scale and significance in regard to the heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Ian Attwood	FS16.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Council has not adequately assessed and accounted for the impact of loss of capital value (financial loss to owners), the increased compliance costs, the constraints on development and alterations, and impact on marketability because of scheduling.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.26	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers the council has failed to quantify costs and benefits of their proposal (heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street), including largely ignoring the way society responds to their incentives, the cost to society of having more restrictive use of land and the costs that fall on owners. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.27	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers the Council has failed to include a level of information and certainty or properly identify risks in regard to the heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	The Section 32 evaluation is considered to be inadequate in regard to the heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street. A detailed list of objections is provided. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.29	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the heritage assessment of the Toomath House (28 Robieson Street) is weak and overstates the heritage value of the building, while ignoring costs. The Council's report makes unsubstantiated claims, or errors. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Ian Attwood	FS16.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support	Heritage assessment is not balanced by alternative views on architectural merit and heritage value. There is no provision at the outset for the architectural merit or significance/influence to be debated or challenged, or an opposing view to be recorded.	Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that while the heritage assessment provided by the Council attempts to assess the significance of heritage in the submitter's home (28 Robieson Street), it makes no attempt to consider or assess the heritage value. Considers that a framework that assesses "Use" and "non-use" values is appropriate. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.53	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Support in part	Support Historic Heritage protection in part. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain Historic Heritage provisions, with amendments [inferred decision requested].
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.54	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Submitter seeking further certainty regarding Historic Heritage provisions. Submitter recognises the importance of Wellington's historic heritage. It is an important aspect of the City and must be protected. In the submitter's experience, however, the lines can become blurred at the boundaries between heritage areas and other areas of the City. Submitter considers that they need greater certainty in proximity controls so that all plan users understand where heritage protections do and do not apply.	Seeks greater certainty in the Historic Heritage proximity controls so that all plan users understand where heritage protections do and do not apply. [Inferred decision requested]
Penny Griffith	418.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Wellington City Council formally recognises Historic Places Wellington as an organisation with specialist knowledge, who get consulted with on heritage policy issues.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan add a new objective that reflects the positive contributions heritage, character and quality design, and the ability to read stories in the urban landscape, make to overall wellbeing.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that Wellington's liveability, and its character and heritage, can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Not every old building needs to be retained, but neither are people's sense of connection and place disposable commodities. Rather than wholesale deregulation and the widespread removal of protections, heritage and character can be considered as part of community dialogue, while new construction focuses first on under-utilised land.	Seeks that I submit that the draft District Plan needs to better recognise and provide for the protection of heritage from inappropriate development and better take into account the need to maintain and enhance amenity values.
Peter Fordyce	431.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	Considers that Heritage Areas should be expanded. Wellington's built heritage comprises a vital part of the city, featuring a cityscape that is not only unique within New Zealand, but the world. This contributes to not only tourism, but fosters a sense of "place" for residents. While the rules as they currently exist provide some protection, this does not go far enough, and irreplaceable buildings and streetscapes are at risk of being lost.	Seeks that Heritage Areas be expanded.
Kay Larsen	447.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the history and character of the southern end of the terrace is protected.
David Lee	454.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers there is the Climate change issue to consider. Demolishing wooden heritage housing (which the Plan will allow of right) will release carbon into the atmosphere. Considers that more carbon will be used in building replacements made of concrete, steel and glass. 'Old is greener than new'.	No specified.
Marilyn Head	457.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Oppose	Opposed to how the Proposed Plan protects Heritage Areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Rachel Underwood	458.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Amend	While supporting the heritage rules, considers they should be drafted to enable more conservation rather than permissive development. Considers there are many details that should be included such as stained and decorative heritage glass window in heritage listed buildings.	Seeks that the historic heritage provisions are amended to enable more conservation.
Christina Mackay	478.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that Neighbourhood clusters of houses set against the backdrop of the green town belt present Wellington's historical character and in the aggregate is of national significance under RMA s.6.	Not specified.
Christina Mackay	478.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / General HH	Not specified	Considers that the maintenance, conservation and upgrading of 19th Century timber houses is not easy and VUW research found a shortage of heritage design and building craft skills and knowledge.	Seeks that WCC adopts policies to promote and encourage sustainable re-use and restoration and provide evidence-based design and technical based resources. [Inferred decision requested]
Paul Burnaby	44.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that a provision should be made for 'transferable development rights' from sites containing listed heritage buildings to adjoining sites that do not fall within an identified heritage area.	Seeks that 'transferable development rights' be created for sites adjoining Heritage areas.
Tim Bright	75.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that a setback of more than 1m should be required to allow for more of a transition zone between Heritage Areas or Character Precincts.	Seeks that a setback of more than 1m is required from boundaries in or adjoining Heritage Areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Historic Places Wellington	182.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that replacement of decorative and coloured glass be disallowed and discouraged.	Seeks that a new rule be added to the Historic Heritage Chapter that requires resource consent for the removal of heritage decorative or stained glass as a restricted discretionary activity.
Historic Places Wellington	182.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that there is a gap in the current regulatory framework whereby property owners of heritage listed buildings can neglect to maintain or repair buildings so they are effectively "demolished by neglect". Demolition by neglect is addressed in the English National Planning Framework. Considers that adding a provision addressing demolition by neglect would address situations where an owner argues that the benefits of a newbuilding (which substantially demolishes a listed heritage building) outweighs its value as an intact or restored heritage building. Considers that such arguments should not be available to owners who have not undertaken maintenance or repair.	Add a new policy to the Historic Heritage Chapter along the lines of: <u>"Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision".</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.11	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	HNZPT supports the addition of a new policy to the Historic Heritage Chapter as mentioned in the submission.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.70	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as this is considered particularly onerous and is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.70	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as this is considered particularly onerous and is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington	182.14	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that HPW specific bulk and shading controls should apply at and near to boundaries of sites which are near heritage listed sites to address the principles set out in various High Court decisions such as: Sydney Substation Ltd v WCC [2017] NZHC 2489.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to include bulk and shading controls at, and near to, the boundaries of sites which are near to each heritage listed site where special height and design controls apply to protect context and curtilage setting of heritage listed buildings.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.30	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	It is important for heritage buildings to be viewed by the public and not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent buildings.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.77	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is concerned about the potential loss in intensification opportunities if the proposed relief is granted.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.71	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as this is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.71	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as this is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington	182.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	<p>Considers that the Character Precincts together with the new “heritage areas” do not sufficiently protect heritage buildings from inappropriate development under RMA s.6. In particular, buildings with heritage value which are outside concentrations of buildings with similar values, or those in poor condition, will be at risk of inappropriate development.</p> <p>Considers that while “heritage is not the same as character”, it has been through character protections in the ODP that heritage has been acknowledged and protected in the existing planning regime (despite not being listed).</p> <p>Considers that Wellington’s unique heritage and character is represented in its native timber oldest inner city suburbs. The heritage values of those buildings are irreplaceable and unable to replicate.</p> <p>Considers that the proposal is consistent with the overlay proposed in the Councils Draft Spatial Plan. Considers that the proposal would protect the heritage of specific buildings where there is not a sufficient cluster of higher quality character streetscape sites, which would otherwise make available a level of protection under RMA s.7.</p> <p>Considers that without such a procedural overlay, the effects on the environment (specifically on heritage) of any ‘level of development’ would be incompatible and inappropriate, by not being considered at all.</p> <p>Considers that the demolition control overlay would see a negligible reduction in additional housing capacity. It would also provide an accumulative benefit from not demolishing NZ’s oldest native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions. [See original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Seeks that a 'heritage demolition control' be added for all areas identified by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Pre-1930s character area review as 'Primary' 'Contributory' or 'omitted'; and - The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's submission on the Draft Spatial Plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.78	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	Further clarification is needed to understand the implications on intensification opportunities of applying the proposed changes.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington	182.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	<p>Considers that the Character Precincts together with the new "heritage areas" do not sufficiently protect heritage buildings from inappropriate development under RMA s.6. In particular, buildings with heritage value which are outside concentrations of buildings with similar values, or those in poor condition, will be at risk of inappropriate development.</p> <p>Considers that while "heritage is not the same as character", it has been through character protections in the ODP that heritage has been acknowledged and protected in the existing planning regime (despite not being listed).</p> <p>Considers that Wellington's unique heritage and character is represented in its native timber oldest inner city suburbs. The heritage values of those buildings are irreplaceable and unable to replicate.</p> <p>Considers that the proposal is consistent with the overlay proposed in the Councils Draft Spatial Plan. Considers that the proposal would protect the heritage of specific buildings where there is not a sufficient cluster of higher quality character streetscape sites, which would otherwise make available a level of protection under RMA s.7.</p> <p>Considers that without such a procedural overlay, the effects on the environment (specifically on heritage) of any 'level of development' would be incompatible and inappropriate, by not being considered at all.</p> <p>Considers that the demolition control overlay would see a negligible reduction in additional housing capacity. It would also provide an accumulative benefit from not demolishing NZ's oldest native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions. [See original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Seeks that within the 'heritage demolition control' the following provisions apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The demolition of any building or structure, excluding ancillary structures, built before 1930 be a restricted discretionary activity. - Intensification provisions would apply (being the level of development enabled under the MDRS and NPSUD policy 3).
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.79	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Oppose	Further clarification is needed to understand the implications on intensification opportunities of applying the proposed changes.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that there should be a specific process of heritage identification and assessment of all existing buildings in the inner city suburbs (noting that the Boffa Miskell 2019 report was not commissioned for the purpose of making a process to identify heritage and assessment of values, but rather identifying concentrations of "Character").	Seeks that a provision is added to make a process of specific heritage identification and assessment of heritage values for all building in the inner city suburbs.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.90	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	<p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>10min walkable catchment</p> <p>Specific heritage identification and assessment</p> <p>Views contributing to sense of place and identity</p> <p>Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell</p> <p>Boffa Miskell streetscapes</p> <p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>CCZ encroachment on residential zones</p> <p>Old St Pauls height controls</p> <p>Preserve viewshalls</p>	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Supports evidence submitted by Historic Places Wellington.	Seeks a new rule so that the removal of decorative/coloured glass from heritage buildings requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.32	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers there should be an additional rule clarifying that additions, alterations and demolition of non-listed heritage features of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures be permitted. This is consistent with the purpose of identifying features of heritage buildings that are not scheduled as not having heritage values, and is currently a gap in the Proposed Plan. For completeness, we note that it we do not consider it necessary for any of the existing standards in the Proposed Plan to apply to this rule.	Add a new rule HH-RX to the Historic Heritage chapter as follows: <u>Additions, alterations and demolition of features that are excluded from the listing of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.10	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	Provides greater clarity to the Plan.	Allow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.10	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	Provides greater clarity to the Plan.	Allow
Murray Pillar	393.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that protection for stained and decorative heritage glass windows is provided for heritage listed buildings.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.55	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH. Considers that it must be clear where heritage protections apply to provide certainty for development. The submitter considers that Wellington must achieve a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development.	Add a new objective (or similar) within the HH chapter after HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage) as follows: <u>Clearly identify historic heritage and provide certainty on the extent of heritage protection.</u>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.56	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH. Considers that it must be clear where heritage protections apply to provide certainty for development. The submitter considers that Wellington must achieve a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development.	Add a new objective (or similar) within the HH chapter after HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage) as follows: <u>Recognise the importance of achieving a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development.</u>
Parliamentary Service	FS48.2	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission on the basis that ensuring certainty for new development and enabling new development may facilitate the continued.	Allow
Peter Fordyce	431.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that the Heritage chapter should have a provision to protect original windows with stained and decorative glass on buildings within the character precincts, and heritage structures. As the chapter stands, provisions have little protection for the windows of heritage buildings, particularly stained and decorative glass, and there is a significant risk that this will be lost with the push for double glazing. Where possible, original window frames should be retained, and new or modified windows must contain the original decorative glass.	Add a new rule in the Historic Heritage chapter providing protection of original windows and stained and decorative window glass on heritage buildings and structures. [Inferred decision requested - note: relief sought refers to heritage structures and character precincts]
Peter Fordyce	431.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that the Heritage chapter should have a provision to protect original windows with stained and decorative glass on buildings within the character precincts, and heritage structures. As the chapter stands, provisions have little protection for the windows of heritage buildings, particularly stained and decorative glass, and there is a significant risk that this will be lost with the push for double glazing. Where possible, original window frames should be retained, and new or modified windows must contain the original decorative glass.	Add a new Rule in the Historic Heritage chapter providing protection of original windows and stained and decorative window glass on buildings in Heritage Areas. [Inferred decision requested - note: relief sought refers to heritage structures and character precincts]
Christina Mackay	478.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that in order to combat intentional neglect the submitter support a new policy to the PDP's Historic Heritage Chapter on Maintenance and Repair.	Add a new policy as follows: "Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision."

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Cherie Jacobson	251.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O1	Not specified	<p>Considers that the schedule does not represent what is distinctive about Wellington, the region and New Zealand.</p> <p>Objective HH-01 Recognising Historic Heritage will not be met if the schedule is not representative. This objective is that 'historic heritage [is] recognised for its contribution to an understanding and appreciation of the history, culture and sense of place of Wellington City, the Wellington region and New Zealand.'</p> <p>WCC has not adequately sought the views of the community on historic heritage in the development of the PDP.</p>	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O1	Support	<p>The further submitters supports the point that there are significant weaknesses in the Council's heritage protection regime, and this includes the Council's engagement and understanding of what the community values.</p> <p>The Council should spend the time and effort to understand how much value the community places on different types of heritage. This work would then inform Council resourcing and support quantitative net benefit assessments of listings as expected under s32 of the RMA.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Allow / The Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the broader community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.61	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O1	Support	This objective recognises the importance of heritage to Wellington's identity and sense of place.	Retain HH-O1 (Recognising historic heritage) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.33	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O1	Support	Supports the objectives relating to historic heritage to the extent they recognise the benefits of enabling sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-O1 (Recognising historic heritage) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O1	Support	Supports HH-O1 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-O1 (Recognising historic heritage) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O1	Amend	the objective is missing a word.	<p>Amend HH-O1 (Recognising historic heritage) as follows:</p> <p>Historic heritage <u>is</u> recognised for its contribution to an understanding and appreciation of the history, culture and sense of place of Wellington City, the Wellington region and New Zealand.</p>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.57	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O1	Support in part	Supports HH-O1 in part. The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH.	Retain HH-O1 (Recognising historic heritage...) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.62	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O2	Support	This objective recognises the importance of heritage to Wellington's identity and sense of place.	Retain HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O2	Support	Supports the objectives relating to historic heritage to the extent they recognise the benefits of enabling sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage) as notified
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O2	Support	Supports HH-O2 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.58	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O2	Support in part	Supports HH-O2 in part. The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH.	Retain HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage...), as notified.
Parliamentary Service	375.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O3	Support in part	Supports but submits that the objective needs to more clearly recognise the need to ensure heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way – “sustainable long-term use” does not adequately capture the concept of ensuring buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.	Retain HH-O3 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) with amendments.
Parliamentary Service	375.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O3	Amend	Supports but submits that the objective needs to more clearly recognise the need to ensure heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way – “sustainable long-term use” does not adequately capture the concept of ensuring buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable and functional way.	Amend HH-O3 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) as follows: Sustainable long-term use One of the best ways to protect built heritage is to ensure that it remains in a sustainable <u>and practicable</u> long term use. ...
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.63	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O3	Support	This objective recognises the importance of heritage to Wellington’s identity and sense of place. It also recognises the importance of maintaining built heritage as part of sustainable use and waste reduction: construction waste is a major waste stream issue for Wellington - building re-use, as far as possible, needs to be incentivised.	Retain HH-O3 (Sustainable long-term use) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.35	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O3	Support	Supports the objectives relating to historic heritage to the extent they recognise the benefits of enabling sustainable long-term use of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-O3 (Sustainable long-term use) as notified.
Parliamentary Service	FS48.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH@O3	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission as it recognises that works to built heritage should encompass maintenance, repair, reuse, and reasonable works; all of which are broadly aligned with the objective of facilitating and enabling practicable and functional use.	Allow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O3	Support	Supports HH-O3 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-O3 (Sustainable long-term use) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.41	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O3	Amend	The objective of the chapter is best captured by HH-01 and HH-02. Concerned that HH-03 could lead to unnecessary demolition of built heritage where current circumstances do not allow for sustainable use. Considers that stabilisation and mothballing may also be an appropriate approach depending on the circumstances.	Amend HH-O3 (Sustainable long term use) as follows: Built heritage is well-maintained, resilient, and kept in sustainable long term use.
Parliamentary Service	FS48.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH@O3	Oppose	Parliamentary Service opposes this submission as the objective needs to recognise the importance of the sustainability of use of built heritage.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.59	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O3	Support in part	Supports HH-O3 in part. The submitter supports the general protection given to historic heritage in chapter HH.	Retain HH-O3 (Sustainable long-term use ...), as notified.
Anna Kemble Welch	434.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-O3	Not specified	Not specified.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P1	Amend	Generally supportive but considers more emphasis to Māori heritage is needed, to be in line with Section 6 of the RMA.	Amend HH-P1 (Identifying historic heritage) as follows: Identify buildings, structures, areas and archaeological sites with significant historic heritage values, or that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of Māori history, <u>relationship to their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, other taonga and culture.</u>
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.66	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P1	Amend	Considers appropriate to amend to include objectives, policies, rules and standards to minimise impact of earthworks or developments on cultural value to Taranaki Whānui. Requests focus on HH-P1.	Seeks that with the amendments to minimise impact of earthworks or developments on cultural value to Taranaki Whānui, that HH-P1 (Identifying historic heritage) is focused on.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P1	Support	Supports HH-P1 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P1 (Identifying historic heritage) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.65	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P2	Support	This policy is helpful in that it signals the need for adherence to conservation principles when maintaining or repairing built heritage.	Retain HH-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.36	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P2	Support in part	Supports the policies to the extent that they enable maintenance, repair and reasonable works to built heritage. It is important to enable works to built heritage to provide for long-term sustainable use to buildings, including where that long-term use is different to the use for which the built heritage was scheduled. Suggests amendments, consistent with the Introduction to this chapter, which clarify that enabling a sustainable long-term use of a building includes adaptive reuse. Subject to these amendments proposed, supports Policy HH-P2 to the extent that it encourages the maintenance and repair of built heritage where undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Retain HH-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P2	Support	Supports HH-P2 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.90	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Support	Supports the policy as it allows internal alterations to heritage buildings unless it involves interior features that are specifically scheduled.	Retain HH-P3 (Internal works) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.66	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Support	This policy is helpful in that it helps make renovations easier - fostering re-use of built heritage.	Retain HH-P3 (Internal works) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Oppose	Opposes heritage controls on new floor levels where only the exterior of a heritage building is scheduled. These are unnecessary because the internal additions to buildings are unlikely to detract from the heritage values of the exterior of a heritage building. Instead, this policy imposes an unreasonable burden on internal works. We understand that the purpose of this policy is to prevent additional or mezzanine floors being constructed which are visible through tall windows and would have a material impact on the heritage value of the building. The drafting of the policy is not sufficiently clear to restrict its application to these circumstances. It does not address the effect on the heritage values but applies to any floor structure that is visible.	Delete HH-P3 (Internal works) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Support	Supports HH-P4 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.42	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Amend	Considers that the policy should be rewritten to focus on conservation as opposed to 'works' and reflect the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter approach to conservation.	Seeks that HH-P3 (Internal works) is rewritten with a focus on conservataion as per the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.43	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Amend	Considers that temporary works referred to in the Heritage Design Guide should be enabled as this is likely to prevent unnecessary demolition.	Amend HH-P3 (Internal works) so that temporary works are enabled as referred in the heritage design guide.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Amend	As per the current District Plan, structural strengthening which is visible from the exterior of the building should not be a permitted activity as this is likely to have an adverse effect on heritage values. There is little reliable evidence in the s32 report to support this change. See our commentary below on HH-S1.	Amend HH-P3 (Internal works) as follows: Enable works internal to built heritage, except where: 1. The works involve interiors or interior features which are specifically scheduled; or 2. New floor levels <u>and structural strengthening</u> that will be visible from the exterior of buildings.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.12	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P3	Support	HNZPT supports the submission because structural strengthening visible from the exterior of the building can have an adverse effect on heritage values.	Allow
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Supports HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as it is enabling of works to built heritage and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as notified.
Historic Places Wellington	182.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Supports the Council encouraging and supporting work on heritage places that increases their resilience and accessibility, contributes to sustainable long-term use and recovers or restores heritage values.	Retain HH-P4 as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington City Council	266.72	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Amend	Considers amendment necessary to enable works to built heritage that are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Amend HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as follows: Enable works to built heritage that: 1. Increase resilience through seismic strengthening, either in isolation or as part of additions and alterations; 2. Support providing a sustainable long-term use; 3. <u>Are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods;</u> 3-4 <u>4</u> Increase accessibility and support means of escape from fire; or 4-5 <u>5</u> Provide the opportunity to promote, enhance, recover or reveal heritage values.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.13	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	HNZPT supports the submission so that works are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.91	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Supports this policy as it enables works to heritage buildings for the purposes of seismic resilience and/or supporting a sustainable long-term use.	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as notified.
Parliamentary Service	FS48.10	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission to the extent that it emphasises the need for HH-P4 to provide for maintenance, repair, and reasonable works to built heritage with a view to practicable and functional sustainable long-term use.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Parliamentary Service	375.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support in part	HH-P4 is supported as it is important to acknowledge that works will be required on heritage buildings to ensure they continue to be useable, as with any building. However, it is submitted that the concept of "sustainable long-term use" does not capture the need to ensure that buildings are retained in a state that ensures heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way.	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) with amendment.
Parliamentary Service	375.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Amend	Considers that the concept of "sustainable long-term use" does not capture the need to ensure that buildings are retained in a state that ensures heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way.	Amend HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as follows: Enable works to built heritage that: 1. Increase resilience through seismic strengthening, either in isolation or as part of additions and alterations; 2. Support providing a sustainable <u>and practicable</u> long-term use; 3. Increase accessibility and support means of escape from fire; or 4. Provide the opportunity to promote, enhance, recover or reveal heritage values.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.67	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	This policy is helpful in that it helps achieve seismic strengthening - very necessary to many heritage structures - and helping remove regulatory impediments to this work	Retain HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.38	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Amend	Supports the policies to the extent that they enable maintenance, repair and reasonable works to built heritage. It is important to enable works to built heritage to provide for long-term sustainable use to buildings, including where that long-term use is different to the use for which the built heritage was scheduled. Suggests amendments, consistent with the Introduction to this chapter, which clarify that enabling a sustainable long-term use of a building includes adaptive reuse. Subject to these amendments proposed, supports Policy HH-P4 as it recognises that works to built heritage will sometimes be required, and are appropriate where certain outcomes are achieved, including providing a sustainable long-term use.	Amend HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works): Enable works to built heritage that: ... 2. Support providing a sustainable long-term use (<u>including reuse</u>);
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.14	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	HNZPT supports the submission because referring to adaptive re-use clarifies the provision.	Allow
Parliamentary Service	FS48.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission as it recognises that works to built heritage should encompass maintenance, repair, reuse, and reasonable works; all of which are broadly aligned with the objective of facilitating and enabling practicable and functional use.	Allow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P4	Support	Supports HH-P5 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P5 (Conservation Plans) as notified.
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Amend	Considers that HH-P5 should be clarified as the proposed wording is misleading (too open and would be mis-interpreted) and will result in confusion. The wording suggests even owners of properties of lesser significance will be required to provide a Conservation Plan. Conservation Plan costs are high and limited funding is much better directed towards building materials, which contribute positively to the ongoing viability of heritage buildings, rather than reports.	Amend HH-P5 (Conservation Plans) as follows: Encourage the preparation of conservation plans <u>for items of greatest significance</u> , and take them into account when considering the effects of development proposals on the identified heritage values of built heritage.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.15	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Oppose	It is appropriate that conservation plans are encouraged for all scheduled heritage places, and not limited to the 'most significant'. It is also noted that the policy does not make conservation plans compulsory, but only 'encourages' their development and use.	Disallow / Retain as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Support	The further submitter supports and expands on the benefits of categorisation in the section "Specific issues with the Heritage Issues and Options report" on page 45 of their submission. [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that the Council commission an independent review into the performance and effectiveness of the current or adopted heritage protection regime in relation to achieving desired heritage outcomes and meeting the requirements of the RMA Seeks that the Council commission an independent evaluation of the costs and benefits of incorporating heritage categories into the heritage regime, and publish this, to the development or future development of the heritage protection regime.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.68	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Support	This policy is helpful in that conservation plans can provide ongoing certainty and continuity in respect of maintaining and sustaining built heritage over time	Retain HH-P5 (Conservation Plans) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.11	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Support	Supports HH-P6 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.45	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P5	Amend	Considers that this policy should come first in the Built heritage section as conservation planning comes after identification and before works are carried out.	Amend the numbering of HH-P5 (Conservation Plans) to HH-P1
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.69	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P6	Support	This policy is helpful in that it provides for mitigation the seismic risk of unreinforced masonry chimneys in a manner sensitive to the built heritage.	Retain HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.12	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P6	Support	Supports HH-P7 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.46	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P6	Oppose	Considers that chimneys are often important parts of heritage buildings and that very few of Wellington's buildings have heritage protection meaning the plan should be encouraging their conservation, not enabling demolition. Considers that the plan would more usefully provide a set of considerations in the heritage design guide to be used when deciding whether to allow removal of a chimney Disagrees with the intent as stated in the s32 report that the approach to chimneys aligns more closely with the way that Council manages removal of chimneys under the Building Act. Considers this is not appropriate as the BA is focussed on safety whereas the RMA is focussed on effects on the environment.	Delete policy HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys)
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.14	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support in part	Supports HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) to the extent that it is enabling of additions and alterations.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) to the extent that it is enabling of additions ad alterations. [Inferred decision requested]
Parliamentary Service	FS48.11	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission to the extent that rule HH-P7 enables works that facilitate the practicable and functional use of heritage buildings	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Considers that HH-P7 should be amended to reflect that a successful alteration or addition is not achieved by whether or not the main determinants of the architectural style have been maintained. The wording is very limiting and would have made previous award winning architecture projects impossible. [Refer to original submission for award winning projects reference].	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as follows (Delete HH-P7.1.c.): ... 1. ... c. Retains the main determinants of the architectural style or design of the heritage building or heritage structure; ...
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.16	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	Having regard to the architectural style or design of a heritage building is an important factor to have regard to.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Parliamentary Service	FS48.12	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission as it emphasises the need for HH-P7 to enable appropriate works on heritage buildings and structures.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.73	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Considers amendments necessary to be consistent in wording between HH-P7 (Heritage buildings and structures), HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings...), HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) and HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas).	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as follows: 1. (...) d. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportions, <u>design</u> and materials of the heritage building or heritage structure;
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.17	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	HNZPT supports the submission because the addition of the word 'design' is appropriate in this policy.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.92	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Supports the policy as it allows additions, alterations and the partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures subject to considerations which seek to retain the heritage values of listed buildings.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Parliamentary Service	375.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support in part	HH-P4 is supported as it is important to acknowledge that works will be required on heritage buildings to ensure they continue to be useable, as with any building. However, it is submitted that the concept of "sustainable long-term use" does not capture the need to ensure that buildings are retained in a state that ensures heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Parliamentary Service	375.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Considers that the concept of “sustainable long-term use” does not capture the need to ensure that buildings are retained in a state that ensures heritage buildings are able to continue to be used in a practicable way.	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as follows: ... <u>2. The viability of the building or structure and the activities associated with it, with and/or without the work;</u> <u>3. For the Parliamentary Precinct, the extent to which the proposal supports the efficient, effective and safe functioning of Parliament and the Executive;</u> 2 4. The visibility of the work from street frontages; 3 <u>5</u> . Whether the works would lead to cumulative adverse effects on identified heritage values; 4 <u>6</u> . Whether there has been any change in circumstances since scheduling in the District Plan, including damage from natural disaster; 5 <u>7</u> . Any advice that has been obtained from a suitably qualified heritage professional including Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga; and 6 <u>8</u> . The identified heritage values of the heritage area, where located within a heritage area.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.18	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	Policy HH-P7 includes reference to sustainable longterm use and the additions requested in this submission are not necessary or desirable.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.70	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	This policy is helpful in that it enables use change whilst signalling the need for this to occur in a manner sensitive to heritage values.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Supports the policies to the extent that they enable maintenance, repair and reasonable works to built heritage. It is important to enable works to built heritage to provide for long-term sustainable use to buildings, including where that long-term use is different to the use for which the built heritage was scheduled. Suggests amendments, consistent with the Introduction to this chapter, which clarify that enabling a sustainable long-term use of a building includes adaptive reuse. Subject to these amendments proposed, supports Policy HH-P7 to the extent that it enables additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of heritage buildings where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations, and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures): Provide for additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the work: a. Supports the heritage building or heritage structure having a sustainable long term use (<u>including reuse</u>);
Parliamentary Service	FS48.13	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Parliamentary Service supports this submission as it emphasises the need for the heritage rules to support and provide for reuse; which may, in turn, allow for works enabling practicable and functional use.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.165	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support in part	HH-P7 is generally supported as it provides for alterations and additions to heritage buildings and structures. However blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy (1(a) to (j) and 2-6) provides more than adequate guidance as to which specific matters need to be considered.	Retain HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) with amendment.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.120	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.166	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Considers that HH-P7 should be amended to focus on identified heritage values as outlined in the Wellington Heritage Inventory and balance the outcomes sought within the Zone the buildings and structures are located within. Blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy (1(a) to (i) and 2-6) provide more than adequate guidance as to which specific matters need to be considered. The Heritage Design Guide should only be used as a reference document as the detail in the guide is high level and of limited value and should be utilised as a non-statutory document.	Amend HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) and its title as follows: Additions, alterations and partial demolition of <u>scheduled</u> heritage buildings and structures Provide for additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of <u>scheduled</u> heritage buildings and heritage structures where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the work: ... j. Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide; 2. The visibility of the work from street frontages; ... 6. The identified heritage values of the heritage area, where located within a heritage area. <u>Note - Please refer to the Heritage Design Guide for further guidance.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.19	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	It is appropriate to retain reference to the Heritage Design Guide in this policy. [Inferred reference to submission 391.66]	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.121	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.11	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Oppose	The proposed change to refer to scheduled heritage buildings only is opposed. The intent of the section is to have wider application within heritage areas, and is explained in the section above in the DP referring to heritage areas	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.11	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Oppose	The proposed change to refer to scheduled heritage buildings only is opposed. The intent of the section is to have wider application within heritage areas, and is explained in the section above in the DP referring to heritage areas.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Support	Supports HH-O3 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-O3 (Sustainable long-term use) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.47	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P7	Amend	Considers the content in the policy should be reordered. [See original submission for full reasons]	Amend the order of order to: 1. The extent to which the work: a. Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use; a. Promotes, enhances, recovers or reveals heritage values; b. Promotes, enhances, recovers or reveals heritage values; b. Respects the valued neighbourhood patterns of the heritage area including any predominant architectural style or design; c. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportion and materials that have been identified as part of the heritage values of the heritage area; d. Responds to the relationships between buildings and structures within the heritage area; e. Enables any adverse effects on heritage values to be reversed; f. Minimizes the loss of heritage fabric and craftsmanship; g. Is in accordance with any conservation plan that has been prepared by a suitably qualified heritage professional; h. Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use; i. Increases structural stability, accessibility and means of escape from fire; and j. Fulfills the intent of the Heritage Design Guide;
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support in part	Supports HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) to the extent that it provides for new buildings and modifications to non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building.	Retain HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as notified to the extent that it provides for new buildings and modifications to non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington City Council	266.74	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Amend	Considers amendments necessary to be consistent in wording between HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures), HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure), HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) and HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas). Clarification is needed in HH-P8 to include reference to heritage values.	Amend HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as follows: (...) 1. The extent to which the work: a. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportions, <u>design, materials, and heritage values</u> of the heritage building or heritage structure;
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.20	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support	HNZPT supports the submission for these minor changes to policy HH-P8.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.71	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support	This policy is helpful in that it enables activities adjacent to heritage buildings, whilst maintaining sensitivity to heritage values.	Retain HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.167	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support in part	HH-P8 is generally supported as it provides for new buildings and structures. However blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy provide adequate guidance as to which matters need to be considered.	Retain HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) with amendment.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.122	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.168	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Amend	Considers that HH-P8 should be amended to focus on the identified heritage values outlined in the Wellington Heritage Inventory balanced with the outcomes sought within the Zone the buildings and structures are located within. The Heritage Design Guide should only be used as a reference document as the detail in the guide is high level and of limited value.	Amend HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as follows: Provide for new buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings and structures on the same site as <u>scheduled</u> heritage buildings or heritage structures where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the work: a. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportion and materials of the <u>scheduled</u> heritage building or heritage structure; b. Respects the identified relationship of the heritage building or heritage structure with its setting; and c. Fulfills the intent of the Heritage Design Guide. <u>Note - Please refer to the Heritage Design Guide for further guidance.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.21	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Oppose	It is appropriate to retain reference to the Heritage Design Guide in this policy.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.123	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.12	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Oppose	Deletion of Heritage Design Guide is opposed. This is a means to ensure the heritage area can remain intact and there is sufficient direction about what heritage is being protected.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.13	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Oppose	Deletion of Heritage Design Guide is opposed. This is a means to ensure the heritage area can remain intact and there is sufficient direction about what heritage is being protected.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.12	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Oppose	Deletion of Heritage Design Guide is opposed. This is a means to ensure the heritage area can remain intact and there is sufficient direction about what heritage is being protected.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.14	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P8	Support	Supports HH-P8 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Oppose in part	Considers that the HH-P9.3 states that 'relocation is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that relocation is one reasonable option among other options. Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate relocation. Relocation should be seen as a 'last resort' to save a building from demolition.	Opposes HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as notified and seeks amendment.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.5	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Oppose in part	Considers that the HH-P9.3 states that 'relocation is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that relocation is one reasonable option among other options. Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate relocation. Relocation should be seen as a 'last resort' to save a building from demolition.	Amend HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as follows: ... 3. In the case of relocation, alternatives have been explored and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option <u>to avoid total demolition.</u>
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.6	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.5	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.75	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Amend	Considers an additional point is required to only allow heritage buildings and heritage structures to be repositioned on the existing site or relocated to another site where it can be demonstrated that the repositioning or relocation work are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Amend HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as follows: (...) <u>4. The work will be undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.22	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	HNZPT supports this submission so that works are undertaken in accordance with recognised conservation principles and methods.	Allow /
Waka Kotahi	370.166	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support in part	Supports direction of policy.	Retain HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure), with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.167	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Amend	Considers that the wording should be amended to be less subjective – the policy requires an assessment of options and heritage values to be undertaken. Waka Kotahi agree that relocation should only be undertaken where other options are not available. The Council officer or decision maker will need to be satisfied that this has been demonstrated – it does therefore not need to be written into the condition.	Amend HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as follows: ... 3. In the case of relocation, <u>there are no practical alternatives</u> alternatives have been explored and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.72	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	This policy signals a preference for maintaining built heritage in situ.	Retain HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P9	Support	Supports HH-P9 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P9 (Repositioning and relocation of a heritage building or structure) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.73	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P10	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of built heritage to Wellington's identity and character.	Retain HH-P10 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P10	Support	Supports HH-P10 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-P10 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.76	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Amend	Considers amendment of HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) necessary for consistency within other policies in the chapter.	Amend title of HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as follows: Height of development within heritage areas
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.74	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support	This policy is helpful as there are unfortunate examples in Wellington where heritage has been put at risk by over-height adjacent structures.	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support	Supports this policy to the extent that it recognises that the height of development in heritage areas in the City Centre zone should be considered in the context of the objectives and policies of that zone	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.169	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support in part	HH-P11 is generally supported as it manages the heights of development within heritage zones to recognise the scale of the heritage areas.	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) with amendment.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.124	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.170	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Amend	Considers that HH-P11 should be amended, as the form of development does not relate to the height of the building as this is covered by HH-P13 and HH-P14. In addition, the height of development should be cognisant of the heights that the Zone generally provides for and the existing height of buildings in the area.	Amend HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as follows: Manage the height of development to recognise and respect the <u>unique setting of the form and scale of heritage areas in conjunction with</u> the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and the Waterfront Zone <u>in which the development occurs.</u>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.125	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.14	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Oppose	We oppose this submission to allow heights in heritage areas in line with the surrounding suburbs. This would run counter to what the heritage areas are trying to achieve and would destroy the sense of heritage in the remaining area	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.13	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposes this submission to allow heights in heritage areas in line with the surrounding suburbs. This would run counter to what the heritage areas are trying to achieve and would destroy the sense of heritage in the remaining area.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support	Supports HH-P11 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention. Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.60	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Support in part	Supports HH-P11 in part. Supports HH-P11's direction to "manage" height in heritage areas, noting that in some instances greater height may be appropriate and consistent with heritage values.	Retain HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas), with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.61	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Amend	Considers that HH-P11 needs clarification that the policy only applies within heritage areas.	Amend HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) as follows: Manage the height of development <u>within heritage areas</u> to recognise and respect the unique form and scale of heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and the Waterfront Zone.
Anna Kemble Welch	434.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Amend	Considers that HH-P11 should allow heights of up to 6 storeys in the Newtown Shopping Centre Historic Area, providing the street frontages of the historic buildings are retained while providing for increased height of new structures set back from the street. The provision restricts the development of buildings in the Newtown shopping Centre, which hinders their sustainable long term use and commercial viability. There is a missed opportunity for housing intensification in the heart of the vibrant shopping precinct. These buildings are ideally situated along a main transport route very close to major community amenities including schools, library and hospital. The suburban centre zone and Newtown shopping centre are ideally situated for an increase in housing by allowing for increased height for apartments to be built, as well as set back on the sites to retain the sense of place of the old shops at street level.	Seeks that HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas) is amended to allow heights of up to six storeys in the Newtown Shopping Centre Historic Area, providing that the street frontages of historic buildings are retained while providing for increased height of new structures set back from the street.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.23	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P11	Oppose	The Proposed District Plan includes 12m height limit for the Newtown Heritage Area while also providing for a 21/22m height limit for sites to the rear of the shop frontages. [Inferred reference to submission 434.7]	Disallow / Retain as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.75	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P12	Support	This policy will help enhance heritage areas previously compromised by poorly designed adjacent buildings.	Retain HH-P12 (Non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P12	Support	Supports HH-P12 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention. Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-P12 (Non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.77	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Amend	Considers amendments necessary to be consistent in wording between HH-P7 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures), HH-P8 (New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure), HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) and HH-P14.	Amend HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows: 1. (...) d. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportions, <u>design</u> and materials that have been identified as part of the heritage values of the heritage area;
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.24	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-P13 as it is important that the scale, form, proportions, design and materials that have been identified are compatible with the heritage values of the heritage area.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.76	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Support	This policy is helpful in that it signals the need for adherence to sensitive design when altering structures in heritage areas, recognising the importance of these areas to Wellington identity and character.	Retain HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.41	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Amend	Notte Policy HH-P13 is very similar to Policy HH-P7 and replicates some of the matters that consent authorities should have regard to when providing for additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures. We propose a similar amendment to Policy HH-P13, for the reasons set out above in relation to Policy HH-P7.	Amend HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows: Provide for additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values of the heritage area, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the work: a. Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use (<u>including reuse</u>)

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.19	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Support	<p>Supports HH-P13 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.48	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Amend	<p>Considers the content in the policy should be reordered.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Amend the order of order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The extent to which the work: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use; a. <u>Promotes, enhances, recovers or reveals heritage values;</u> b. Promotes, enhances, recovers or reveals heritage values; b. <u>Respects the valued neighbourhood patterns of the heritage area including any predominant architectural style or design;</u> c. <u>Is compatible with the scale, form, proportion and materials that have been identified as part of the heritage values of the heritage area;</u> d. <u>Responds to the relationships between buildings and structures within the heritage area;</u> e. <u>Enables any adverse effects on heritage values to be reversed;</u> f. <u>Minimizes the loss of heritage fabric and craftsmanship;</u> g. <u>Is in accordance with any conservation plan that has been prepared by a suitably qualified heritage professional;</u> h. <u>Supports buildings and structures having a sustainable long term use;</u> i. <u>Increases structural stability, accessibility and means of escape from fire; and</u> j. <u>Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide;</u>
Anna Kemble Welch	434.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P13	Amend	<p>Considers that HH-P13 should be amended to allow for essential earthquake strengthening of buildings in the Newtown Shopping Centre Historic Area. The provision restricts the development of buildings in the Newtown shopping Centre, which hinders their sustainable long term use and commercial viability. There is a missed opportunity for housing intensification in the heart of the vibrant shopping precinct. Wssential earthquake strengthening of the old buildings should be allowed, as well as increasing housing intensification at the same time.</p>	<p>Seeks that HH-P13 (Additions and alterations to, and partial demolition of buildings and structures within heritage areas) be amended to allow for essential earthquake strengthening of buildings in the Newtown Shopping Centre historic Area.</p>
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support in part	<p>Considers that HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) is appropriate with respect to development in Salisbury Garden Court (Item 24 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas)</p>	<p>Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified, with respect to Salisbury Garden Court.</p>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.77	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support	<p>This policy is helpful in that it enables new activities in heritage areas, whilst ensuring these are done in a way that recognises heritage values.</p>	<p>Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.171	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support in part	<p>HH-P14 is generally supported as it provides for new buildings and structures. However blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy provide adequate guidance as to which matters need to be considered.</p>	<p>Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) with amendment.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.126	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.172	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Amend	Considers that HH-P14 should be amended to focus on identified heritage values as outlined in the Wellington Heritage Inventory and balanced with the outcomes sought within the Zone the buildings and structures are located within. Blanket reference to the extent to which work fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide is considered unnecessary when the other arms of the Policy provide more than adequate guidance as to which matters need to be considered. The Heritage Design Guide should only be used as a reference document as the detail in the guide is high level and of limited value.	Amend HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows: Provide for new buildings and structures within heritage areas where it can be demonstrated that the works will not detract from the identified heritage values of the heritage area, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the work: a. Respects any valued neighbourhood patterns of the heritage area including any predominant architectural style or design; b. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportions, design and materials of the heritage area <u>and the role and function of the Zone; and</u> c. Is sited to maintain a consistent pattern of front façade alignment; and d. Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide. <u>Note - Please refer to the Heritage Design Guide for further guidance.</u>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.127	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support	Supports HH-P14 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention. Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.62	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Support in part	Supports HH-P14 in part. Supports providing for new buildings and structures within heritage areas and the matters to have regard to, other than the Heritage Design Guide.	Retain HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.63	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P14	Amend	Submitter considers that HH-P14.1.d's reference to having regard to the Heritage Design Guide should be removed.	Amend HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows: Provide for new buildings and structures within heritage areas where it can be demonstrated that the works will not detract from the identified heritage values of the heritage area, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the work: ... d. Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Oppose in part	Considers that the HH-P15.3 states that 'relocation is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that relocation is one reasonable option among other options. Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate relocation. Relocation should be seen as a 'last resort' to save a building from demolition.	Opposes HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as notified and seeks amendment.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.6	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Amend	Considers that the HH-P15.3 states that 'relocation is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that relocation is one reasonable option among other options. Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate relocation. Relocation should be seen as a 'last resort' to save a building from demolition.	Amend HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as follows: ... 3. For relocation outside of the heritage area, alternatives to relocation have been explored and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option <u>to avoid demolition</u>
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.78	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Amend	Considers clarification is needed in title of HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures)	Amend HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) title as follows: Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures <u>within heritage areas</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.168	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support in part	Supports the direction of policy.	Retain HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.169	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Amend	Considers that the wording should be amended to be less subjective – the policy requires an assessment of options and heritage values to be undertaken. Waka Kotahi agree that relocation should only occur if there all alternatives have been explored. The Council officer or decision maker will need to be satisfied that this has been demonstrated – it does therefore not need to be written into the condition.	Amend HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as follows: ... and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.78	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	This policy signals a preference for maintaining contributing buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ.	Retain HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.21	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P15	Support	<p>Supports HH-P15 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-P15 (Repositioning and relocation of contributing buildings and structures) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.19	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the HH-P16.2 states that 'total demolition is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that demolition is one reasonable option among other options.</p> <p>Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate demolition. The wording of this policy for contributing buildings should align with the policy for demolition of scheduled buildings.</p>	Opposes HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified and seeks amendment.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Amend	<p>Considers that the HH-P16.2 states that 'total demolition is considered ... to be a reasonable option' which can be taken to mean that demolition is one reasonable option among other options.</p> <p>Considers that stronger wording is needed to protect heritage values from inappropriate demolition. The wording of this policy for contributing buildings should align with the policy for demolition of scheduled buildings.</p>	Amend HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as follows: ... 2. Alternatives to total demolition have been explored and <u>it has been demonstrated that there are no reasonable alternatives</u> to total demolition. is considered by Council to be a reasonable option.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.10	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Amend	Considers that HH-R16 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) is appropriate with respect to demolition in Salisbury Garden Court (Item 24 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas)	Retain HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified, with respect to Salisbury Garden Court.
Wellington City Council	266.79	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Amend	Considers clarification is needed in title of HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures)	Amend HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as follows: Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures <u>within heritage areas</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.170	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support in part	Supports the direction of policy.	Retain HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures), subject to amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.171	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Amend	Considers that the wording should be amended to be less subjective – the policy requires an assessment of options and heritage values to be undertaken. Waka Kotahi agree that relocation should only occur if there all alternatives have been explored. The Council officer or decision maker will need to be satisfied that this has been demonstrated – it does therefore not need to be written into the condition.	Amend HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as follows: ... and relocation is considered by Council to be a reasonable option.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.79	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of heritage areas to Wellington's identity and character.	Retain HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.22	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P16	Support	Supports HH-P16 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention. Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.80	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P17	Support	This policy will help facilitate knowledge of archaeological sites: an important first step in ensuring their ongoing recognition and protection.	Retain HH-P17 (Information, advocacy and advice) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.81	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P20	Support	This policy will enable activities that increase appreciation of sites whilst protecting them	Retain HH-P20 (Modification of scheduled archaeological sites and earthworks within their extent) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.172	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P21	Support	Support policy as worded – demolition of scheduled sites should only occur if it can be demonstrated that there are no reasonable alternatives	Retain HH-P21 (Total demolition of scheduled archaeological sites) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.82	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-P21	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of archaeological sites to our history and identity	Retain HH-P21 (Total demolition of scheduled archaeological sites) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.93	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.83	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	HH-R1 is supported as it supports sustainable ongoing use of heritage buildings and structures.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.42	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and buildings in heritage areas being permitted.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.23	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	Supports HH-R1 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R1	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings being permitted activities.	Retain HH-R1 (Maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.173	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	Support rule as proposed, as it enables the demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.84	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	HH-R2 is supported as it facilitates enhancement of heritage.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.43	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	Supports demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings being permitted.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures)
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.173	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	HH-R2 is supported as it permits the demolition of non-scheduled heritage buildings on a heritage site when the building has no heritage value.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.24	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	Supports HH-R2 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structure) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.21	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R2	Support	Supports HH-R2 as notified.	Retain HH-R2 (Partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided under HH-R3.2 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) where compliance with the requirements of HH-R3.1 cannot be achieved.	Retain the Discretionary Restricted activity status at HH-R3.2 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.80	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Amend	Considers it necessary to add HH-P5 (Conservation plans) and HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys) to the list of matters of discretion.	Amend HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of HH-R3.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in HH-P4, <u>HH-P5</u> , <u>HH-P6</u> and HH-P7; 2. The extent of compliance with HH-S4.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.25	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R3 to be a restricted discretionary activity where compliance with the requirements of HH-R3.1 cannot be achieved.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.94	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports this rule as it makes provision for additions and alterations to heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.85	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	HH-R3 is supported as it facilitates changing use of heritage buildings whilst safeguarding heritage values.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and buildings in heritage areas being permitted, subject to the comments made in relation to Standard HH-S1.1.b above. Argosy supports the default activity status being restricted discretionary. The provision, subject to the amendments sought to Standard HH-S1.1.b, provide appropriate restrictions on additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified, subject to amendments to HH-S1.1.b
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.25	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports HH-R3 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.22	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R3	Support	Supports Rule HH-R3 as notified. Fabric supports the default activity status being restricted discretionary.	Retain HH-R3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	Supports HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures)	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structure) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.95	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	Supports this rule as it makes provision for new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.86	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	HH-R4 is supported as it enables new activities in heritage areas, whilst ensuring these are done in a way that recognises heritage values.	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.45	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	Supports new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures and within heritage areas being permitted.	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.174	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Oppose in part	HH-R4 is opposed as it restricts non-heritage buildings on heritage sites, which will hinder development potential in medium and high density areas where this will not affect built heritage values. HH-R2 permits partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures. By comparison, Rule HH-R4 permits new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures where HH-S2 is achieved. HH-S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m2. Given that the additional buildings are to the rear of, and accessory to, the primary residential building it is considered that the 10m2 limit should be removed as this will generally avoid the building being visible from the street and interfering with the heritage character. (Option A)	Opposes HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.175	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Amend	Considers that HH-R4 should be amended to remove compliance with HH-S2. HH-S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m2.	Amend HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with HH-S2 is achieved.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.26	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Oppose	HH-R4 in conjunction with HH-S2 control the addition of buildings on sites of heritage buildings. New buildings on heritage sites have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values and it is appropriate that this matter is controlled by district plan rules.	Disallow / Retain as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.26	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R4	Support	Supports HH-R4 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R4 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Support	Supports HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures)	Retain HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.87	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Support	HH-R5 is supported as it enables new activities in heritage areas, whilst ensuring these are done in a way that recognises heritage values.	Retain HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.176	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Oppose in part	HH-R5 is opposed as it only allows additions to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of a heritage buildings where HH-S3 is achieved. HH-S3 limits modifications to less than 10% and where there are no additional storeys to the existing building. Additions to buildings are covered by other general rules and standards in the Heritage Overlay or underlying Zone so it is considered unnecessary to also control this matter here.	Opposes HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.177	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Amend	Considers that HH-R5 should be amended to remove the reference to HH-S3. HH-S3 limits modifications to less than 10% and where there are no additional storeys to the existing building. Additions to buildings are covered by other general rules and standards in the Heritage Overlay or underlying Zone so it is considered unnecessary to also control this matter here.	Amend HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with HH-S3 is achieved.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.27	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Oppose	HH-R5 in conjunction with HH-S3 control additions to non-scheduled buildings on sites of heritage buildings. In the same way as new buildings on heritage sites have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values, substantial additions likewise have potentially adverse effects.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.27	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R5	Support	Supports HH-R5 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R5 (Additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.88	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R6	Support	HH-R6 is supported as it supports maintaining buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ, recognising that place and position are a key part of heritage value	Retain HH-R6 (Repositioning of heritage buildings and heritage structures on their existing site) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.46	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R6	Support	Supports the Proposed Plan enabling heritage buildings to be repositioned.	Retain HH-R6 (Repositioning of heritage buildings and heritage structures on their existing site) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R6	Support	Supports HH-R6 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R6 (Repositioning of heritage buildings and heritage structures on their existing site) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.89	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R7	Support	HH-R7 is supported as it will help decrease seismic risk whilst not making it overly difficult for building owners to do so.	Retain HH-R7 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys from built heritage) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.29	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R7	Support	Supports HH-R7 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R7 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys from built heritage) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.49	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R7	Support in part	Support removal of chimneys to be restricted discretionary but not reference to HH-P6	Retain rule HH-R7 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys from built heritage) with amendments.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.50	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R7	Amend	Do not support the matters of discretion at HH-P6.	Amend rule to remove matter of discretion as HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys)
Wellington City Council	266.81	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Amend	Considers provision is blank and does not have any related points.	Amend HH-R8 (Relocation of heritage buildings and heritage structures beyond the existing site) as follows: 1. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Section 88 information requirements to accompany applications for the relocation of heritage buildings and structures beyond the existing site:</u> <u>An application under this rule for the relocation of heritage buildings and structures beyond the existing site must be accompanied by:</u> <u>2. A Heritage Impact Assessment of the relocation of the building, notably assessing: a. The heritage values of the building in its current location; and</u> <u>b. The heritage values of the building resulting from its relocation;</u> <u>3. An assessment of alternatives to relocation that have been considered by the applicant, including evidence demonstrating why none of these alternatives are reasonable;</u> <u>4. A Heritage Construction Management Plan notably outlining the measures and methods that will be taken to protect the building before, during, and after the relocation; and</u> <u>5. A Conservation Plan where one exists.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.28	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R8 as a discretionary activity.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.90	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Support	HH-R8 is supported as it supports maintaining buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ, recognising that place and position are a key part of heritage value.	Retain HH-R8 (Relocation of heritage buildings and heritage structures beyond the existing site) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.47	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Support	Supports the Proposed Plan enabling heritage buildings to be relocated.	Retain HH-R8 (Relocation of heritage buildings and heritage structures beyond the existing site) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R8	Support	Supports HH-R8 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R8 (Relocation of heritage buildings and heritage structures beyond the existing site) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.82	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Amend	Considers more information requirements are required to accompany applications for total demolition of heritage buildings and structures. This is based on the need for greater assessment from professionals, and the need to add options for seismic strengthening, adaptive reuse, or restoration.	Amend HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows: (...) <u>1. A Heritage Impact Assessment for the demolition of a building;</u> 2.4- A detailed seismic analysis (DSA) where the building is identified as earthquake prone, and a detailed description and methodology of the works required to increase seismic resilience, <u>provided by a suitably qualified structural engineer;</u> <u>3. Where the building is identified as being beyond repair, a condition survey report of the building, provided by a suitably qualified professional;</u> 4.2- Costings of the works required to increase seismic resilience provided by a suitably qualified quantity surveyor; 5.3- Estimates of contributions that are available, including funding, grants, consent fee reimbursement and rates relief; 6.4- An assessment of market demand and pricing for comparable buildings and floor space; 7.5- A valuation of the: a. Building following completion of works; and b. Financial return on investment expected upon completion of the works; i. Depending on the proposal this could be by way of lettable income on floorspace as well as forecast sales price; and 8.6- An assessment of alternatives to total demolition that have been considered by the applicant, including <u>options for seismic strengthening, reuse, or restoration where applicable, and evidence demonstrating why none of these options are reasonable; and</u> <u>9. A Conservation Plan where one exists.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.29	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R9 for greater assessment from professionals, and the need to add options for seismic strengthening, adaptive reuse or restoration.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.83	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Amend	Considers clarification is needed on who will undertake the peer review referred to in the final sentence in HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures)	Amend HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows: (...) The Council will obtain a peer review <u>by a suitably qualified professional</u> of the information provided by the applicant.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.30	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment for the council to obtain a peer review by a suitably qualified professional of the information provided by the applicant.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.174	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	Support discretionary activity status for demolition of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.91	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of heritage areas to Wellington's identity and character.	Retain HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.48	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Oppose in part	Supports a consenting pathway for heritage buildings to be demolished as a discretionary activity. While Argosy is not currently intending to demolish any of the scheduled heritage buildings it owns, it opposes Rule HH-R9 in part as set out below. It is unnecessary for HH-R9 to specify a notification status for resource consent applications made under this rule. where it may be appropriate for a resource consent application to be publicly notified, s 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) provides sufficient guidance for the consent authority to use its discretion to decide if public notification is appropriate. We also note that the information requirements under this Rule are potentially onerous and inappropriate. The mandatory considerations under HH-R9 which relate to costs of works, market demand and financial returns do not relate to the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development (as required under s 6 of the RMA) and should not be mandatory application requirements.	Amend HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Discretionary Notification status: An application for a resource consent made in respect of HH-R9 must be publicly notified. Section 88 information requirements to accompany applications for total demolition of heritage buildings and structures: An application under this rule for the total demolition of heritage buildings and structures must be accompanied by: 1. A detailed seismic analysis (DSA) where the building is identified as earthquake prone, and a detailed description and methodology of the works required to increase seismic resilience; 2. Costings of the works required to increase seismic resilience provided by a suitably qualified quantity surveyor; 3. Estimates of contributions that are available, including funding, grants, consent fee reimbursement and rates relief; 4. An assessment of market demand and pricing for comparable buildings and floor space; 5. A valuation of the: a. Building following completion of works; and b. Financial return on investment expected upon completion of the works; i. Depending on the proposal this could be by way of lettable income on floorspace as well as forecast sales price; and
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.31	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Oppose	While in general the notification provisions provide the appropriate framework for decisions on notification, there are circumstances where public notification is always appropriate. The information requirements are also appropriate for this sort of application.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.31	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Support	Supports HH-R9 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-R9 (Total demolition of heritage buildings and heritage structures) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.23	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Oppose in part	Supports a consenting pathway for heritage buildings to be demolished as a discretionary activity. Considers that the information requirements under this Rule are potentially onerous and inappropriate. These requirements do not relate to the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development (as required under s 6 of the RMA) and should not be mandatory application requirements. Considers that it is unnecessary for HH-R9 to specify a notification status for resource consent applications made under this rule. Where it may be appropriate for a resource consent application to be publicly notified, s 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) provides sufficient guidance for the consent authority to use its discretion to decide if public notification is appropriate.	Opposes HH-R9 (Total demolition of structures) in part and seeks amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.24	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Amend	<p>Supports a consenting pathway for heritage buildings to be demolished as a discretionary activity.</p> <p>Considers that it is unnecessary for HH-R9 to specify a notification status for resource consent applications made under this rule. Where it may be appropriate for a resource consent application to be publicly notified, s 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) provides sufficient guidance for the consent authority to use its discretion to decide if public notification is appropriate.</p>	<p>Delete the notification clause under HH-R9 (Total demolition of structures) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p>Notification status: An application for a resource consent made in respect of HH-R9 must be publicly notified.</p>
Fabric Property Limited	425.25	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R9	Amend	<p>Supports a consenting pathway for heritage buildings to be demolished as a discretionary activity.</p> <p>Considers that it is unnecessary for HH-R9 to specify a notification status for resource consent applications made under this rule. Where it may be appropriate for a resource consent application to be publicly notified, s 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) provides sufficient guidance for the consent authority to use its discretion to decide if public notification is appropriate.</p>	<p>Delete the notification clause under HH-R9 (Total demolition of structures) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p>Notification status: An application for a resource consent made in respect of HH-R9 must be publicly notified.</p>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.92	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	HH-R10 is supported as it supports sustainable ongoing use of heritage areas.	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.49	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings and buildings in heritage areas being permitted.	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.32	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	<p>Supports HH-R10 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.26	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of scheduled heritage buildings being permitted activities.	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.27	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R10	Support	Supports HH-R10 as notified and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.84	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	Considers matters of discretion in HH-R11.2 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) should include HH-P11 (Height of development in heritage areas). Matters of discretion should have an additional point referring to HH-P6 (Removal of unreinforced masonry chimneys) for buildings and structures within a heritage area, except non-heritage buildings and structures.	Amend HH-R11.2 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as follows: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary (...) Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in HH-P4, <u>HH-P11</u> and HH-P13; <u>and</u> 2. <u>The matters in HH-P6 for buildings and structures within a heritage area, except non-heritage buildings and structures.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.32	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R11.2 to a restricted discretionary activity and that consideration should be given to matters of discretion.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.85	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	Considers HH-P4 (Enabling approach to works) needs to be included in matters of discretion.	Amend HH-R11.3 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as follows: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary (...) Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in <u>HH-P4</u> , HH-P11 and HH-P13; <u>and</u> 2. <u>The extent of compliance with HH-S4.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.33	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R11.3 to a restricted discretionary activity and that consideration should be given to matters of discretion.	Allow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.50	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	Supports additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings and buildings in heritage areas being permitted, subject to the comments made in relation to Standard HH-S1.1.b above. Argosy supports the default activity status being restricted discretionary. The provision, subject to the amendments sought to Standard HH-S1.1.b, provide appropriate restrictions on additions, alterations and partial demolition of heritage buildings.	Retain HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified, subject to amendments to HH-S1.1.b.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.178	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Oppose in part	HH-R11 is opposed in part and should be clarified.	Opposes HH-R11 in part (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.179	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	Considers that HH-R11 should be amended. HH-S1 only allows minor Internal alterations and states that this Standard does not apply to non heritage buildings. The rule should reflect this to be clear. Accordingly, Kāinga Ora seeks changes to the rule to improve clarity. Consequential changes to restricted discretionary activities should be made to reflect that changes to non-heritage buildings are permitted.	Amend HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: <u>a. Non-heritage buildings and structures are affected; or</u> <u>b. For heritage buildings and structures - Compliance with HH-S1 is achieved.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.34	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	The amendment as proposed by the submitter helps to clarify the intent of this provision.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.33	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	<p>Supports HH-R11 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.51	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	<p>Considers that there is no rationale given for having different considerations in these zones for additions and alterations.</p> <p>Considers the approach should be based on the heritage values of the place not what zone the place is in.</p>	Amend HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) so that there are not different considerations depending on the zone.
Fabric Property Limited	425.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Support	Supports HH-R11 as notified and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings) as notified.
Peter Fordyce	431.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R11	Amend	Considers that Historic Heritage rules governing demolition of pre-1930s buildings should have their coverage increased to more widely cover demolition prevention of pre-1930s dwellings in areas under protection.	<p>Seeks that HH-R11 (Additions, alterations and partial demolition of buildings and structures within a heritage area, including non-heritage buildings and structures) have increased demolition protection coverage for pre-1930s dwellings in Heritage Areas.</p> <p>[Decision requested - submission refers to Historic Heritage provisions]</p>
Waka Kotahi	370.175	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R12	Support	Support permitted activity status for total demolition repositioning, or removal of identified non-heritage building or structure in heritage area.	Retain HH-R12 (Total demolition, repositioning and relocation of an identified non-heritage building or structure) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.93	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R12	Support	HH-R12 is supported as it facilitates enhancement of heritage areas.	Retain HH-R12 (Total demolition, repositioning and relocation of an identified non-heritage building or structure) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R12	Support	<p>Supports HH-R12 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R12 (Total demolition, repositioning and relocation of an identified non-heritage building or structure) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.29	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R12	Support	Supports HH-R12 as notified and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-R12 (Total demolition, repositioning and relocation of an identified non-heritage building or structure) as notified.
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.5	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers that HH-R14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) is appropriate with respect to development in Salisbury Garden Court (Item 24 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas)	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified, with respect to Salisbury Garden Court.
Wellington City Council	266.86	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers a minimum size to allow for small structures in heritage areas (e.g. bollards, kerbing) necessary. Without this provision any structure, no matter how small, will require resource consent.	<p>Add new permitted activity rule for 'All zones' being HH.13.1 (Heritage Areas - New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows:</p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. The works involve the construction of a structure associated with the operation, use and maintenance of the legal road; or</u></p> <p><u>2. The height of the structure does not exceed 1.0 metres; or</u></p> <p><u>3. The structure is a lamppost.</u></p> <p>2. 2. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</p> <p>i. HRZ-S1;</p> <p>ii. HRZ-S3;</p> <p>iii. HRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard boundary setback;</p> <p>iv. HRZ-S5;</p> <p>v. HRZ-S6;</p> <p>vi. HRZ-S7;</p> <p>vii. HRZ-S8;</p> <p>viii. HRZ-S9; and</p> <p>ix. HRZ-S10.</p> <p>3. 3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary (...)</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.35	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	HNZPT supports the addition of new permitted activity rule for 'all zones' being HH.13.1.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.94	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	HH-R13 is supported as it facilitates changing use of heritage areas whilst safeguarding heritage values	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.51	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	Supports new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures and within heritage areas being permitted.	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.180	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Oppose in part	HH-R13 is opposed as it restricts new buildings and structures that are at the rear of the primary residential building as this will hinder development potential in high medium and high density areas where this will not affect heritage area values.	Opposes HH-R13 in part (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.181	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers that HH-R13.1 should be amended to remove the reference to HH-S2. Rule HH-R13 permits new buildings and structures within heritage areas where HH-S2 is achieved. HH-S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m2. (Option A)	<p>Amend HH-R13.1 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with HH-S2 is achieved</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.35	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	<p>Supports HH-R13 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.52	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that there is no rationale given for having different considerations in these zones for additions and alterations.</p> <p>Considers the approach should be based on the heritage values of the place not what zone the place is in.</p>	Amend HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) so that there are not different considerations depending on the zone.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support in part	Supports HH-R13.2 in part. Supports the restricted discretionary status in HHR13.2.	Retain HH-R13.2 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.65	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers that public notification should be precluded from HH-R13.2. Submitter considers that non-notification which is adopted by the Operative District Plan, is proven and efficient, and should be maintained.	Amend HH-R13.2 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows: ... <u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HH-R13.2a is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.36	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Oppose	New buildings within heritage areas have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values and it is appropriate that this matter is subject to the normal RMA notification standards.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.66	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support in part	Supports HH-R13.3 in part. Supports the restricted discretionary status in HHR13.2.	Retain HH-R13.3 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.67	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Amend	Considers that public notification should be precluded from HH-R13.3. Submitter considers that non-notification which is adopted by the Operative District Plan, is proven and efficient, and should be maintained.	Amend HH-R13.3 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as follows: ... <u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HH-R13.3 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.37	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Oppose	New buildings within heritage areas have the potential for significant adverse effects on heritage values and it is appropriate that this matter is subject to the normal RMA notification standards.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R13	Support	Supports HH-R13 as notified and seeks that it is retained.	Retain HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.95	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R14	Support	HH-R14 is supported as it supports maintaining buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ, recognising that place and position are a key part of heritage value.	Retain HH-R14 (Repositioning of contributing buildings and structures within a heritage area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.36	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R14	Support	<p>Supports HH-R14 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R14 (Relocation of contributing buildings and structures within a heritage area) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.87	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R15	Amend	Considers the provision is blank and does not have any related points as to what should be included as part of an application for resource consent under this rule. Considers further guidance on accompanying information requirements is appropriate to include for this rule.	<p>Amend HH-R15 (Relocation of contributing buildings and structures to a location outside of a heritage area) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p><u>Section 88 information requirements to accompany applications for the relocation of heritage buildings and structures beyond the existing site:</u></p> <p><u>An application under this rule for the relocation of heritage buildings and structures beyond the existing site must be accompanied by:</u></p> <p><u>1. A Heritage Impact Assessment of the relocation of the building, notably assessing: a. The heritage values of the heritage area and the contribution of the building in its current location; and b. The heritage values of the heritage area resulting from the relocation of the building;</u></p> <p><u>2. An assessment of alternatives to relocation that have been considered by the applicant, including evidence demonstrating why none of these alternatives are reasonable;</u></p> <p><u>3. A Heritage Construction Management Plan notably outlining the measures and methods that will be taken to protect the building before, during, and after the relocation.</u></p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.38	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R15	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R15 as a discretionary activity status.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.96	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R15	Support	HH-R15 is supported as it supports maintaining contributing buildings or structures in heritage areas in situ, recognising that place and position are a key part of heritage value.	Retain HH-R15 (Relocation of contributing buildings and structures to a location outside of a heritage area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R15	Support	<p>Supports HH-R15 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.</p> <p>Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.</p>	Retain HH-R15 (Relocation of contributing buildings and structures to a location outside of a heritage area) as notified.
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.6	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Amend	Considers that HH-P16 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas) is appropriate with respect to demolition in Salisbury Garden Court (Item 24 of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas)	Retain HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified, with respect to Salisbury Garden Court.
Wellington City Council	266.88	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Amend	Considers this provision is blank and does not have any related points as to what should be included as part of an application for resource consent under this rule. Considers further guidance on accompanying information requirements is appropriate to include for this rule.	<p>Amend HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p><u>Section 88 information requirements to accompany applications for the total demolition of contributing buildings and structures:</u> <u>An application under this rule for the total demolition of heritage buildings and structures must be accompanied by:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. A Heritage Impact Assessment of the demolition of the building;</u> <u>2. A detailed seismic analysis (DSA) where the building is identified as earthquake prone, and a detailed description and methodology of the works required to increase seismic resilience, provided by a suitably qualified structural engineer;</u> <u>3. Where the building is identified as being beyond repair, a condition survey report of the building, provided by a suitably qualified professional;</u> <u>4. Costings of the works required to increase seismic resilience provided by a suitably qualified quantity surveyor;</u> <u>5. Estimates of contributions that are available, including funding, grants, consent fee reimbursement and rates relief;</u> <u>6. An assessment of market demand and pricing for comparable buildings and floor space;</u> <u>7. A valuation of the:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. Building following completion of works; and</u> <u>b. Financial return on investment expected upon completion of the works;</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>i. Depending on the proposal this could be by way of lettable income on floorspace as well as forecast sales price; and</u> <u>8. An assessment of alternatives to total demolition that have been considered by the applicant, including options for seismic strengthening, adaptive reuse, or restoration where applicable, and evidence demonstrating why none of these options are reasonable.</u> <p>The Council will obtain a peer review by a suitably qualified professional of the information provided by the applicant.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.39	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-R16 as a discretionary activity status.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.97	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of heritage areas to Wellington's identity and character.	Retain HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.38	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Support	Supports HH-R16 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention. Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) as notified.
Peter Fordyce	431.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R16	Amend	Considers that Historic Heritage rules governing demolition of pre-1930s buildings should have their coverage increased to more widely cover demolition prevention of pre-1930s dwellings in areas under protection.	Seeks that HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) have increased demolition protection coverage for pre-1930s dwellings in Heritage Areas. [Decision requested - submission refers to Historic Heritage provisions]
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.98	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R18	Support	HH-R18 is supported as it will enable activities that increase appreciation of sites whilst protecting them.	Retain HH-R18 (Modification of a scheduled archaeological site, including earthworks within the mapped extent) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.99	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R19	Support	Avoiding demolition unless specific conditions are met provides certainty and reflects the importance of archaeological sites to our history and identity.	Retain HH-R19 (Total demolition of scheduled archaeological sites) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.53	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-R20	Oppose	Opposes the rule enabling alterations to enable building access at ground floor level of 32 the Terrace 'The Braemar building' being permitted as they may have an adverse effect on heritage.	Delete rule HH-R20 (Alterations to enable building access at ground floor level of 32 the Terrace 'The Braemar building')
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.52	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Oppose	Considers standard HH-S1.1.b would restrict internal additions and alterations of heritage buildings and heritage structures which would otherwise be permitted. It is important to encourage and enable the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings to ensure that they are occupied and maintained, this includes the ability to change internal floor layout and height for modern uses	Delete HH-S1.1.b (Permitted additions, alterations, and partial demolition) in its entirety.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Support	Supports HH-S1 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S1 (Permitted additions, alterations and partial demolition) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.54	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Amend	Considers that as per the current District Plan, structural strengthening which is visible from the exterior of the building should not be a permitted activity as this is likely to have an adverse effect on heritage values.	Amend HH-S1 (Permitted additions, alterations and partial demolition) as follows 1. The works must be internal to built heritage and not: a. Involve buildings where the whole interior, or individual interior elements have been specifically scheduled (and the work affects the scheduled interior or elements; or b. Result in new internal walls, floor levels, or internal structural strengthening visible from the exterior of the building

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.40	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of HH-S1 as internal structural elements have the potential to adversely impact on heritage values.	Allow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.55	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Amend	Considers that HH-S1 should apply to non-heritage buildings in heritage areas also as visible strengthening is likely to have an adverse effect on the area.	Seeks that HH-S1 (Permitted additions, alterations and partial demolition) apply to non-heritage buildings in heritage areas.
Fabric Property Limited	425.31	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S1	Support	Supports HH-S1 as notified as it recognises that the standard does not apply to non-heritage buildings in heritage areas.	Retain HH-S1 (Permitted additions, alterations and partial demolition) as notified.
Wharenui Apartments Ltd	358.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose in part	HH-S2 is opposed on the grounds that it will prevent development rights to be exercised at the rear of 274 Oriental Parade. The potential heritage listing of the building will not allow the development of the area of approximately 800 square metres. The rear of the site has a pedestrian right from Wilkinson St. The Submitter considers that the heritage listing will make the realisation of the development potential far more difficult to achieve.	Opposes HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) as notified and seeks amendment.
Wharenui Apartments Ltd	358.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Amend	Considers that wording in HH-S2 should be amended to allow the development of new buildings on sites of heritage buildings.	Amend HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) to allow the development of new buildings on heritage building sites.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.182	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose in part	HH-S2 is opposed and an amendment is sought.	Opposes HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) and seeks amendment.
Hilary Watson	FS74.2	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.183	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Amend	Considers that HH-S2 should be amended to remove the size and height limits for accessory buildings in order to not restrict development on heritage sites. The Standard restricts non-heritage buildings on heritage sites, which will hinder development potential in high medium and high density areas where this will not affect built heritage values. HH-R2 permits partial and total demolition of non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures. By comparison, Rule HH-R4 permits new buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures where HH-S2 is achieved. HH-S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m2. Given that the additional buildings are to the rear of, and accessory to, the primary residential building it is considered that the 10m2 limit should be removed as this will generally avoid the building being visible from the street and interfering with the heritage character. (Option B)	Amend HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) as follows: Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone: 1. Any new building or structure must be: a. Accessory to the primary residential building; <u>and</u> b. Located to the rear of the primary residential building; <u>and</u> c. Smaller than 10m2. 2. Any new structure (excluding buildings provided for in HH-S2.1) must have a maximum height of 4.5m
Hilary Watson	FS74.3	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.184	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Amend	Considers that HH-S2 should be amended to remove the size and height limits for accessory buildings in order to not restrict development on heritage sites. HH-S2 only applies to the MDRZ and HDRZ and only allows buildings and structures that are accessory to the primary residential building, located to the rear and less than 10m2. Given that the additional buildings are to the rear of, and accessory to, the primary residential building it is considered that the 10m2 limit should be removed as this will generally avoid the building being visible from the street and interfering with heritage character. (Option B)	Amend HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) as follows: Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone: 3. Any new building or structure must be: a. Accessory to the primary residential building; and b. Located to the rear of the primary residential building; and c. Smaller than 10m2. 4. Any new structure (excluding buildings provided for in HH-S2.1) must have a maximum height of 4.5m
Hilary Watson	FS74.4	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S2	Support	Supports HH-S2 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S2 (New buildings and structures on the site of heritage buildings or structures and on sites within heritage areas) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.41	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S3	Support	Supports HH-S3 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S3 (Modifications to non-scheduled buildings and structures on the site of a heritage building or structure) as notified.
Parliamentary Service	375.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Support in part	HH-S4 is supported due to the differentiation of maximum heights across the Parliament Precinct. However the wording used in this Standard is ambiguous, and does not appear to align with the height controls set out on the Council's interactive maps.	Retain HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) with amendment.
Parliamentary Service	375.10	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Amend	Considers that the wording in HH-S4 should be amended to avoid any ambiguity about maximum heights allowed at the site. The wording used in this Standard is ambiguous, and does not appear to align with the height controls set out on the Council's interactive maps. The submitter requests that the wording is amended to avoid any ambiguity about maximum heights allowed at the site.	Amend HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) as follows: Location ... Between Parliament buildings and Museum Street <u>From the front (eastern edge) of Parliament buildings westward to Museum Street</u>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.53	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Support	Note the maximum height above ground level for the part of the Stout Street Precinct heritage area that includes 15 Stout Street and 143-149 Lambton Quay is 50m. This is appropriate in light of the building heights on the site and in the surrounding area and Argosy supports this height limit. The maximum height above ground level for the sites at 360-366 Lambton Quay is 95m in the airspace above 360-366 Lambton Quay and 8 Wills Street. This is also appropriate in light of the existing building heights and Argosy supports this height limit	Retain HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.185	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Oppose in part	HH-S4 is opposed and amendments are sought.	Opposes HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) and seeks amendments.

Historical and Cultural Values - Notable Trees

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.186	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Amend	Considers that HH-S4 should be amended to align with other relief relating to Zone provisions as the heights of buildings should be comparable with the underlying zone rather than the heritage provisions particularly at the interface with the underlying zone.	Amend HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) to: - Align height limits with amended Historic Heritage Standards, - Amend underlying zoning according to Appendix 4, - Amend Residential and Centre Zones heights and Heights in relation to boundary standards. [Refer to original submission, including Appendix 4]
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.42	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S4	Support	Supports HH-S4 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S4 (Minimum and maximum heights for heritage areas in the City Centre Zone, Centre Zones and Waterfront Zone) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.43	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S5	Support	Supports HH-S5 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S5 (Grazing of stock) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S6	Support	Supports HH-S6 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S6 (Earthworks for the maintenance and repair of existing roads, walking and access tracks, and operation of existing cultivation areas) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.45	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / HH-S7	Support	Supports HH-S7 as it is consistent with the direction of Part 2 of the Act and the direction of the RPS for the Wellington Region to maintain the historic heritage values of the city, while providing for upkeep and maintenance. The policy direction of avoiding demolition of heritage buildings and structures and buildings in heritage areas strongly discourages demolition and the rule structure supports this intention.	Retain HH-S7 (Mowing of lawns, trimming and pruning of trees and vegetation within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site) as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / General TREE	Support	Supports the provisions to protect notable trees. Considers that these are an important part of the quality of the public space and protect genetic resources.	Retain the Notable Trees chapter as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.176	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / New TREE	Amend	Proposes a new rule to enable relocation, removal, or destruction of notable trees for maintenance and development of infrastructure. A restricted discretionary activity status is appropriate as it enables Council to assess whether the activity is necessary for the specified purposes, methods, and whether alternatives have been sufficiently explored.	Add a new Rule to the Notable Tree chapter: <u>TREE-RX.</u> <u>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where</u> <u>a. The relocation, removal, or destruction of notable trees is for the purposes of maintaining or upgrading infrastructure.</u> <u>Matter of discretion are:</u> <u>a. Methods of relocation, removal, or destruction</u> <u>b. Feasibility of alternatives Public safety and benefit</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.34	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / New TREE	Amend	<p>Considers that that the provisions of the Thames Coromandel District Plan, as they relate to the management of Kauri Dieback disease, should be adopted into the Proposed District Plan where appropriate.</p> <p>Schedule 6 of the Wellington City Proposed District Plan lists several Kauri as Notable Trees and there are likely to be other Kauri within Wellington's boundaries. Kauri Dieback is caused by a pathogen that is easily spread through soil movements, including when it is carried on footwear, equipment, and vehicles. The disease is threatening Kauri with functional extinction and requires collaborative work to manage the disease and control any further spread. Any land disturbance works within three times the radius of the canopy of the dripline of New Zealand Kauri Tree ("the kauri hygiene zone") can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site and spread the disease.</p>	<p>Add provisions to address the management of Kauri Dieback, particularly around earthworks and measures to prevent spread of the disease.</p> <p>Provide clear guidance for the management of Kauri Dieback disease, such as laid out in the Thames Coromandel District Plan.</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.152	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O1	Oppose in part	Seeks rewording to ensure Notable Trees do not include pest species that are registered weed species as per pest definition of the proposed district plan.	<p>Amend TREE-O1 (Purpose):</p> <p>Notable trees are recognised for their contribution to the city's amenity, history, ecology and sense of place and cultural value to mana whenua <u>and don't include pest species.</u></p>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.54	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O1	Support	Supports the objectives relating to notable trees to the extent that they provide for maintenance and appropriate modification of notable trees.	Retain TREE-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.43	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O1	Support	Supports the recognition of the cultural value of notable trees for mana whenua	Retain Objective TREE-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.153	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O2	Support	Supports TREE-O2.	Retain TREE-O2 (Protecting notable trees) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.55	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O2	Support	Supports the objectives relating to notable trees to the extent that they provide for maintenance and appropriate modification of notable trees.	Retain TREE-O2 (Protecting notable trees) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.154	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O3	Support	Supports TREE-O3.	Retain TREE-O3 (Maintaining notable trees) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.56	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-O3	Support	Supports the objectives relating to notable trees to the extent that they provide for maintenance and appropriate modification of notable trees.	Retain TREE-O3 (Maintaining notable trees) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.155	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P1	Oppose in part	Seeks policy direction to enable further surveys of Notable Trees and provide for the inclusion of additional trees in SCHED6 over the life of the Plan.	<p>Amend TREE-P1 (Identifying notable trees):</p> <p>Identify notable trees having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Tree health, condition and ecological value; <u>x. Age, height and irreplaceability;</u> Amenity value and community benefit; Notability and recognition; and Significant cultural and heritage value. <p><u>Provide opportunity to add to SCHED6 by:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>requiring assessments of trees for subdivision, development and land use consent applications;</u> <u>supporting survey initiatives;</u> <u>supporting plan change processes to update SCHED6</u>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.57	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P1	Support	Supports the policies relating to notable trees, except as specified below. It is important that notable trees are identified according to robust criteria and appropriate controls are in place for maintenance and works in proximity to trees	Retain TREE-P1 (Identifying notable trees) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.156	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P2	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P2.	Retain TREE-P2 (Support for landowners) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.58	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P2	Support	Supports the policies relating to notable trees, except as specified below. It is important that notable trees are identified according to robust criteria and appropriate controls are in place for maintenance and works in proximity to trees	Retain TREE-P2 (Support for landowners) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.157	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P3	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P3.	Retain TREE-P3 (Allowing trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.177	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P3	Support	Support policy as worded as it allows for trimming or pruning of notable trees where the works prevent interface with footpaths, property, or network utilities. This will provide for trimming or pruning or notable trees where it is essential for the safe and efficient operation of State Highway infrastructure.	Retain TREE-P3 (Allowing trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.59	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P3	Support	Supports TREE-P3, as it reflects that there are circumstances where it is reasonable or necessary to prune notable trees, including to prevent notable trees being damaged where the canopy overhangs footpaths. For example, the notable trees at 7 Waterloo Quay overhang the footpath on Waterloo Quay and pruning is necessary to prevent the trees from becoming a nuisance (and potential safety hazard) to pedestrians	Retain TREE-P3 (Allowing trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.158	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P4	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P4.	Retain TREE-P4 (Other trimming and pruning) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.60	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P4	Support	Supports TREE-P4 as it allows trimming or pruning of notable trees which is consistent with other criteria in which works to notable trees are appropriate. There are practical reasons which may not fit into TREE-P3 but in which works to notable trees are needed, and it is important that these are provided for	Retain TREE-P4 (Other trimming or pruning) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.159	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P5	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P5.	Retain TREE-P5 (Managing activities in the root protection area) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.61	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P5	Support	Supports TREE-P5 which places appropriate considerations for works within the root protection area of a tree. Argosy has also made a submission on the definition for root protection area below	Retain TREE-P5 (Managing activities in the root protection area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.160	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P6	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P6.	Retain TREE-P6 (Repositioning and Relocation) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.178	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P6	Support	Support policy as worded, as it allows repositioning or relocating of notable trees where necessary to enable development and operation of infrastructure. It is noted that there is no rule to enable repositioning or relocating of notable trees for these purposes. Waka Kotahi submit that a rule be included to enable repositioning, relocation, or destruction for purposes specified in Tree-P6.	Retain TREE-P6 (Repositioning and Relocation) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.62	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P6	Support	Supports TREE-P6.	Retain TREE-P6 (Repositioning and relocation) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.161	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P7	Support	Generally supports policy TREE-P7.	Retain TREE-P7 (Destruction) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.179	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P7	Support in part	Support policy.	Retain TREE-P7 (Destruction), subject to amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.180	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P7	Amend	Considers amendments appropriate to enable destruction of a notable tree where necessary for purposes of maintaining or developing infrastructure. It is noted that the policy requires repositioning and relocation to be explored in the first instance. Waka Kotahi also submit that a rule be included in this chapter to enable demolition where is necessary in enabling efficient development and operation of infrastructure	Amend TREE-P7 (Destruction) as follows: Only allow the destruction of notable trees where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The tree poses a serious and imminent threat to the safety of people or property; or 2. The tree is dead, or in a state of terminal decline; or 3. <u>Destruction of the tree is necessary to enable the efficient development and operation of infrastructure</u> 4. There are no reasonable alternatives including: a. Trimming and pruning; and b. Repositioning and relocation.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.63	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-P7	Support in part	Supports TREE-P7 however it is more appropriate to refer to 'removal' rather than 'destruction'.	Amend TREE-P7 (Destruction) to refer to "destruction and removal".
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.162	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R1	Support	Generally supports TREE-R1.	Retain TREE-R1 (Trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.181	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R1	Support	Support permitted activity status for trimming and pruning of notable trees for specified purposes – the permitted activity status enables Waka Kotahi to trim or prune notable trees where necessary to enable maintaining the safety and operation of infrastructure – including provision for emergency works.	Retain TREE-R1 (Trimming and pruning of notable trees) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R1	Support in part	Supports TREE-R1.1 to the extent that it enables trimming and pruning of trees to be permitted in appropriate circumstances, for the reasons set out above. Argosy also supports the default activity status for activities that do not comply with TREE-R1 to be restricted discretionary. However, it is considered that it is also appropriate for trimming and pruning to be permitted where the works will maintain or improve tree health. Policy TREE-P3 recognises that trimming and pruning should be allowed where the works will maintain or improve tree health, but this is not reflected in Rule TREE-R1. This is appropriate to allow for ongoing maintenance to protect the health of notable trees. We've also suggested some amendments for clarity.	Amend TREE-R1 (Trimming and pruning of notable trees) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The trimming and pruning is necessary to- i. <u>The trimming and pruning is necessary to</u> comply with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003; or ii. The works are necessary to prevent interference with footpaths, buildings, structures or network utilities and are undertaken to the minimum extent required to prevent interference and TREE-S1 is complied with; or iii. The works involve the removal of broken branches, dead wood and diseased vegetation and TREE-S1 is complied with; or iv. <u>The works will maintain or improve tree health and TREE-S1 is complied with; or</u> iv. The works are essential due to a serious and imminent threat to the safety of people or damage to property and TREE-S2 is complied with.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.163	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R2	Support	Generally supports TREE-R2.	Retain TREE-R2 (Activity and development within the root protection area of notable trees) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.182	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R2	Support	Support permitted activity status as it will enable Waka Kotahi to undertake works within the root zone for the purposes of undergoing maintenance and/or repair of infrastructure.	Retain TREE-R2 (Activity and development within the root protection area of notable trees) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.65	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R2	Support in part	Supports rule TREE-R2.1 however considers that it also needs to refer to existing footpaths.	Amend TREE-R2 (Activity and development within the root protection area of notable trees) as follows: b. The works are for the maintenance and repair of existing <u>footpaths</u> , roading, transport or other infrastructure
Jeremy Partridge	102.2	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R3	Amend	Opposes Tree-R3.1.b (Destruction, relocation or removal of notable trees) which allows the removal of a Notable Tree without a consent if it is deemed to be 'in terminal decline' by a Technician Arborist as a permitted activity. Considers that as tree's age they inevitably decline and may develop large cavities, die back and be consumed by decay fungi. Such trees may be safe or can be managed to keep them safe, and may live for another 100 years. Such trees could be classed as veteran and remain very important for their historical, cultural and ecological value.	Delete the ability to remove Notable Trees as a permitted activity in TREE-R3 (Ⓜ) Destruction, relocation or removal of notable trees) if it is deemed to be in terminal decline by a Technician Arborist.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.164	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R3	Support	Generally supports TREE-R3.	Retain TREE-R3 (Destruction, relocation or removal of notable trees) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.183	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R3	Support	Support the inclusion of emergency works in the permitted activity status for destruction, relocation, or removal of notable trees.	Retain TREE-R3 (Destruction, relocation or removal of notable trees) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.66	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R3	Support	Supports the rule as it is recognised that in some instances it will be appropriate for notable trees to be destroyed, relocated or removed.	Retain TREE-R3 (Destruction, relocation, or removal of notable trees) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.165	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R4	Support	Generally supports TREE-R4.	Retain TREE-R4 (All other land use activities) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.184	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R4	Support	Support discretionary activity status for all other land use activities as it provides pathway for other relocation, removal, or destruction of notable trees for infrastructure development and maintenance purposes	Retain TREE-R4 (All other land use activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.166	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-R5	Support	Generally supports TREE-R5.	Retain TREE-R5 (The storage or discharge of any toxic substance within the root protection area of notable trees) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.167	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S1	Support	Generally supports TREE-S1.	Retain TREE-S1 (Certification by works arborist) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.185	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S1	Support	Support standards as worded.	Retain TREE-S1 (Certification by works arborist) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.67	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S1	Support	Considers this standard is appropriate and should be retained.	Retain TREE-S1 (Certification by works arborist) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.168	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S2	Support	Generally supports TREE-S2.	Retain TREE-S2 (Emergency trimming or pruning work) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.186	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S2	Support	Support standards as worded.	Retain TREE-S2 (Emergency trimming or pruning work) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.68	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S2	Support in part	Supports enabling emergency trimming or pruning work, is necessary. However, in the case of a true emergency it may be difficult to advise the Council of works at least one hour prior to the works commencing. This is particularly onerous as the activity would otherwise be permitted.	Amend TREE-S2 (Emergency trimming or pruning work) as follows: 1. The works are undertaken or supervised by a works arborist and Council is advised at least 1 hour prior to the work commencing <u>or as soon as practicable after the works have occurred.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.169	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S3	Support	Generally supports TREE-S3.	Retain TREE-S3 (Certification that a scheduled notable tree is dead or in terminal decline) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.187	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S3	Support	Support standards as worded.	Retain TREE-S3 (Certification that a scheduled notable tree is dead or in terminal decline) as notified.
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.62	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Oppose	Standard TREE-S4 should be deleted and relocated from the Notable Trees chapter to the Infrastructure – Other Overlays Sub-Chapter. The current wording is based on the Auckland Unitary Plan and was requested by the telecommunications submitters on the draft plan.	Delete TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) in order to relocate the provision in the Infrastructure - Other Overlays sub-chapter.

Historical and Cultural Values - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.63	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Amend	TREE-S4 should be clarified and amended. A readability edit is recommended to make it clearer how the rule is intended to apply and how it has been interpreted in practice.	Amend TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) as follows: ... 2. Excavation must be undertaken by drilling machine at a depth of 1m or greater, hand-digging, air spade, or hydro vac or drilling machine, within the root protection area at a depth of 1m or greater; ...
Jeremy Partridge	102.3	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Amend	Considers that TREE-S4.2 should be amended to remove the ability to use a hydrovac tool to remove soil around a Notable Tree's roots. A hydrovac uses water at high pressure to dislodge and then suck away soil around tree roots. Unfortunately the high pressure also removes outer and inner bark and damages cambium which functionally kills tree roots.	Amend TREE-S4.2 (Works in the root protection area) to remove the ability to use a hydrovac tool to remove soil around a Notable Tree's roots.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.170	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Support	Generally supports TREE-S4.	Retain TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.188	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Support	Support standards as worded.	Retain TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.69	Historical and Cultural Values / Notable Trees / TREE-S4	Support in part	Considers the standard is generally appropriate by requires some amendments for clarity. In addition, the area restriction for a single excavation of 1m ² is not necessary when a control is applied of no more than 10% disturbance to the root protection area. Having a single excavation limit may lead to a number of smaller excavation areas to fit within the permitted activity rule, where one large excavation area would be better for the tree.	Amend TREE-S4 (Works in the root protection area) as follows: 2. Excavation must be undertaken by one or a combination of the following methods: a) hand-digging, air excavation spade, hydro excavation vac, and / or b) directional drilling machine within the root protection area at a depth of 1m or greater; 3. The surface area of a single excavation must not exceed 1m²; ... 7. Any excavation machines ...
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.64	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose in part	There are a number of piped awa shown in the SASM mapped overlay. This are located in built up areas of central Wellington. It is unclear if undertaking infrastructure work above these piped awa (e.g., routine work in roads) are considered to impact in this overlay, or if it is only if the piped awa is physically altered. This should be clearly clarified in the rules.	Clarify the Infrastructure - Other Overlays rules relating to SASM as necessary such that it is clarified that work not directly affecting a piped awa (e.g. infrastructure work in roads above) is not affected by the overlay and related rules.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.38	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports prioritising mana whenua input into development and design, and design which acknowledges the history of this land, and consider this a much more valuable restoration of history than heritage and character protections.	Not specified.
Historic Places Wellington	182.18	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports the objective of protecting and enhancing heritage values, including heritage of significance to Māori.	Retain Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori provisions as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington City Youth Council	201.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Not specified	Identifies that Wellington City was built on top of significant sites for tangata whenua such as Te Aro Pā and Pipitea Pā. Considers that the rights of mana whenua to exercise rangatiratanga over their ancestral land are essential.	Seeks that significant sites for tangata whenua are protected.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tyers Stream Group	221.30	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter as it relates to the Tyers stream catchment.	Retain the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports the Category C classification as it applies to their land.	Retain the inclusion of Category C in the introduction to the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter as notified.
Roland Sapsford	305.28	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Supports provisions which seek to enhance the mana of kaitiaki and to give effect at a local level to the solemn commitment to rangatiratanga contained in Te Tiriti o Waitangi	Retain Tangata Whenua chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Richard Murcott	322.15	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. The stream flowed through a partially surveyed gully across the Thorndon Flat. Stilt foundations, retaining walls and the topography below the houses at 60 & 62 Hobson St are evidence that the houses were built on fill of a gully through which the Tiakiwai Stream flowed. Drainage plans from 1915 as well as the current drainage point on the eastern side of Hobson Street provide further evidence of the former location of the stream. Any qualifying matters that arise from knowing the feature's actual location should be identified.</p> <p>A publication is provided in the submission to show evidence of the stream's accurate location, as well as a map in attachments.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Seeks that the significance of the Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua is considered.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.21	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. They request for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori overlay to be amended to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream. They also seek for the significance of Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua to be considered. They also seek that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building. They consider that the location of the stream, item 60 of SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) is more correctly represented. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission as this site is adequately recorded in the PDP, and its significance to mana whenua is considered as it is recorded in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori schedule.	Disallow
Richard Murcott	322.16	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. The stream flowed through a partially surveyed gully across the Thorndon Flat. Stilt foundations, retaining walls and the topography below the houses at 60 & 62 Hobson St are evidence that the houses were built on fill of a gully through which the Tiakiwai Stream flowed. Drainage plans from 1915 as well as the current drainage point on the eastern side of Hobson Street provide further evidence of the former location of the stream. Any qualifying matters that arise from knowing the feature's actual location should be identified.</p> <p>A publication is provided in the submission to show evidence of the stream's accurate location, as well as a map in attachments.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Seeks that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building (fill (unnatural terrain), buried streams, etc).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.22	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. They request for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori overlay to be amended to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream. They also seek for the significance of Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua to be considered. They also seek that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building. They consider that the location of the stream, item 60 of SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) is more correctly represented. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission as this site is adequately recorded in the PDP, and its significance to mana whenua is considered as it is recorded in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori schedule.	Disallow
Kimberley Vermaey	348.9	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	The Sites of Significance to Maori rule framework should be clarified to be clearer when it relates to a feature such as a stream or piped waterway. It is unclear whether the rules apply to the whole site, or just the portion of the site where the feature passes through a corner of a property.	Clarify the 'Sites of Significance to Maori' chapter to state whether provisions for waterways and streams apply to whole sites of portions where the features pass through.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.142	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Considers it to be appropriate requests modification to the MDRS adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, to ensure the values in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are preserved as part of intensification activities. This request gives effect to the relevant Operative RPS Policies, namely: (a) Policy 48 of the RPS, which directs that plans give particular regard to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and Waitangi Tribunal reports and settlement decisions relating to the Wellington region; and (b) Policy 49 of the RPS, which directs that plans recognise and provide for the exercise of kaitiakitanga; mauri, particularly in relation to fresh and coastal waters; mahinga kai and areas of natural resources used for customary purposes; and places, sites and areas with significant spiritual or cultural historic heritage value to tangata whenua. (c) Historic heritage policies 21, 22 and 46. Greater Wellington acknowledges that MRZ-P4 recognises that the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga applies as a qualifying matter. However we do not consider this to go far enough and it should be extended to sites adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. The extent of modification necessary will require a situation-specific impact analysis depending on the nature of the SASM, including the need to avoid adjacent intensification in some instances.	Seeks to modify intensification levels through setbacks and reduced building heights for areas adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori to the extent necessary following site-specific analysis, and to only allow intensification on sites adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori where the associated buildings and structures will provide for tino rangatiratanga. This includes any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.143	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Considers it to be appropriate requests modification to the MDRS adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, to ensure the values in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are preserved as part of intensification activities.</p> <p>This request gives effect to the relevant Operative RPS Policies, namely: (a) Policy 48 of the RPS, which directs that plans give particular regard to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and Waitangi Tribunal reports and settlement decisions relating to the Wellington region; and (b) Policy 49 of the RPS, which directs that plans recognise and provide for the exercise of kaitiakitanga; mauri, particularly in relation to fresh and coastal waters; mahinga kai and areas of natural resources used for customary purposes; and places, sites and areas with significant spiritual or cultural historic heritage value to tangata whenua. (c) Historic heritage policies 21, 22 and 46. Greater Wellington acknowledges that MRZ-P4 recognises that the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga applies as a qualifying matter. However we do not consider this to go far enough and it should be extended to sites adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. The extent of modification necessary will require a situation-specific impact analysis depending on the nature of the SASM, including the need to avoid adjacent intensification in some instances.</p>	Seeks to include any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that provisions within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter and mapping should be clarified to whether “within a site or area of significance to Māori” applies to only the line, or the entire title subject to the site.</p> <p>The clearest interpretation is that those rules would only apply to the line itself.</p>	Clarify the intention of how sites and areas of significance to Māori represented by lines are to be treated within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that provisions within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter and mapping should be clarified to whether “within a site or area of significance to Māori” applies to only the line, or the entire title subject to the site.</p> <p>The clearest interpretation is that those rules would only apply to the line itself.</p>	Clarify the intention of how sites and areas of significance to Māori represented by lines are to be treated within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.67	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support in part	Support for general direction of chapter, with amendments.	Seeks that there are amendments to text to reflect Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua especially at Category C.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.53	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.68	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	Considers that new or existing developments of marae should be endorsed by and based on a relationship with Taranaki Whānui.	Seeks that there are amendments to text to reflect Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua especially at Category C.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.54	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.69	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose in part	Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands. Taranaki Whānui support the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.	Seeks that the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford is removed; specifically at Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government. Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.19	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.9	Part 2/ Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whanui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.69].</p>	Disallow
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.7	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whanui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.19	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.6	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.23	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.7	Part 2/ Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.15	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whānui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.69]</p>	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.70	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui support the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p>	Seeks that the objectives, policies, rules and standards in the Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are amended to ensure mana whenua can exercise tino rangatiratanga over Te Motu Kairangi.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.20	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.8	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.20	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.7	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.24	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.42	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.8	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.71	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui support the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p>	Seeks that the objectives, policies, rules and standards in the Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are amended to make papakainga a permitted activity, subject to standards.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lance Lones	FS81.9	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.72	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	<p>Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui support the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p>	Seeks that any other relief to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their properties in Te Motu Kairangi.
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.43	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.217	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose in part	<p>Supports the clarification provided by the introductory text that the provisions of this chapter only apply to the use, development and activities located within the mapped extent of the scheduled Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.</p>	<p>Retain SASM chapter introduction as notified, subject to the general relief sought by WIAL in the covering submission.</p> <p>[See original submission for further detail].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.143	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.218	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Not specified	Considers that Moa Pont site is located within a core operational area of the airport and is subject to strict Civil Aviation regulations. As the infrastructure methods do not apply within the Airport Zone, there is no clear consenting pathway within the SASM chapter for what is otherwise a piece of regionally significant infrastructure.	Not specified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.144	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.219	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the SASM chapter is amended to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone, particularly given the regional significance of the Airport and the existing modified state of the sites of significance.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.145	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.87	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter requests for the SASM chapter is amended to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone, particularly given the regional significance of the Airport and the existing modified state of the sites of significance. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification, sites of significance should still be protected and the engagement requirements with Tangata Whenua to remain. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use the SASM chapter to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.220	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	Considers that the following SASMs should not be over the Airport Zone: - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B).	Delete the following SASMs from the Airport Zone: - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.146	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.88	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter requests for the SASM chapter is amended to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone, particularly given the regional significance of the Airport and the existing modified state of the sites of significance. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification, sites of significance should still be protected and the engagement requirements with Tangata Whenua to remain. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use the SASM chapter to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.221	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	Considers that the following SASMs require significant changes to the Airport Zone to accommodate airport activities: - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B).	Seeks that the following SASMs require significant changes to the Airport Zone to accommodate airport activities: - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.147	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose WIAL's amendments and removal as the airport zone does not need to be 'accommodated' in relationship to the following SASMs - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B). These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.89	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	The submitter requests for the SASM chapter is amended to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone, particularly given the regional significance of the Airport and the existing modified state of the sites of significance. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification, sites of significance should still be protected and the engagement requirements with Tangata Whenua to remain. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use the SASM chapter to accommodate activities within the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.56	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Amend	Considers that given that many of the scheduled SASM are also archaeological sites (pre-1900 human activity), reference should be made within the Introduction that modifications to some of the SASM may	Seeks that the introduction to the chapter be amended to include reference to the archaeological provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.44	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Oppose	Considers that Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori may be impacted by the scale of development permitted by the plan in residential zones. Considers that the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori provisions may not be able to cover site specific protection requirements.	Seeks that further work be undertaken in some of these areas to see if there needs to be a significant level of modification needed to the currently identified high intensification residential areas.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.111	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General SASM	Support	Greater Wellington seek to ensure all sites are recorded and provisions apply appropriate protection, including on adjoining sites.	Allow / Seeks to ensure that all sites of significance are captured in the Proposed District Plan and appropriate protections from the effects of intensification are provided, including on properties surrounding those sites.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.45	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / New SASM	Amend	Considers that the Accidental Discovery Protocol and its implementation can be improved by embedding the process in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori chapter.	Add new policy to the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori chapter that acknowledges the importance of Accidental Discovery to maintaining and protecting the sites and areas of significance to Māori and iwi.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.112	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / New SASM	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.17	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O1	Support	Supports the purpose of the chapter as set out in this objective.	Retain SASM-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.100	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O1	Support	Objective SASM-O1 is supported, as identifying and protecting sites and significance to Māori is a fundamental aspect of protecting cultural heritage. This objective provides for that protection in a way that empowers Māori enables Mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga	Retain Objective SASM-O1 (Purpose) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.222	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O1	Oppose in part	Supports the identification and mapping of areas and sites of significance to Māori and considers it is appropriate to protect these areas from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.101	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O2	Support	Objective SASM-O2 is supported, as identifying and protecting sites and significance to Māori is a fundamental aspect of protecting cultural heritage. This objective provides for that protection in a way that empowers Māori enables Mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga	Retain Objective SASM-O2 (Protecting the sites and areas of significance to Māori) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.223	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O2	Oppose in part	Supports the identification and mapping of areas and sites of significance to Māori and considers it is appropriate to protect these areas from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Retain SASM-O2 (Protecting sites and areas of significance to Maori) as notified, subject to relief sought by WIAL in the covering submission. [See original submission for further detail]
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.148	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-03 These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.102	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O3	Support	Objective SASM-O3 is supported, as identifying and protecting sites and significance to Māori is a fundamental aspect of protecting cultural heritage. This objective provides for that protection in a way that empowers Māori enables Mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga	Retain Objective SASM-O3 (Kaitiakitanga) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.224	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O3	Oppose in part	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-O3 (Kaitiakianga) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.149	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-03 These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.90	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O3	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-O3 (kaitiakitanga) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework, nor from the schedule of SASM. It is unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.225	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O3	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-O3 (Kaitiakianga) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.150	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-O3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-03 These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.91	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-03	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-03 (kaitiakitanga) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework, nor from the schedule of SASM. It is unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.103	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P1 (Identifying sites and areas of significance) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.226	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P1 (Identifying sites and areas of significance to Māori) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.151	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P1. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.227	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P1 (Identifying sites and areas of significance to Māori) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.152	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P1	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P1. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.96	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it makes provision for the maintenance and repair of existing buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance to Māori.	Retain SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.18	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Supports the ability to maintain and repair activities occurring on sites/areas of significance.	Retain SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.104	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.228	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.153	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P2. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.92	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P2 (maintenance and repair) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.229	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.154	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P2. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.93	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P2 (maintenance and repair) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.46	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support in part	Supports the policy protecting spiritual and cultural values of Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori. [Inferred reason]	Retain SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) with amendment below.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.113	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.47	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Amend	Considers that there are environmental values embedded to cultural values and this should be recognised.	Seeks that SASM-P2 (Maintenance and repair) is amended to include protection of environmental values that mana whenua have attributed to sites.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.114	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.15	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P2	Support	Support and agree that SASM-P2 be amended to include the protection of environmental values that mana whenua attribute to sites.	Allow
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.19	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P3	Support	Supports that the ongoing use and development of marae is enabled.	Retain SASM-P3 (Ongoing use and development of marae) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.105	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P3	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P3 (Ongoing use and development of marae) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.97	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Support	Supports the policy as it makes provision for the construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance to Māori. An established fire station is located within a site and area of significance to Māori and this rule would provide for any future on-site alterations, subject to the protection of cultural and spiritual values	Retain SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.20	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Support	Supports the inclusion of this policy. It provides for the construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance so long as they consider the extent and impact on relevant matters listed in the policy.	Retain SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.106	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.230	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.155	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P4. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.94	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P4 (construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.231	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.156	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P4. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.95	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P4 (construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.232	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Not specified	Considers that SASM-P4 and P5 and associated SASM-R4 and R5 set out the parameters around when buildings and structures may be appropriate within sites or areas of significance to Māori. Submitter does not oppose the sites being SASM but the sites have been significantly modified by land use development over time and that it is not clear how planning framework applies to these areas.	Clarify how SASM-P4 (Construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) will apply to heavily modified sites and areas which will not affect any identified "integral" features.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.157	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P4. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.96	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P4 (construction of buildings and structures within sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments to update the planning framework to exclude Maupuia Pā and Moa Point or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because no matter the extent of modification sites of significance should still be protected. Therefore, Moa Point and Maupuia Pā should not be excluded from the planning framework. It is also unclear why regionally significant infrastructure should have priority over the protection of sites of significance to Māori. Under section 6(e) of the Resource Management Act, wāhi tapu are matters of national importance that should be recognised and provided for in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.98	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Support	Supports the policy as it permits the extension of the footprint of existing buildings providing iwi values and sufficiently considered and protected.	Retain SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.107	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.233	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.158	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P5. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.97	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P5 (modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.234	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.159	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P5. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.98	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P5 (modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.235	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Not specified	Considers that SASM-P5 and associated SASM-R3 provides for the 'modification of features integral to a Category A or B site of significance to Māori', however Schedule 7 does not identify any "features integral" to the Maupuia Pa or Moa Point.	Clarify how provisions SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) will apply to Maupuia Pa or Moa Point.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.160	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P5. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.99	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P5 (modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.236	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Not specified	Considers that SAMS-P4 and P5 and associated SASM-R4 and R5 set out the parameters around when buildings and structures may be appropriate within sites or areas of significance to Māori. Submitter does not oppose the sites being SASM but the sites have been significantly modified by land use development over time and that it is not clear how planning framework applies to these areas.	Clarify how SASM-P5 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) will apply to heavily modified sites and areas which will not affect any identified "integral" features.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.161	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P5. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.100	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P5 (modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori and extension of the footprint of existing buildings) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.108	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Support	This policy provides a comprehensive framework for protection of sites of significance while providing the flexibility to enable mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. The SASM policies together recognize not just the importance of protection but of allowing, and making easy, ongoing use in a practical way - and the importance of using sites of significance as a fundamental part of their "significance".	Retain SASM-P6 (Destruction of sites and areas of significance) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.237	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-P6 (Destruction of sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.162	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.101	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P6 (destruction of sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.238	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-P6 (Destruction of sites and areas of significance) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.163	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-P6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in the SASMs.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.102	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-P6	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-P6 (destruction of sites and areas of significance) and seeks amendments and clarification. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.99	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R1	Support	Supports the policy as it permits the maintenance and repair of sites of significance in Category A	Retain SASM-R1 (Maintenance and repair of sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.21	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R1	Support	Supports that maintenance and repair of sites and areas of significance is a permitted activity.	Retain SASM-R1 (Maintenance and repair of sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.109	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R1	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R1 (Maintenance and repair of sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.22	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Support	Supports that undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance is a permitted activity.	Retain SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.110	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.239	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.164	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.103	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.240	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.165	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.104	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R2	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R2 (Undertaking cultural rituals, practices, and tikanga Māori in sites and areas of significance in Category A, Category B and Category C) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.23	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Support	Supports the permitted activity of rule SASM-R3.1.	Retain SASM-R3.1 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.24	Strategic Direction / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Support	Supports the restricted discretionary activity of rule SASM-R3.2.	Retain SASM-R3.2 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.111	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.241	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.166	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.105	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.242	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.167	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.106	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.243	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Not specified	Considers that SASM-P5 and associated SASM-R3 provides for the 'modification of features integral to a Category A or B site of significance to Māori', however Schedule 7 does not identify any 'features integral' to the Maupuia Pa or Moa Point.	Clarify how provisions SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) will apply to Maupuia Pa or Moa Point.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.168	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.107	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R3	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R3 (Modification of features integral to a Category A or B site or area of significance to Māori identified in SCHED7) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.100	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Support	Supports the rule as it makes provision for the establishment of new buildings or structures within sites and areas of significance to Māori in Category A or B.	Retain SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.112	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.41	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Support in part	Supports SASM-R4 in part and in particular supports the permitted activity status provided under SASM-R4.1 and restricted discretionary activity status provided under SASM-R4.2, subject to the relief sought above.	Supports Rule SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) in its current form and seeks amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.37	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Support in part	Supports SASM-R4 in part and in particular supports the permitted activity status provided under SASM-R4.1. Also supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided, but considers there needs to be amendments to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Retain SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) and seeks amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.38	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Amend	Supports SASM-R4 in part and in particular supports the permitted activity status provided under SASM-R4.1. Also supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided, but considers there needs to be amendments to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Amend SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.244	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.169	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.108	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.245	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.170	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.109	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.246	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Not specified	Considers that SAMS-P4 and P5 and associated SASM-R4 and R5 set out the parameters around when buildings and structures may be appropriate within sites or areas of significance to Māori. Submitter does not oppose the sites being SASM but the sites have been significantly modified by land use development over time and that it is not clear how planning framework applies to these areas.	Clarify how SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) will apply to heavily modified sites and areas which will not affect any identified “integral” features.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.171	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.110	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R4 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.101	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Support	Supports the rule as it makes provision for additions within the footprint of existing buildings within sites and areas of significance to Māori in Category A or B.	Retain SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.113	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.42	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Support in part	Supports SASM-R5 in part and in particular supports the permitted activity status provided under SASM-R4.1 and the restricted discretionary activity status provided under SASM-R5, subject to the relief sought above.	Supports Rule SASM-R5 (New buildings or structures within a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A or B) in its current form and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.39	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Support in part	Supports SASM-R5 in part and particular supports the permitted activity status under SASM-R4.1. Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided, but considers there needs to be amendments to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Retain SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.40	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Amend	Supports SASM-R5 in part and particular supports the permitted activity status under SASM-R4.1. Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided, but considers there needs to be amendments to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.	Amend SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) to clarify that this rule only applies within the line area identified as a SASM on the maps, and not to the entire site that the line encroaches into.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.247	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.172	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.111	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.114	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R6 (Destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. [Inferred reference to submission 406.50]	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.248	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.173	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.112	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow

Historical and Cultural Values - Viewshafts

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.115	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R6 (Destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. [Inferred reference to submission 406.51]	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.249	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Not specified	Considers that SAMS-P4 and P5 and associated SASM-R4 and R5 set out the parameters around when buildings and structures may be appropriate within sites or areas of significance to Māori. Submitter does not oppose the sites being SASM but the sites have been significantly modified by land use development over time and that it is not clear how planning framework applies to these areas.	Clarify how SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) will apply to heavily modified sites and areas which will not affect any identified "integral" features.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.174	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.113	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes SASM-R5 (Additions to the footprint of an existing buildings within sites and areas of significance Māori Category A or B) and seeks amendment. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.114	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Support	This rule framework is supported as it operationalises Policies from the SASM chapter. As well as providing a flexible framework to allow ongoing use of sites of significance where appropriate, the rule provides a specific pathway for repair and construction of marae, which is supported as it further enables mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga.	Retain SASM-R6 (destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.250	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SASM-R6 (Destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.175	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.251	Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Amend	Opposes these provisions to the extent that apply to the two identified sites at the regionally significant Wellington International Airport. [See paragraph 4.81 to 4.84 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SASM-R6 (Destruction or demolition of a site or area of significance to Māori in Category A and Category B) is amended to update the planning framework, either broadly or insofar as it relates to Maupuia Pā and Moa Point, to exclude these sites or provide greater clarity around the application of the planning framework particularly where it relates to existing heavily modified environments and the ongoing operation, maintenance, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.176	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / SASM-R6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated oppose the removal of - Maupuia Pā (Category A); and - Moa Point (Category B) from SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6. These are significant heritage areas to Māori that need to be in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed to retain Maupuia Pā (Category A) and Moa Point (Category B) in SASM-R2/ SASM-R3/ SASM-R4/ SASM-R5/ SASM-R6.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.13	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / General VIEW	Support	Considers that the provisions in the VIEW chapter (Viewshafts) identify and maintain significant views that contribute to Wellingtons sense of place and identity. They are an important part of Wellingtons Character and should be preserved.	Retain VIEW (Viewshafts) chapter as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.91	Part 2 / Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / General VIEW	Support	Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings 10min walkable catchment Specific heritage identification and assessment Views contributing to sense of place and identity Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell Boffa Miskell streetscapes Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings CCZ encroachment on residential zones Old St Pauls height controls Preserve viewshafts	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.89	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / General VIEW	Amend	Considers an additional sentence is needed in the introduction.	Add the following sentence to the end of the last paragraph in the introduction: <u>The associated rules apply to sites within the City Centre Zone, Waterfront Zone and the Viewshaft Control Area identified on the District Plan maps, and only to development that impinges on the specific parameters of each view set out in SCHED5.</u>
Claire Bibby	329.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / General VIEW	Amend	Considers that the survey mark used for the construction of the Tawa tunnel has a view worthy of preservation as a viewshaft. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendices]	Seeks that the view from the survey marker used for the centre line of the railway tunnel in Tawa be recognised as a viewshaft.
Juliet Broadmore	471.1	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / General VIEW	Support in part	Support viewshafts to protect the views to important and connecting landmarks in the city.	Retain Viewshaft chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.70	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / VIEW-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it enables reasonable intrusions into viewshafts. Viewshafts are generally provided within the street corridor, however some extend onto and over private properties. This policy reflects that buildings and additions to existing buildings can be appropriate	Retain VIEW-P2 (Maintaining identified values) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.71	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / VIEW-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it enables reasonable intrusions into viewshafts. Viewshafts are generally provided within the street corridor, however some extend onto and over private properties. This policy reflects that buildings and additions to existing buildings can be appropriate	Retain VIEW-P3 (Avoiding intrusions into iconic and landmark views) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.90	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / VIEW-R1	Amend	Considers amendment needed to fix drafting error. Considers the reference to CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) is incorrect. Considers this rule is meant to cross-reference to CCZ veranda standard, which is CCZ-S7.	Amend VIEW-R1 (Verandahs within viewshafts) as follows: a. Compliance with Standard CCZ-S8 CCZ-S7 is achieved; and ...
Wellington City Council	266.91	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / VIEW-R1	Amend	Considers zoning boxes should be added to the left of the rules, so it is clear where the viewshaft provisions apply.	Amend VIEW-R1.1 (Verandas within viewshafts) and R1.2 to add a zones column for both the Permitted Activity and Restricted Discretionary rule categories as follows: <u>City Centre Zone</u>
Wellington City Council	266.92	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / VIEW-R2	Amend	Considers zoning boxes should be added to the left of the rules, so it is clear where the viewshaft provisions apply. Considers this rule only applies to the less significant Golden Mile views that only rule through the CCZ and WFZ and end at the waterfront.	Amend VIEW-R2.1 (Construction of new buildings and structures, and alterations and additions to existing buildings, within a viewshaft), to add a zones column for the Restricted Discretionary rule category as follows: <u>City Centre Zone</u> <u>Waterfront Zone</u>

Natural Environment Values - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.93	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / VIEW-R2	Amend	<p>Considers zoning boxes should be added to the left of the rules, so it is clear where the viewshaft provisions apply.</p> <p>Considers this rule relates to more significant views out to long range focal elements over the harbour.</p>	<p>Amend VIEW-R2.2 (Construction of new buildings and structures, and alterations and additions to existing buildings, within a viewshaft), to add a zones column for the Restricted Discretionary rule category as follows:</p> <p>City Centre Zone Waterfront Zone Viewshaft Control Area</p>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.72	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / VIEW-R2	Support in part	<p>Supports the rule in that construction of new buildings and structures, and alterations and additions to existing buildings within viewshafts that are not iconic or landmark views should be restricted discretionary. This is appropriate to reflect that some intrusions into viewshafts are appropriate and can be considered in light of the relevant policies. It appears that Policy VIEW-P3 has been overlooked as a matter of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend VIEW-R2 (Construction of new buildings and structures, and alterations and additions to existing buildings within a viewshaft) as follows:</p> <p>Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in VIEW-P2 and VIEW-P3.</p>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.73	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / VIEW-S1	Support in part	<p>Supports the standard in that construction of new buildings and structures, and alterations and additions to existing buildings within viewshafts that are not iconic or landmark views should be restricted discretionary. This is appropriate to reflect that some intrusions into viewshafts are appropriate and can be considered in light of the relevant policies. It appears that Policy VIEW-P3 has been overlooked as a matter of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend VIEW-S1 (View protection):</p> <p>Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in VIEW-P2 and VIEW-P3.</p>
CentrePort Limited	402.109	Historical and Cultural Values / Viewshafts / VIEW-S1	Support	<p>Support exclusion for the Commercial Port Area from provisions</p>	<p>Retain VIEW-S1 (View protection) as notified.</p>
Steve West	2.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>	<p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>
Steve West	2.3	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>	<p>Seeks that if Significant Natural Areas are to apply to private land, incentives should be offered to compensate for loss of land value, to avoid landowners either removing natives, or reducing their environmental efforts to protect that bush. Providing incentives for new planting of natives so as to avoid a reduction in food sources for native birds and indigenous biodiversity.</p>
Steve West	2.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Considers that the SNA rules are unworkable and have resulted in owners pre-emptively removing vegetation before the plan was notified. Because they are generic they do not suit urban land which have unique characteristics on each site, such as views, slopes and development potential.</p>	<p>Seeks that the Council work with private landowners to develop rules unique to specific properties rather than blanket rules.</p>
Steve West	2.5	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	<p>Considers that SNAs on private urban land affect a large number of landowners but contribute little total area of vegetation. This creates increased work for Council staff and challenges to intensify housing within urban boundaries as some of the undeveloped city land will include native bush.</p>	<p>Supports that Significant Natural Areas do not apply to private residential land. [Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	2.6	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that SNA criteria should be clarified so that it is more representative of Wellington's biodiversity. Much vegetation that is being identified as significant are common native species. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p> <p>Considers that the criteria being used by WCC for assessing for SNAs are broad with large areas of commonly found bush being captured by the policy settings as a result. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Council have set its own specific criteria, rather than using those set by the Greater Wellington Regional Council, to reflect Wellington's natural and built-up environment.
Steve West	2.7	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Not specified	Considers that the rules create significant legal risk for landowners if they misunderstand those rules, are unaware of future rule updates, or if the SNA boundaries are imprecisely defined.	Not specified.
Steve West	2.8	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that alternative options should be pursued to manage indigenous biodiversity on private land.</p> <p>SNA provisions in the district plan including: making signing up to SNA rules a voluntary option, Council negotiate purchase of land or seek agreement from owner on rules, use QEII tools, and establish a city wide campaign of native planting.</p>	<p>Seeks that alternative policy options are explored:</p> <p>a) Remove all private land from the Significant Natural Area requirement.</p> <p>b) Make signing up to Significant Natural Areas on private land voluntary, and if coupled with Council incentives would see some landowners signing up to lock in their Significant Natural Area for future generations.</p> <p>c) If there were a significant area of private land (say more than one hectare) the Council could negotiate with that landowner to seek agreement on how to protect this area, or even to purchase the land for addition to the Council's land reserves.</p> <p>d) The Council could accept all types of protection including QEII and title conservation covenants. This would require the Council to create more nuanced maps with multiple protection measures shown (including Significant Natural Areas) as a measure of the protected indigenous biodiversity areas.</p> <p>e) Establish a program to encourage city wide planting of suitable natives to provide a broad spread of food across the city.</p>
Shannon Andrews	12.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Supports WCC's decision to exclude SNAs from residential zones.	Retain as notified.
Peter Kelly	16.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Councillors have a democratic mandate to balance the interests of WCC residents against the important natural environment values represented by significant natural areas (SNAs). The Proposed Rules are essentially the Officer Draft Rules, but with the SNA designation removed from all residential zoned land.	Supports the Proposed District Plan as notified - with no Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land.
Peter Kelly	16.3	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Councillors have a democratic mandate to balance the interests of WCC residents against the important natural environment values represented by significant natural areas (SNAs). The Proposed Rules are essentially the Officer Draft Rules, but with the SNA designation removed from all residential zoned land.</p> <p>Requests that if SNAs are returned to residentially zoned land, the provisions in the draft District Plan are reinstated and fine-tuned.</p>	<p>If the Proposed District Plan is amended to allow Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land:</p> <p>Seeks that changes are made to ECO (Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity) to give effect to the following provision:</p> <p>Add an amended Draft District Plan ECO-R4:</p> <p>i. Be held in a freehold title that existed at 18 July 2022 1 July 2027</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Barry Insull	32.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP does not identify why shingle beaches are endangered.</p> <p>At several points it is recorded that shingle beaches are endangered e.g. site 122 (Toungue Point). Given numerous shingle beaches exist between Owhiro Bay and Makara perhaps it would be helpful to explain both why such a designation exists and set out what mitigation/enhancement measures are being undertaken and by whom.</p>	Clarify the endangered status of shingle beaches.
Barry Insull	32.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP does not identify what mitigation/enhancement measures are being undertaken to protect shingle beaches.</p> <p>At several points it is recorded that shingle beaches are endangered e.g. site 122 (Toungue Point). Given numerous shingle beaches exist between Owhiro Bay and Makara perhaps it would be helpful to explain both why such a designation exists and set out what mitigation/enhancement measures are being undertaken and by whom.</p>	Seeks that the PDP make mention of what mitigation and enhancement measures to protect shingle beaches are being undertaken.
Barry Insull	32.3	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP does not identify who is undertaking mitigation/enhancement measures to protect shingle beaches.</p> <p>At several points it is recorded that shingle beaches are endangered e.g. site 122 (Toungue Point). Given numerous shingle beaches exist between Owhiro Bay and Makara perhaps it would be helpful to explain both why such a designation exists and set out what mitigation/enhancement measures are being undertaken and by whom.</p>	Seeks that the PDP make mention of who is undertaking mitigation and enhancement measures to protect shingle beaches.
Hugh Good	90.3	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Not specified	Not opposed to attempts to reinstate Significant Natural Areas on private land.	Not Specified
Capital Kiwi Trust Board	91.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that there is a level of concern across landowners in the Capital Kiwi project area around the potential for SNAs to be declared over their properties in the future should kiwi either be released onto their land or be ranging onto them.</p> <p>In particular, concern is around any potential to unreasonably limit, restrict or prevent operations or developments on their land.</p> <p>Considers that the Capital Kiwi project would not be possible without the trust and support of a wide range of rural private landowners.</p> <p>Considers that based discussions with the Minister of Conservation, and officials in DOC (Director General and Head of Policy), GWRC, and WCC, each party makes it clear that the declaration of SNAs on private land as the result of having North Island brown kiwi on their land is not a possible outcome.</p> <p>[Refer to submission for full reasons].</p>	Clarify the intent of the Significant Natural Area policy to provide assurance that Significant Natural Areas will not, and cannot, be created through native bird species being released onto, or visiting landowners' properties as a result of their commitment to predator control.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS106.1	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Policy 23 of the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region (RPS) sets out the criteria for identifying significant ecosystems and habitats (i.e. SNAs). Ecosystems and habitats will be considered significant if they meet one or more of the criteria listed under Policy 23. Point d of Policy 23 states "provides seasonal or core habitat for protected or threatened indigenous species". The definition of protected species under the RPS is "Species protected by the Wildlife Act 1953 and the Marine Mammals Protection Act 1978". Although North Island Brown Kiwi have a conservation status of "not threatened" under the NZ Threat Classification System, they are "absolutely protected" under the Wildlife Act 1953. As such, it is considered that the seasonal or core habitat of the North Island Brown Kiwi (or any other protected indigenous species) would meet the criteria of a SNA under Policy 23 of the RPS and would therefore be required to be scheduled in WCC's District Plan as a SNA. It is noted that areas used intermittently by protected indigenous species may not meet the criteria of a SNA, however, could meet the criteria for a highly mobile fauna area under the NPS-IB exposure draft. Note: The North Island Brown Kiwi has not been identified as highly mobile fauna under Appendix 2 of the NPS-IB exposure draft.	Allow / Acknowledges that the presence of kiwi would currently result in eligibility for SNA status and seeks that that submission be allowed in part.
Oliver Sangster	112.9	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support in part	Generally supports the use of SNA provisions	Retain Significant Natural Area provisions with amendment.
Oliver Sangster	112.10	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Not specified	[Inferred reasons] Considers that awareness is needed about SNAs, what they do, their benefits, and how to work appropriately within and around them.	Seeks that the implementation of the Proposed District Plan be coupled with a strong public education campaign about Significant Natural Areas.
Pam Wilson	120.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Oppose any attempt to reinstate Significant Natural Areas on private land.	Not specified.
Thomas Brent Layton	164.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that the WCC should abandon the SNA overlay and instead enter into negotiations. This will focus WCC and the community's mind on what value they place on conserving areas. Considers that if the council thinks that there is a net benefit to society from an SNA it should negotiate with the current owners over the imposition of controls and impose the costs of preservation on all ratepayers. If they don't think the community will bear the costs sought by the landowner, then, clearly, the community (which includes the landowner) will be better off if the land is not subject to an SNA. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Adopt a policy of negotiating with current landowners for agreement to preserve significant natural areas.
Helen Grove	197.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Opposes the Council confiscating land rights of private ownership in multiple ways, including SNAs.	Opposes Significant Natural Areas on urban or rural private land.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Boston Real Estate Limited	220.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that where 'site specific' assessments are not completed then the status quo of the operative district plan should prevail.
Tyers Stream Group	221.31	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Opposes exception of residentially zoned land to SNA classification.	Amend the plan to include significant natural areas on privately owned residential land.
Steve West	FS110.1	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Notes that original submitter states that "SNAs on residential private property adjoining Tyers Stream should be reinstated as they protect increasingly important habitat and biodiversity of the Wellington area. Considers that this would then enable those residents and the community to be supported in efforts to enhance those values." The original submitter also infers that without SNAs on private urban land, Wellington's indigenous biodiversity would be worse. Opposes the reinstatement of SNAs on residential private property in the Proposed District Plan (including around Tyers Stream) for the following reasons: - Indigenous biodiversity in Wellington has increased significantly over the last 20 years, without any need for SNAs. Rather voluntary conservation efforts have been hugely successful in Wellington City. - Considers that instead of supporting residents, creating SNAs on private urban land in the district plan will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner value and goodwill in the process. There is real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish over time should SNAs be created on private urban land.	Disallow
Paul Blaschke	FS129.10	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Support submission points made by a significant number of individuals and groups that essentially support the same proposition "Reinstate the overlay of all properly delineated SNAs or part SNAs on all relevant residential zoned properties".	Allow
Dominic Hurley	260.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Considers that site owners will lose control and value of their land due to SNA's. SNA's on land will drive owners to remove the native bush to avoid SNA status, having the opposite effect. Incentives should be offered instead.	Remove the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter from the PDP.
Dominic Hurley	260.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Considers that site owners will lose control and value of their land due to SNA's. SNA's on land will drive owners to remove the native bush to avoid SNA status, having the opposite effect. Incentives should be offered instead.	Seeks that Significant Natural Areas are not applied to residentially zoned private land in the future.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.21	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that there is a restrictive policy and rule framework that would apply to SNAs (and in particular where the sites are within a Coastal Environment overlay) and wishes to ensure any sites that are identified are in fact warranted as significant areas. Horokiwi does have concerns with particular areas on both its site and on the adjoining land to the west, in terms of whether the biodiversity values merit the specific areas being identified as SNAs. Based on the independent ecological assessment, Horokiwi seeks amendment to the SNA area identified. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the Significant Natural Area overlay be amended as it relates to the Horokiwi quarry site including to remove the SNA from the Horokiwi site which is subject to the existing use certificate reference 1048648. [Refer to original submission, including figure and attachments]
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.2	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	The methodology used to determine SNAs for the PDP should align with the criteria of Policy 23 of the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region. It is also considered effective and efficient to align the review of Significant Natural Area provisions with the policy direction and requirements that are anticipated to come into effect during the PDP hearing process as set out in the exposure draft of the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB). Removal or amendments to the extent of any SNA is not supported without the site being ground-truthed by a suitably qualified ecologist to confirm the accuracy of the current SNA mapping in Schedule 8. The SNA opposed by Horokiwi Quarries Ltd should be ground-truthed before a determination is made to retain, amend, or remove the site/SNA from Schedule 8. If the site does not meet the SNA criteria under the NPS-IB exposure draft or the RPS, only then should it be removed.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission is disallowed, unless it can be confirmed that the site does not meet the relevant SNA criteria
Jane Hurley	286.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Opposes significant natural area controls, but if are included on residential land considers that the Council should at the market price, and that that compensation should be determined at the point at which owners wish to sell their property, so that it reflects the actual market loss suffered at that point. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that compensation be provided to private landowners should residential zoned sites have significant natural area controls applied.
Tawa Community Board	294.10	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Supports the protection of our ecology on public land by the use of the Significant Natural Area (SNA). Considers that SNA's on private land may leave some property owners with unusable land, leading to financial hardship.	Retain ECO Chapter as notified (with regards to Significant Natural Areas).
Tawa Community Board	294.11	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Not specified	Considers that SNA's on private land may leave some property owners with unusable land, leading to financial hardship.	Not specified.
Roland Sapsford	305.29	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that Aro Valley's vegetation should be considered natural heritage. Aro Valley is recognised for the significant presence of vegetation within its urban fabric, along with its built environment. Significant Natural Areas are not the only tool at the Council's disposition. Creative use can be made of design controls which recognise the value of green space and enable design conversations about its retention.	Seeks that Aro Valley's vegetation be considered natural heritage and make creative use of planning tools to protect it.
Wilma Sherwin	306.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Opposes any attempts to re-instate Significant Natural Areas (SNA's) on private land.	Supports that Significant Natural Areas do not apply to private urban land. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wilma Sherwin	306.5	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Opposes any attempts to re-instate Significant Natural Areas (SNA's) on private land.	Supports that Significant Natural Areas do not apply to private rural land. [Inferred decision requested]
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.162	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Supports the introductory text which clarifies that provisions specific to infrastructure are addressed in the infrastructure chapter.	Retain the Introduction to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter as notified.
Bruce Crothers	319.9	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Not specified	Considers that support for revegetation of marginal land and restoration of wetlands for biodiversity and carbon sequestration should be continued. No further draining or development on wetland. It is considered that if humans are to survive as a species for more than fifty years, the Council must put in place the means to reduce emissions and ensure carbon sequestration by restoring green spaces and wetlands, as per the IPCC report.	Seeks that the council put in place the means to reduce emissions and ensure sequestration of carbon by restoring greenspace and wetlands, as per the IPCC report as well as ensuring no further draining or development of, wetlands.
Bruce Crothers	319.10	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Opposes the draining or development of wetlands.	Not specified.
Bruce Crothers	319.11	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that there should be a ban on the covering of waterways in green fields development.	Seeks a ban on covering waterways in greenfield development
Bruce Crothers	319.12	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers the Queen's chain should be restored, possibly allowing for public walking network and wildlife corridor.	Seeks that the Queen's chain is restored.
Bruce Crothers	319.13	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Not specified	Considers that the Council needs to intervene on the noticeable biodiversity collapse by not allow the wholesale destruction of nature on land, in the air and sea, or any destruction of irreplaceable natural assets.	Seeks that Council protect nature on land, in the air and in the sea, as well as any irreplaceable natural assets.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.171	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Not specified	Generally supports the provisions in this chapter, subject to the submission points below. As discussed above, the SNA provisions applying to residential SNAs must be reinstated from the previous version of the Plan. Reinsert all provisions relating to SNAs in residential zones, from the District Plan draft dated 20 April 2022 (ECO chapter is attached to this submission) with amendments as set out below. This includes any deleted references to residential SNAs or SCHED 9 - Urban Environment Allotments that may have been included in other parts of the Plan. If this is not done, there will need to be an alternative rule or rules to protect significant biodiversity in residential areas, that still meets the requirements of the Act. Insert additional provisions in this chapter and in other relevant chapters to provide for Council's function for the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity, including regulatory methods to restrict vegetation clearance and policy direction for assessments of effects on indigenous biodiversity. Include provisions to promote maintenance, restoration, and enhancement of areas within and beyond SNAs. There appears to be a referencing problem with several of the provisions. The provisions seem to have retained the references to policies prior to the deletion of the residential SNAs. We seek that all references to ECO policies are reviewed to ensure that they are accurate.	Not specified.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.157	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes amendments as this may impact on residential intensification outcomes.	Disallow
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.3	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.3	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Disagree that reinstatement of residential SNAs in the Proposed District Plan is required for WCC to meet its obligations under section 6(c) of the RMA and policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neither the RMA or RPS prescribe in detail how a council might give effect to the requirement to protect of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. On note, in the 2015 Environment Court case between Forrest & Bird and New Plymouth District Council the Environment Court concluded Councils might conceivably meet RMA Section 6(c) duties through methods other than identification and rules, but in this case the non-regulatory methods relied on by the Council were insufficient to provide protection. - Alternative methods of compliance are available to WCC. - Indigenous biodiversity in Wellington (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years, including Zealandia and Predator Free, along with voluntary conservation efforts without any need for SNAs. - Creating SNAs on private urban land will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners , destroying landowner value and goodwill in the process. Real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish should SNAs be created on private urban land, and as a result would see both GWRC and WCC failing to meet their regulatory obligations, including under the RMA. - Specifically for Captain Edward Daniell Drive, indigenous biodiversity is already protected under Section 3 of the Land Covenant registered on the records of title. <p>Considers that as the NPSIB is in draft form and has no legal effect, and given how unpopular SNAs proved to be in submissions on the draft district plan, pushing on with creating SNA on private urban land before the policy statement is in effect would further undermine WCC's already poor relationship with impacted landowners. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed and that already protected land (such as Captain Edward Dainell Drive) be removed from Schedule 9, should residential SNAs be reinstated.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.23	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Support the position that the SNA provisions applying to residential SNAs must be reinstated from the previous version of the Plan. Reinsert all provisions relating to SNAs in residential zones, from the District Plan draft dated 20 April 2022. Further support amendment to clarify the wider role of the Council maintaining biodiversity wider than SNAs. We support the submission point and need an objective stating the district's biodiversity is maintained and enhanced. Support the need for a new suite of objectives, policies, and rules to provide for protection of wetlands.	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.172	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support in part	Considers the Introduction is silent on the Council function of maintaining biodiversity, which is wider than only protection SNAs. The purpose of this chapter is to identify significant natural areas within Wellington City to protect and maintain the remaining areas of indigenous biodiversity. In addition to the requirement to identify and protect significant natural areas, Council also has the job of maintaining biodiversity outside of significant natural areas. This chapter contains provisions which support that function.	<p>Amend the Introduction to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter:</p> <p>The purpose of this chapter is to identify significant natural areas within Wellington City to protect and maintain the remaining areas of indigenous biodiversity. <u>In addition to the requirement to identify and protect significant natural areas, Council also has the job of maintaining biodiversity outside of significant natural areas. This chapter contains provisions which support that function.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>The SNAs that are covered by this chapter are contained in SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas, <u>SCHED 9 – Urban Environment Allotment, and any area that biodiversity values that meet Policy 23 RPS. Where SNAs are within an urban environment allotment the trees and location are identified in SCHED9 – Urban Environment Allotments to meet the requirements of s76 of the RMA.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.24	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Support the position that the SNA provisions applying to residential SNAs must be reinstated from the previous version of the Plan. Reinsert all provisions relating to SNAs in residential zones, from the District Plan draft dated 20 April 2022. Further support amendment to clarify the wider role of the Council maintaining biodiversity wider than SNAs. We support the submission point and need an objective stating the district's biodiversity is maintained and enhanced. Support the need for a new suite of objectives, policies, and rules to provide for protection of wetlands.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.144	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support in part	Supports the identification of SNAs in the PDP in accordance with RPS Policies 23 and 24.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.145	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Considers that in managing the effects of intensification on indigenous ecosystems and habitats, we recommend WCC includes additional controls for zones where intensification may occur in areas adjacent to SNAs, such as buffer zones and ecological corridors. Such areas contribute to the long-term viability and enhancement of SNAs. Greater Wellington seeks consideration of these measures in accordance with Policy 47(a) and (b) of the operative RPS.	Seeks to include any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.4	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.9	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Support GWRC seeking that WCC includes additional controls for zones where intensification may occur in areas adjacent to SNAs, such as buffer zones and ecological corridors. Agree with them that such areas contribute to the long-term viability and enhancement of SNAs, and also give effect to Policy 47(a) and (b) of the operative RPS.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.146	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Though Greater Wellington supports WCC's identification of SNAs in line with RPS Policy 23, we oppose the omission of SNAs on private residential land from the Proposed District Plan (PDP) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the removal of identified SNAs from the PDP contradictory to national direction for indigenous biodiversity protection. Section 6(c) of the RMA 1991 states that 'the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is a matter of national importance, and that this matter must be 'recognised and provided for' by all persons exercising functions and powers under the RMA, including local authorities under Sections 30 and 31. the removal of SNAs on private residential land from the PDP is contrary to Policy 24 of RPS. Policy 24 directs district councils to include in their district plans policies, rules and methods to protect the indigenous ecosystems and habitats identified in accordance with policy 23. Policy 24 requires district councils to protect all areas identified in accordance with policy 23 through provisions in their district plans. the removal of identified SNAs on private residential land from the PDP to be inconsistent with WCC's vision and aspirations for protecting and restoring the city's indigenous biodiversity. The Our Natural Capital: Wellington's Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2015[1] states that WCC will protect biodiversity by 'focussing on the protection of priority biodiversity sites on public and private land and rare, threatened, or locally significant species', and that it will build natural capital by 'respect[ing] the importance of indigenous biodiversity to New Zealand and its intrinsic right to exist'. We do not consider the exclusion of SNA on private residential land to align with this direction. 	Seeks to apply SNAs to all zones as intended by section 6 of the RMA and Policy 24 of the RPS.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.5	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Steve West	FS110.12	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Do not agree that reinstatement of SNAs on residential private property in the PDP is required for WCC to meet its obligations under section 6(c) of the RMA and policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neither the RMA or RPS prescribe in detail how a council might give effect to the requirement to protect of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The 2015 Environment Court case between Forrest & Bird and New Plymouth District Council the Environment Court concluded Councils might conceivably meet RMA Section 6(c) duties through methods other than identification and rules, but in this case the non-regulatory methods relied on by the Council were insufficient to provide protection. - Indigenous biodiversity in Wellington (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years, including Zealandia and Predator Free, along with voluntary conservation efforts without any need for SNAs. - Creating SNAs on private urban land will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner goodwill and value in the process. Real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish should SNAs be created on private urban land, and as a result would see both GWRC and WCC failing to meet their regulatory obligations, including under the RMA. - Specifically for Captain Edward Daniell Drive, indigenous biodiversity is already protected under Section 3 of the Land Covenant registered on the records of title. <p>Policies 23/24 are flawed, when applied to Wellington city, particularly the 'representativeness' criteria. To explain: Wellington is part of the MF6 ecosystem, described as a Kohekohe and Tawa forest with only 16% remaining. Also in this ecosystem are Kawakawa, Mahoe, Nikau, Supplejack. Wellington is a compact region of around 29,000 hectares, of which ~40% is urban, compared to the regional average of ~25%, yet there is no specific criteria provided for Wellington City to reflect its greater proportion of urban land. By using the GWRC criteria of 30% remaining for Wellington City, rather than a specific criteria, areas of native bush with any of the listed plants, including secondary trees like Mahoe will trigger representativeness criteria, despite none of these trees being listed as threatened species. Mahoe is commonly found across Wellington city, in the town belt, council reserves and on private urban land. As a result, urban land with few notable features other than some Mahoe, has become ensnared in the SNA assessments. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed and that already protected land (such as Captain Edward Dainell Drive) be removed from Schedule 9, should residential SNAs be reinstated.</p> <p>Seeks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WCC engages with GRWC to establish appropriate criteria in the RPS for Wellington City, so indigenous biodiversity that is actually significant is identified, rather than capturing vast areas with commonly found bush. - SNAs on private urban land remain excluded from the Proposed District Plan.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.10	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	<p>Support GWRC's opposition to the omission of SNAs on private residential land from the Proposed District Plan (PDP) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the removal of identified SNAs from the PDP is contradictory to the national direction for indigenous biodiversity protection; - is also contrary to Policy 24 of RPS;and - is inconsistent with WCC's Our Natural Capital: Wellington's Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2015. 	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.27	Part 2 / Energy Infrastructure and Transport / Renewable Electricity Generation / REG-S3	Support	WCCERG agree with the submitter and oppose the omission of SNAs on private residential land from the Proposed District Plan (PDP).	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.147	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Policy IE.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1 directs district plans include policies, rule or methods to partner with mana whenua to managing indigenous biodiversity values. where offsetting is required, this policy could be implemented by provisions requiring management plans for managing offset biodiversity areas and effects on significant areas. Monitoring requirements would form part of these plans and plan direction could encourage the adoption of mātauranga Māori in monitoring of indigenous species in relevant circumstances. Other relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies include Policy 47 and IE.2.	Seeks to Amend the PDP to require partnering with mana whenua in the management of activities that affect indigenous biodiversity. Consider the requirement for management plans for consents and within those management plans a requirement for enabling tangata whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga to monitor biodiversity.
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.6	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.11	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Support GWRC's request to require partnering with mana whenua in the management of activities that affect indigenous biodiversity. This is because Policy IE.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1 directs district plans to include policies, rules or methods to partner with mana whenua to manage indigenous biodiversity values.	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.25	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	The submitter seeks to amend the PDP to require partnering with mana whenua in the management of activities that affect indigenous biodiversity. They also seek that the requirement for management plans for consents is considered, and within those management plans a requirement for enabling tangata whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga to monitor biodiversity. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this part of the submission because requiring partnership with mana whenua in the management of indigenous biodiversity will support kaitiakitanga. This will support mana whenua in building their mātauranga and skills in relation to monitoring and management of biodiversity and te taiao.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.148	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that while mana whenua / tangata whenua exercising their role as kaitiaki have been provided for, we consider the policy requires amendment or a new policy inserted to specifically recognise mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in the mapping of indigenous biodiversity, including to identify taonga species. This would be to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 policies IE.1 and IE.2.	Seeks to amend to provide for mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in the mapping of indigenous biodiversity, including to identify taonga species.
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.7	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.26	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	The submitter seeks to amend to provide for mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in the mapping of indigenous biodiversity, including to identify taonga species Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this part of the submission because providing for mana whenua involvement in mapping indigenous biodiversity and taonga species will also support kaitiakitanga and the ability of mana whenua to build their skills and mātauranga.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.149	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers amendments are required have regard to Policies IE.1 and IE.2 of Proposed RPS Change 1. We consider the adverse effects on mahinga kai, other customary uses and access for these activities needs to be included as an assessment matter for consent applications	Seeks to include a new matter of discretion/control to consider the adverse effects on mahinga kai, other customary uses and access for these activities.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.8	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Richard Herbert	360.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Supports the retention of SNAs as proposed originally, before the Councillor amendment to remove SNAs from residential zones in June 2022.	Amend Significant Natural Areas to re-instate on Residential Zones, as proposed prior to the Councillor Amendment to remove Significant Natural Areas from Residential Zones in June 2022.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that SNAs should not be on private property.	Seeks that Significant Natural Areas be removed Significant Natural Areas on private property in both urban and rural environments. [Inferred decision requested].
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.115	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that Schedule 8 should include all the SNAs identified in the draft district plan version provided to the Council's environment committee from officers. "Wellington, wild at heart" is what our unique capital city trades upon - and as the population grows and urban areas densify, preserving and enhancing significant natural areas will become increasingly important. Research shows that access to natural areas, and 'biophilic' environments are keys to human health and well-being and are a critical part of protecting biodiversity. On this matter, Wellington as a city is playing a critical role in providing refuge for formerly at risk native birds, e.g. kaka, and with efforts such as the Halo Project and Predator Free initiatives being undertaken by thousands of Wellingtonians, it is important our city's district plan provides legal and policy support to this. The failure to include SNA areas in residential zones means that the district plan is not in accordance with section 6 of the RMA, nor is it giving effect to relevant provisions of GWRC's regional policy statement and regional plan.	Seeks that Significant Natural Areas to add all the SNA areas in the residential zones recommended by officers in the draft district plan version provided to the Council's environment and planning committee on June 23 2022.
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.9	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	The decision requested by the original submitter is supported. The omission of SNAs on private residential sites in the PDP is considered contrary to section 6(c) of the RMA and Policy 23 & 24 of the RPS. It is also considered contrary to the NPS-IB exposure draft. It is noted at the time of this further submission the NPS-IB exposure draft no legal effect, however, it is expected to come into effect in December 2022 prior to the PDP hearing process.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.18	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>The original submitter seeks that Schedule 9 of the draft district plan be reinstated (adding back SNAs on private residential land), citing this exclusion is contradictory to both section 6(c) of the RMA and Policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Steve West does not agree that reinstatement of SNAs on residential private property in the Proposed District Plan is required for WCC to meet its obligations under section 6(c) of the RMA and policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neither the RMA or RPS prescribe in detail how a council might give effect to the requirement to protect of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. On note, in the 2015 Environment Court case between Forrest & Bird and New Plymouth District Council the Environment Court concluded Councils might conceivably meet RMA Section 6(c) duties through methods other than identification and rules, but in this case the non-regulatory methods relied on by the Council were insufficient to provide protection. - In any case, indigenous biodiversity in Wellington (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years, including through activities like Zealandia and Predator Free, along with voluntary conservation efforts without any need for SNAs. These activities have contributed significantly to the recovery of birds like the Kaka, and proves the current voluntary conservation efforts are working well. - Creating SNAs on private urban land in the district plan will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner value and goodwill in the process. So rather than providing legal protection for our flora and fauna, there is real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish over time should SNAs be created on private urban land. <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that SNAs on private urban land remain excluded from the Proposed District Plan.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.73	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support in part	Supports the general direction of chapter, with amendments.	Retain Natural Character chapter with amendments.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.74	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.</p> <p>Submitter supports the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p> <p>Concerns there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their ancestral lands.</p>	Seeks that the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford is removed; specifically at Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.9	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.21	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.10	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.74].</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.9	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whanui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.21	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whanui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.8	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.25	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.44	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.10	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.16	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whānui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.74]</p>	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.75	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.</p> <p>Submitter supports the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p> <p>Concerns there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their ancestral lands.</p>	Seeks that any other relief to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their properties in Te Motu Kairangi.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.10	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.22	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.10	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.22	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.9	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.26	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.45	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.11	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>SNAs are being arbitrarily being introduced without any consideration to the potential cost to the landowner that this policy will incur</p>	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.23	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Considers Significant Natural Areas are important in order to protect our environment and native plantlife.</p> <p>Considers that while the city is built denser, the environment and our wildlife should be protected.</p> <p>Considers that it is ironic that the argument for being anti-density is to protect the 'character' of our housing but yet there is no consideration for the 'character' of our nature, which is arguably much harder to restore than the character amenity gained from what the Council deems as character housing.</p>	Seeks that significant natural areas provisions apply to residentially zoned sites.
Steve West	FS110.22	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>The original submitter states "it is incredibly disappointing that they [SNAs] have been removed for residential land considering this land is at great risk of being damaged further".</p> <p>Steve West does not support the reinstatement of SNAs on residential private property in the Proposed District Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indigenous biodiversity in Wellington (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years, through voluntary conservation and activities like Predator Free without any need for SNAs. - While recently there was reported felling of some native trees, this was in response to the planned SNA introduction in the draft district plan. Arguably the biggest threat to indigenous biodiversity on private urban land in Wellington remains how landowners might respond to the creation of SNAs, such as by reducing conservation efforts, in the face of their bush being turned into an expensive and unwanted burden. 	Disallow
Johnsonville Community Association	429.24	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Supports the protection of significant natural areas on public land within Wellington.	Not specified.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.25	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	<p>Considers that unilaterally taking over of private property is a major intrusion on rights of the property owners, and may lead to removal of major natural areas on urban property.</p> <p>Opposes SNA's on private urban or rural land.</p>	Opposes Significant Natural Areas on urban or rural private land.
Paul M Blaschke	435.5	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Objectives, Policies and Rules in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity section are strongly supported, as they support a critical part of the city's overall vision and strategic objectives and are strongly supported by the overwhelming majority of the city's residents.	Retain the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul M Blaschke	435.6	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	<p>Considers that the Council should allow SNAs on residentially zoned properties. The Council should be consistent with its overall policy objectives and let its original decisions on SNAs stand on their merits. The decision from Council's Planning & Environment Committee to remove SNAs from all residentially zoned properties on 23 June 2022 is opposed. This decision renders the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity section much less effective than it could and should be.</p> <p>It greatly hinders the achievement of Council's Te Atakura blueprint and other moves towards sustainability and resilience.</p> <p>It disadvantages the great majority of the city's residents except for a tiny number of suburban residential landowners who become privileged over all others including other suburban residential landowners with portions of SNAs within their properties and who have welcomed or not objected to the provisions.</p> <p>It overturns the very good process adopted by the council team and consultants who have planned and undertaken the SNA survey and policy development. Finally, it renders ECO-01, ECO-P1, ECO-P2, and ECO-P3, and the rules supporting these objectives and policies, incapable of being properly implemented, and perpetuates the uncertainty caused by lack of a comprehensive statutory process around significant areas and indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks to extend Significant Natural Areas to residentially zoned properties.
Paul M Blaschke	435.7	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that the SNA regulatory framework in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity section should apply to SNAs on residentially zoned properties.	Seeks that Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity provisions apply to Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned properties.
Meredith Robertshawe	444.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for Significant Natural Areas and support the intent of the provisions in the PDP.	Retain the objectives in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity (ECO) chapter as notified.
Meredith Robertshawe	444.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for Significant Natural Areas and support the intent of the provisions in the PDP.	Retain the policies in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity (ECO) chapter as notified. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Meredith Robertshawe	444.3	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for Significant Natural Areas and support the intent of the provisions in the PDP.	Retain the provisions in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity (ECO) chapter as notified. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Chris Horne, Sunita Singh, Julia Stace, Paul Bell-Butler	456.3	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support in part	<p>Supports the protection of Indigenous Biodiversity and Significant Natural Areas.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain Significant Natural Area provisions, with amendment. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chris Horne, Sunita Singh, Julia Stace, Paul Bell-Butler	456.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that SNA-status should be restored to all residential-zoned properties. In particular considers that the Planning and Environment Committee vote to remove SNAs from all residential-zoned properties over-ride the purpose of the ECO chapter which " ... is to identify significant natural areas within Wellington City in order to protect and maintain the remaining areas of indigenous biodiversity".	Amend mapping of Significant Natural Areas to include all residential-zoned properties.
Chris Horne, Sunita Singh, Julia Stace, Paul Bell-Butler	456.5	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Amend	Considers that there should be monitoring compliance by all owners of Significant Natural Areas with Council's objective of protecting those SNAs' indigenous ecosystems in perpetuity.	Seeks that a monitoring programme for Significant Natural Areas is established. [Inferred decision requested]
Grant and Marilyn Griffiths, Griffiths Family Trust	460.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose in part	Opposes Significant Natural Areas on Private land.	Retain Significant Natural Area provisions with amendment below.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.48	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Oppose	Opposes that significant natural areas provisions do not apply to residential zoned land.	Seeks that Significant Natural Area provisions are applied to all zones.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.173	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	Protection of SNAs and encouragement of restoration by community groups etc is not enough to fulfil the Council's obligation to maintain biodiversity under s31(1)(b)(iii). As such, we seek a new objective. The S32 report briefly touches on this issue, in the context of potential vegetation clearance rules outside SNAs (pg 41). It refers to the RPS approach of suggesting non-regulatory methods outside of SNAs. The report also mentions that additional controls on non-SNA indigenous vegetation are included in the overlay chapters for Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes and the Coastal Environment. However, these additional controls are not for the purpose of biodiversity maintenance, and do not refer back to any policy which would allow consideration of this Council function. The rules in the Coastal Environment chapter for example, only consider natural character effects and policies. We seek that additional provisions (an objective, policy and rules) are included in the ECO chapter for the maintenance of biodiversity outside of SNAs. We also seek that the vegetation clearance controls in other chapters refer back to the ECO policy for maintenance of biodiversity. It is not clear what non-regulatory methods have been included in the plan to fulfil this function. In any case, given the biodiversity crisis, non-regulatory measures are not sufficient to meet S31.	Add a new objective to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter: <u>ECO-OX</u> <u>The District's indigenous biodiversity is maintained and enhanced.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.117	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	Considers that the objective of maintaining and enhancing indigenous biodiversity at an overall District Scale is appropriate. Enhancement will not be achievable or appropriate in all circumstances however and, consistent with the approach in Objective ECO-O1, the proposed objective would be improved by making it clear that enhancement should occur at the District-wide scale and where appropriate.	Allow / Amend provision to clarify that indigenous biodiversity is to be enhanced overall at District scale and where practicable – for example as follows (or similar wording): 'The District's indigenous biodiversity is maintained and, where appropriate, enhanced'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.25	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Support the position that the SNA provisions applying to residential SNAs must be reinstated from the previous version of the Plan. Reinsert all provisions relating to SNAs in residential zones, from the District Plan draft dated 20 April 2022. Further support amendment to clarify the wider role of the Council maintaining biodiversity wider than SNAs. We support the submission point and need an objective stating the district's biodiversity is maintained and enhanced. Support the need for a new suite of objectives, policies, and rules to provide for protection of wetlands.	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.174	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	<p>Considers it is not clear that the plan adequately provides for the protection of wetlands. In relation to wetlands, the Council has responsibilities in terms of integrated management and the maintenance of biodiversity. This includes responsibilities under the RMA and NPSFM. RPS Policy 61 allocates responsibility for various matters as between district and regional council. It is not clear that the GWRC has sole responsibility for works in wetlands and their margins. Policy 61 provides:</p> <p>Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity Regional and district plans shall recognise and provide for the responsibilities below, when developing objectives, policies and methods, including rules, to maintain indigenous biodiversity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wellington Regional Council shall be responsible for developing objectives, policies, and methods in the regional policy statement for the control of the use of land to maintain indigenous biological diversity; - Wellington Regional Council shall be responsible for developing objectives, policies, rules and/or methods in regional plans for the control of the use of land to maintain and enhance ecosystems in water bodies and coastal water. This includes land within the coastal marine area, wetlands and the beds of lakes and rivers; and - city and district councils shall be responsible for developing objectives, policies, rules and/or methods in district plans for the control of the use of land for the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity. This excludes land within the coastal marine area and the beds of lakes and rivers. GWRC is clearly responsible for controlling the use of land within wetlands to maintain and enhance ecosystems in water bodies (paragraph (b)). However, according to paragraph (c), this Council retains responsibility for controlling the use of land for the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. Neither wetlands, nor their margins, are excluded from that responsibility. Policy 23 echoes that concept. The explanation to the policy states: Regional plans will identify indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity values in the coastal marine area, wetlands and the beds of lakes and rivers. District plans will identify indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity values for all land, except the coastal marine area and the beds of lakes and rivers. Again, Council's responsibility under s31 still applies to wetlands. The regional plan states: "Also refer to the relevant district plan for provisions that apply to activities within or adjacent to wetlands. "As such, we seek objectives, policies and rules protecting wetlands and their margins, as far as is possible within Council's responsibilities under the RAM and NPSFM. These provisions may need to be located throughout the plan, for example in the earthworks chapter. 	Add new suite of objectives, policies, and rules to provide for protection of wetlands.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.99	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	Greater Wellington consider that the Proposed District Plan needs to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on wetlands in order to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow / Seeks provisions that ensure urban development is located and designed in a way that protects wetlands in accordance with the NPS-FM and proposed RPS Change 1 FW 3.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.10	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	The reasoning and decision requested by the original submitter is supported.	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.26	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / General ECO	Support	Support the position that the SNA provisions applying to residential SNAs must be reinstated from the previous version of the Plan. Reinsert all provisions relating to SNAs in residential zones, from the District Plan draft dated 20 April 2022. Further support amendment to clarify the wider role of the Council maintaining biodiversity wider than SNAs. We support the submission point and need an objective stating the district's biodiversity is maintained and enhanced. Support the need for a new suite of objectives, policies, and rules to provide for protection of wetlands.	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.175	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	Considers the plan should include a policy aimed at identification of SNAs. This is important for where new SNAs are identified, for example as part of consenting processes.	Add new policy ECO-PX (<u>Identification of Significant Natural Areas</u>); <u>Identify all areas with significant indigenous biodiversity values and list within SCHED8 and SCHED9, and provide for identification of additional areas with significant biodiversity values.</u>
Steve West	FS110.5	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	The original submitter seeks to include a new policy aimed at identification of new SNAs and also for maintaining indigenous biodiversity in other areas, suggesting rules to limit removal of indigenous biodiversity in each area to under 200m2 in any 10-year period. Steve West does not support the identification and/or creation of SNAs under the district plan, particularly on private urban land, or provision of other overly restrictive rules (as suggested above) for the following reasons: - Considers that through voluntary conservation programs and effort, the city's indigenous biodiversity (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years. This has occurred without any need for SNAs. - Considers that creating SNAs (and other overly restrictive rules), particularly on private urban land, in the district plan will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner goodwill in the process. And as a result, planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNAs and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules. - Considers that by seeking regulatory outcomes for expanding SNA areas, rather than continuing to encourage and support voluntary conservation efforts there is real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish over time.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.176	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	Considers the Plan does not give effect to the Council's obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity. Considers support for restoration is not sufficient (by way of ECO P4), and therefore seeks a new policy be added. Also seeks that the relevant rules and their matters of discretion in this and other chapters refer back to this new policy.	Add new policy ECO-PX (<u>Maintaining Indigenous Biodiversity</u>): <u>1. To maintain indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of subdivision, land use and development on indigenous biodiversity.</u> <u>2. To have regard to the following potential adverse effects in considering subdivision, land use and development that may adversely affect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with indigenous biodiversity values:</u> <u>a. Fragmentation of, or reduction in the extent of, indigenous vegetation or habitats of indigenous fauna;</u> <u>b. Fragmentation or disruption of connections and linkages between ecosystems or habitats of indigenous fauna;</u> <u>c. Loss of, or damage to, buffering of ecosystems or habitats of indigenous fauna; and</u> <u>d. Loss or reduction of rare or threatened indigenous species' populations or habitats.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.100	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	Greater Wellington agree with the intent of the submission point but not the wording as drafted.	Allow / Support this submission point in part.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.118	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	Considers that the requested additional policy should manage potential adverse effects in accordance with a management hierarchy, as signaled by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity	Allow / Seeks that if the requested additional policy is included, to ensure that it is amended to manage potential adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity in accordance with an effects management hierarchy that focuses on the indigenous biodiversity values.
Steve West	FS110.6	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	<p>The original submitter seeks to include a new policy aimed at identification of new SNAs and also for maintaining indigenous biodiversity in other areas, suggesting rules to limit removal of indigenous biodiversity in each area to under 200m2 in any 10-year period.</p> <p>Steve West does not support the identification and/or creation of SNAs under the district plan, particularly on private urban land, or provision of other overly restrictive rules (as suggested above) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considers that through voluntary conservation programs and effort, the city's indigenous biodiversity (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years. This has occurred without any need for SNAs. - Considers that creating SNAs (and other overly restrictive rules), particularly on private urban land, in the district plan will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner goodwill in the process. And as a result, planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNAs and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules. - Considers that by seeking regulatory outcomes for expanding SNA areas, rather than continuing to encourage and support voluntary conservation efforts there is real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish over time. 	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.177	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	Considers including a policy to deal with the development of existing vacant lots, as was included in the plan version as at 20 April 2022 (attached to this submission), which provided parameters around developing in existing vacant residential sites established prior to the notification of the DP where there is no suitable building platform available outside the SNA. Notes the date would need to be amended to reflect that the SNAs were not included at notification. We would support more protective parameters than those above, to ensure the SNA was protected to the greatest extent possible.	<p>Add new policy ECO-PX (<u>Development of Existing Vacant Lots</u>):</p> <p><u>Provide for the development of existing vacant residential site established prior to the notification of the District Plan where there is no suitable building platform available outside of a Significant Natural Area identified in SCHED8 and SCHED9, having regard to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. The location of the building platform and minimizing the extent of associated vegetation removal</u> <u>2. The location of the access or driveway to the building platform to minimize the loss of vegetation or fragmentation of the Significant Natural Area; and</u> <u>3. The location of lateral service connections to public wastewater, sewer and water supply network, electricity and telephone cables.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.178	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	<p>Seeks additional rules to manage vegetation clearance outside SNAs. Considers the plan's provisions do not fulfil Council's requirement to maintain indigenous biodiversity. Regulating activities only in SNAs falls short of this function.</p> <p>This rule would limit permitted indigenous vegetation removal to 200m2 in any 10 year period. Where this PA was not met, it would become RDA, and the matters of discretion would need to reference the new policy aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity. This rule is particularly important given the deletion of the residential SNAs.</p>	Add new rule ECO-RX to manage vegetation clearance outside Significant Natural Areas that permit indigenous vegetation removal to 200m2 in any 10 year period. Where the Permitted activity status is not met, the activity would become a Restricted Discretionary activity, and the matters of discretion would need to reference the new policy aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.119	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Considers that the requested additional rules would apply to any and all indigenous biodiversity. The proposed limits are unduly restrictive in a rural setting and capture even indigenous vegetation that is planted rather than naturally occurring. The policy needs to give effect to clause (1) (b) of the objective of the exposure draft NPS Indigenous Biodiversity (providing for social, economic wellbeing of people and communities) as well as protecting, maintaining and restoring indigenous biodiversity.	Disallow / Seeks that the requested new rules are disallowed, or if the requested rules are included, to ensure the permitted activity standards provide for the clearance of indigenous vegetation to the extent necessary to maintain existing lawfully established infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure.
Steve West	FS110.7	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	<p>The original submitter seeks to include a new policy aimed at identification of new SNAs and also for maintaining indigenous biodiversity in other areas, suggesting rules to limit removal of indigenous biodiversity in each area to under 200m2 in any 10-year period.</p> <p>Steve West does not support the identification and/or creation of SNAs under the district plan, particularly on private urban land, or provision of other overly restrictive rules (as suggested above) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considers that through voluntary conservation programs and effort, the city's indigenous biodiversity (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years. This has occurred without any need for SNAs. - Considers that creating SNAs (and other overly restrictive rules), particularly on private urban land, in the district plan will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner goodwill in the process. And as a result, planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNAs and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules. - Considers that by seeking regulatory outcomes for expanding SNA areas, rather than continuing to encourage and support voluntary conservation efforts there is real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish over time. 	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.179	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	<p>Notes that there is a vegetation clearance rule in the Coastal Environment chapter, which currently only applies in high natural character areas and outside SNAs. As submitted in the Coastal Environment chapter, the vegetation clearance rules should apply everywhere outside SNAs in the coastal environment, not only in high natural character areas, where CES1 is met.</p> <p>We seek a rule that would also have effect outside the coastal environment. Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation outside SNAs would be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to address an imminent threat to people or property provided that a standard is complied with, - for the operation or maintenance of lawfully established buildings, infrastructure, walking cycling or private vehicle access or fences or existing farming activities; and the removal does not exceed 200m2 per title as at notification. A new RDA would apply if those standards were not met. 	Add new rule ECO-RX to manage vegetation clearance in all areas of the coastal environment.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.120	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Considers that the requested additional rules would apply to any and all indigenous biodiversity. The proposed limits are unduly restrictive in a rural setting and capture even indigenous vegetation that is planted rather than naturally occurring. The policy needs to give effect to clause (1) (b) of the objective of the exposure draft NPS Indigenous Biodiversity (providing for social, economic wellbeing of people and communities) as well as protecting, maintaining and restoring indigenous biodiversity.	Disallow / Seeks that the requested new rules are disallowed, or if the requested rules are included, to ensure the permitted activity standards provide for the clearance of indigenous vegetation to the extent necessary to maintain existing lawfully established infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.180	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	<p>We seek a rule that would also have effect outside the coastal environment. Trimming or removal of indigenous vegetation outside SNAs would be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to address an imminent threat to people or property provided that a standard is complied with, - for the operation or maintenance of lawfully established buildings, infrastructure, walking cycling or private vehicle access or fences or existing farming activities; and the removal does not exceed 200m2 per title as at notification. A new RDA would apply if those standards were not met. 	<p>Add new rule ECO-RX to manage vegetation clearance outside Significant Natural Areas, with Permitted activity standards requiring the activity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - address an imminent threat to people or property provided that a standard is complied with, - before the operation or maintenance of lawfully established buildings, infrastructure, walking cycling or private vehicle access or fences or existing farming activities; and the removal does not exceed 200m2 per title as at notification. <p>Non-compliance with Permitted activity standards would default to a Restricted Discretionary activity.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.36	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Considers that on the basis SNA's are identified in the PDP (and have been comprehensively addressed) Transpower does not support the provision of a blanket rule to apply to all indigenous vegetation. While Transpower agrees that indigenous vegetation outside an SNA has value, given the significant planning implications of imposing a rule to apply outside an SNA, a robust S32AA analysis is required as to the alternatives, cost and benefits, effectiveness and efficiency, risks and then a decision made about the most appropriate action. There is no higher order support for such a rule. The PDP gives effect to Objective 16 and Policies 23 and 24 of the RPS and Section 6(c) of the RMA is confined to significant indigenous vegetation. Given the robustness of the process in determining the SNAs (notwithstanding the Council decision to not notify SNA within urban area), the inclusion of a plan wide rule is not the most efficient and effective way in which to give effect to the objectives of the PDP or the higher order RPS.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.121	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Considers that the requested additional rules would apply to any and all indigenous biodiversity. The proposed limits are unduly restrictive in a rural setting and capture even indigenous vegetation that is planted rather than naturally occurring. The policy needs to give effect to clause (1) (b) of the objective of the exposure draft NPS Indigenous Biodiversity (providing for social, economic wellbeing of people and communities) as well as protecting, maintaining and restoring indigenous biodiversity.	Disallow / Seeks that the requested new rules are disallowed, or if the requested rules are included, to ensure the permitted activity standards provide for the clearance of indigenous vegetation to the extent necessary to maintain existing lawfully established infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.181	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	Considers that it is appropriate to include standards for residential SNA's in line with those in the Draft Plan.	Reinstate the Draft Plan's ECO standards for residential Significant Natural Areas.
Steve West	FS110.4	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Disagree that reinstatement of residential SNAs in the Proposed District Plan is required for WCC to meet its obligations under section 6(c) of the RMA and policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neither the RMA or RPS prescribe in detail how a council might give effect to the requirement to protect of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. On note, in the 2015 Environment Court case between Forrest & Bird and New Plymouth District Council the Environment Court concluded Councils might conceivably meet RMA Section 6(c) duties through methods other than identification and rules, but in this case the non-regulatory methods relied on by the Council were insufficient to provide protection. - Alternative methods of compliance are available to WCC. - Indigenous biodiversity in Wellington (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years, including Zealandia and Predator Free, along with voluntary conservation efforts without any need for SNAs. - Creating SNAs on private urban land will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners , destroying landowner value and goodwill in the process. Real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish should SNAs be created on private urban land, and as a result would see both GWRC and WCC failing to meet their regulatory obligations, including under the RMA. - Specifically for Captain Edward Daniell Drive, indigenous biodiversity is already protected under Section 3 of the Land Covenant registered on the records of title. <p>Considers that as the NPSIB is in draft form and has no legal effect, and given how unpopular SNAs proved to be in submissions on the draft district plan, pushing on with creating SNA on private urban land before the policy statement is in effect would further undermine WCC's already poor relationship with impacted landowners. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed and that already protected land (such as Captain Edward Dainell Drive) be removed from Schedule 9, should residential SNAs be reinstated.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.182	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support in part	It is not clear how these policies are given effect to in the rules. Seeking (in the ECO chapter) a general indigenous vegetation clearance rule, outside of SNAs. Seek that this is applied in the rural zone, in order to maintain biodiversity.	Add new rule ECO-RX to manage indigenous vegetation clearance outside of Significant Natural Areas to maintain biodiversity.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.37	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Considers that on the basis SNA's are identified in the PDP (and have been comprehensively addressed) Transpower does not support the provision of a blanket rule to apply to all indigenous vegetation. While Transpower agrees that indigenous vegetation outside an SNA has value, given the significant planning implications of imposing a rule to apply outside an SNA, a robust S32AA analysis is required as to the alternatives, cost and benefits, effectiveness and efficiency, risks and then a decision made about the most appropriate action. There is no higher order support for such a rule. The PDP gives effect to Objective 16 and Policies 23 and 24 of the RPS and Section 6(c) of the RMA is confined to significant indigenous vegetation. Given the robustness of the process in determining the SNAs (notwithstanding the Council decision to not notify SNA within urban area), the inclusion of a plan wide rule is not the most efficient and effective way in which to give effect to the objectives of the PDP or the higher order RPS.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.122	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Considers that the requested additional rules would apply to any and all indigenous biodiversity. The proposed limits are unduly restrictive in a rural setting and capture even indigenous vegetation that is planted rather than naturally occurring. The policy needs to give effect to clause (1) (b) of the objective of the exposure draft NPS Indigenous Biodiversity (providing for social, economic wellbeing of people and communities) as well as protecting, maintaining and restoring indigenous biodiversity.	Disallow / Seeks that the requested new rules are disallowed, or if the requested rules are included, to ensure the permitted activity standards provide for the clearance of indigenous vegetation to the extent necessary to maintain existing lawfully established infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.150	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Considers that WCC has stated that wetlands are sufficiently covered by the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater 2020, the submitter does not support this view and considers that the PDP has a role for integrated management of adverse effects on wetlands and their functions, including those wetlands not yet identified, under NPS-FM Clause 3.5. Under NPS-FM Section 3.5 the PDP should contribute to the protection and enhancement of the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, including wetlands, through WCC's RMA section 31 functions, as outlined in Policies FW.3 and FW.6 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This approach would help to achieve NPS-FM Policies 6 and 7 and operative RPS policy 47. The PDP should provide for identification and avoidance of waterways (both within and outside of SNAs) during structure planning and sub-division, such that waterways must be identified and protected prior to any development occurring. Greater Wellington does not consider the freshwater direction in the design guides to provide sufficient certainty of protection and enhancement.	Add a policy and objective to protect and enhance the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, including wetlands, in the ECO chapter. This should lead into rules in the subdivision and future urban zone chapters, requiring that waterways and wetlands have been identified for structure planning or subdivision prior to any development occurring.
Director-General of Conservation	385.35	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Not specified	Considers that Policy 8 of the NPS-IB exposure draft seeks that "The importance of maintaining indigenous biodiversity outside SNAs is recognised and provided for". Given the NPS-IB is anticipated to be gazetted in December 2022, the Director-General submits that the Proposed District Plan should give effect to this national direction.	Add policy to require the protection of indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.2	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, Transpower does not support the provision of policies to give effect to the NPS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.1	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	Given the NPS-IB is anticipated to be gazetted in December 2022, Forest & Bird agrees that the Proposed District Plan should give effect to this national direction.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.53	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Further clarification is needed to understand the implications on land use opportunities of applying significant natural areas.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.123	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	Considers that the requested policy should manage potential adverse effects in accordance with a management hierarchy, as signaled by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity.	Amend / Seeks that if the additional policy is included, to ensure it is amended to manage potential adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity in accordance with an effects management hierarchy that focuses on the indigenous biodiversity values.
Director-General of Conservation	385.36	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Amend	<p>Considers addition of setback standard within the chapter.</p> <p>Under the current standards, there is no setback requirement from a Significant Natural Area (SNA) which means development could be located directly against the boundary of a SNA. Adverse effects resulting from development within proximity to an SNA include bright lights impacting indigenous fauna and people trimming/removing vegetation/trees from an SNA for being too close to their property. The provision of a buffer or setback between new development and SNAs will reduce the possibility of adverse effects and allow the consideration of effects/mitigation at resource consent stage if new development is proposed within the setback.</p> <p>Additionally, the addition of a development setback for SNAs would ensure the Proposed District Plan is in line with Policy 47, specifically point b, of the RPS.</p>	Add standard which would manage development setbacks as follows: New buildings, building additions, structures, and swimming pools shall be setback 5m from the boundary of a Significant Natural Area.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.15	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	Greater Wellington support the proposed setback provisions as one method to protect SNAs from the adverse effects of intensification.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.54	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Oppose	Kainga Ora does not support the proposed change requested and considers it is unnecessary to manage identified values.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.124	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	Considers that there may be circumstances where a 5m setback is not achievable due to legitimate functional or operational needs of infrastructure.	Amend / Seeks that if the requested standard is included, to ensure that there is provision for reduction of the setback distance where necessary to provide for existing lawfully established infrastructure and where functional or operational needs mean it is not practicable to achieve or maintain a 5m setback.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.28	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / New ECO	Support	Agree with the Director-General of Conservation to include a set-back standard where a development is adjacent to an SNA. This buffer provision will reduce the possibility of adverse effects by allowing consideration of effects/mitigation at resource consent stage. It also brings the Proposed District Plan in line with Policy 47, specifically point b, of the RPS.	Allow
Tyers Stream Group	221.32	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend ECO-01 (Significant Natural Areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and where appropriate, restored) as follows: Significant Natural Areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and where appropriate, restored.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.125	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Oppose	Considers that Part 2 of the RMA intends that significant natural areas should be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.68	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Support in part	Considers that it is the values of Significant Natural Areas that should be protected, not the geographic areas they occupy.	Retain Objective ECO-01 (Significant natural areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, and where appropriate, restored) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.69	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Amend	Considers that it is the values of Significant Natural Areas that should be protected, not the geographic areas they occupy.	Amend Objective ECO-01 (Significant natural areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, and where appropriate, restored) as follows: <u>The ecological and indigenous biodiversity values</u> of Significant Natural Areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and where appropriate, restored.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.7	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Support	WELL agree in principle with the submitter that it is the values of Significant Natural Areas that should be protected, not the geographic areas they occupy. In this regard, WELL consider that the sought amendment to ECO-01 is appropriate and therefore is supported.	Allow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.34	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Support in part	Considers that It is important that Council identified SNAs within the City in order to protect and maintain the remaining areas of indigenous biodiversity. However, this should not include areas earmarked for public access and roads. The Submitter accepts the overlay being clipped to the proposed MRZ areas of their land, but not over the paper road and parts of the access.	Retain ECO-01 (Significant Natural Areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and where appropriate, restored) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.183	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Support in part	Notes that Section 6(c) does not include reference to 'inappropriate subdivision, use and development'.	Amend ECO-01 as follows: Significant Natural Areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and where appropriate, restored.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.126	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Oppose	Considers that the scheme of the RMA is that significant natural areas should be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.116	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Amend	Considers that it is crucial that SNAs are protected, as is required by law. By rephrasing this objective, it puts the emphasis on restoration as the default position, rather than a possible option. It is thought that this strikes the balance better between use and protection	Amend the wording "where appropriate" from ECO-01 (Significant Natural Areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use...) to "where possible"

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.127	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Oppose	Considers that restoration in all circumstances 'where possible' creates an unduly stringent requirement. Evaluation of what is 'appropriate' better gives effect to the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity objective, including providing for the social and economic wellbeing of people and communities and enabling consideration of the merit or restoring specific indigenous biodiversity resources.	Disallow
Director-General of Conservation	385.37	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Oppose in part	Considers that as the objectives (ECO-01 and ECO-02) are seeking the same outcome, they should be incorporated into one objective.	Opposes ECO-01 in its current form and seeks amendment.
Director-General of Conservation	385.38	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Amend	The Director-General is supportive of the intention of Objective ECO-01 & ECO-02, however considers that as the objectives are seeking the same outcome, they should be incorporated into one objective. The suggested wording is in line with the NZCPS including Policy 7 which provides protection from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development in these areas through objectives and Policy 14 which promotes restoration or rehabilitation of the natural character of the coastal environment.	Amend Objective ECO-01 as follows: "Significant Natural Areas (<u>including those within the coastal environment</u>) are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and where appropriate, restored <u>or rehabilitated</u> ."
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.49	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Support in part	Supports that the objective says that significant natural areas are protected from inappropriate land use	Retain ECO-01 (Significant Natural Areas are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and where appropriate, restored) with amendment below.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.50	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-01	Amend	Considers the objective should mention protection from adverse effects of incompatible activities.	Amend Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Objective 1 (Protection of significant natural areas) to mention protection from adverse effects of incompatible activities.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.39	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Not specified	Considers that ECO-02 (Significant Natural Areas within the coastal environment are protected.) supports the restriction of building activities around the coast. Section 6(a) of the RMA identifies the protection of the natural character of the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development as a matter of national importance.	Seeks that building activities around the coast are restricted to protect biodiversity, natural character, and amenity values.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.40	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Support	Considers that ECO-02 (Significant Natural Areas within the coastal environment are protected.) supports the restriction of building activities around the coast.	Seeks that building activities around the coast, and any expansion of the city including airport runway extensions, acknowledge the large range of indigenous birds nesting around the Pōneke Wellington coastline.
Tyers Stream Group	221.33	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-02 (Significant Natural Areas within the coastal environment are protected) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.70	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Support in part	Considers that it is the values of Significant Natural Areas that should be protected, not the geographic areas they occupy.	Retain Objective ECO-02 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.71	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Amend	Considers that it is the values of Significant Natural Areas that should be protected, not the geographic areas they occupy.	Amend Objective ECO-02 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment) as follows: <u>The ecological and indigenous biodiversity values of Significant Natural Areas within the coastal environment are protected.</u>
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.35	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Support in part	Considers that it is important that Council identified SNAs within the City in order to protect and maintain the remaining areas of indigenous biodiversity. However, this should not include areas earmarked for public access and roads. The Submitter accepts the overlay being clipped to the proposed MRZ areas of their land, but not over the paper road and parts of the access.	Retain ECO-02 (Significant Natural Areas within the coastal environment are protected) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.184	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Support	Generally supports ECO-02.	Retain ECO-02 as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.151	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Amend	Considers that the wording used for the coastal environment should differ from that in ECO-01.	Seeks to amend wording to 'protected and, where appropriate, restored' or remove the objective.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.128	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Support	Meridian supports the proposed wording, which includes 'where appropriate, restored'.	Amend / Allow the requested amendment, provided it includes the words 'and, where appropriate, restored'.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.117	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Support	ECO-02 is supported as it is vital to ensuring SNAs are protected.	Retain ECO-02 (Significant Natural Areas within the coastal environment are protected). As notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.39	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-02	Oppose in part	Considers that as the objectives (ECO-01 and ECO-02) are seeking the same outcome, they should be incorporated into one objective.	Delete objective ECO-02 in its entirety, on the grounds that ECO-01 is amended.
Tyers Stream Group	221.34	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-03	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-03 (Significant Natural Areas are protected from the adverse effects of plantation forestry activities) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.36	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-03	Support in part	Considers that it is important that Council identified SNAs within the City in order to protect and maintain the remaining areas of indigenous biodiversity. However, this should not include areas earmarked for public access and roads. The Submitter accepts the overlay being clipped to the proposed MRZ areas of their land, but not over the paper road and parts of the access.	Retain ECO-03 (Significant Natural Areas are protected from the adverse effects of plantation forestry activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.185	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-03	Support	Generally supports ECO-03.	Retain ECO-03 as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.118	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-03	Support	ECO-03 is supported as it is vital to ensuring SNAs are protected.	Retain ECO-03 (Significant Natural Areas are protected from the adverse effects of plantation forestry activities) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.51	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-03	Support in part	Supports mention of protection from the effects of plantation forestry.	Retain ECO-03 (Significant Natural Areas are protected from the adverse effects of plantation forestry activities.) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.35	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-04	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-04 (Significant Natural Areas are maintained or restored by mana whenua in accordance with kaitiakitanga) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.37	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-04	Support in part	Considers that It is important that Council identified SNAs within the City in order to protect and maintain the remaining areas of indigenous biodiversity. However, this should not include areas earmarked for public access and roads. The Submitter accepts the overlay being clipped to the proposed MRZ areas of their land, but not over the paper road and parts of the access.	Retain ECO-04 (Significant Natural Areas are maintained or restored by mana whenua in accordance with kaitiakitanga) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.186	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-04	Support	Generally supports ECO-04.	Retain ECO-04 as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.152	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-04	Amend	Considers that the wording, 'maintain and restore' is inconsistent with 'protect and restore' in ECO-01 and the related policy ECO-P4.	Seeks to amend wording in ECO-04 to 'protect and restore'.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.119	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-04	Support	Supports as the objective is vital to ensuring SNAs are protected. Particularly supports ECO-R4 (Significant Natural Areas are maintained or restored by mana whenua in accordance with kaitiakitanga) as it further Wellington City Council's Te Tiriti obligations.	Retain ECO-R4 (Significant Natural Areas are maintained or restored by mana whenua in accordance with kaitiakitanga) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.36	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.72	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose in part	Considers that the mitigation hierarchy created by Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) should focus biodiversity and compensation initiatives at adverse effects that are more than minor (not all residual adverse effects). Considers the word 'only' in clauses 4 and 5 is unnecessary because the circumstances when biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation will be considered are set out in APP2 (Biodiversity offsetting) and APP3 (Biodiversity compensation). Considers the word 'only' adds no value to the principles in APP2 and APP3.	Retain Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.73	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Amend	<p>Considers that the mitigation hierarchy created by Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) should focus biodiversity and compensation initiatives at adverse effects that are more than minor (not all residual adverse effects).</p> <p>Considers the word 'only' in clauses 4 and 5 is unnecessary because the circumstances when biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation will be considered are set out in APP2 (Biodiversity offsetting) and APP3 (Biodiversity compensation). Considers the word 'only' adds no value to the principles in APP2 and APP3.</p>	<p>Amend Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) as follows:</p> <p>Protect the biodiversity values of the identified significant natural areas within SCHED8 by requiring subdivision, use and development to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values where practicable; 2. Minimise adverse effects on the biodiversity values where avoidance is not practicable; 3. <u>Where practicable, remedy</u> adverse effects on the biodiversity values where they cannot be avoided or minimised; 4. <u>Where residual adverse effects cannot be avoided, mitigated or remedied, Only</u> consider biodiversity offsetting for any residual adverse effects that are more than minor cannot otherwise be avoided, minimised or remedied and where the principles of APP2 – Biodiversity Offsetting are met; and 5. <u>Only if biodiversity offsetting of more than minor residual adverse effects is not practicable,</u> consider biodiversity compensation after first considering biodiversity offsetting and where the principles of APP3 – Biodiversity Compensation are met.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.22	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Support	<p>Supports ECO-P1 as it reflects the common mitigation hierarchy approach to biodiversity. Depending on the identification of specific SNA areas, Horokiwi is not opposed to the policy. The references to 'where practicable' and ability for offsetting are supported.</p>	Retain ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.14	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Support	<p>ECO-P1 is supported as it provides for an effects management hierarchy for land development, including offsetting and compensation, within Significant Natural Areas.</p>	Retain ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.163	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Support	<p>Considers policy INF-ECO-P36 and P37 requires application of the effects management hierarchy (which is incorrectly referenced as ECO-P2 within the aforementioned policies) to the upgrade and development of the National Grid. Submitter notes that in its comments on INF-ECO-P36 and P37 deletion of the cross reference to Policy ECO-P1 is sought.</p> <p>Submitter is not opposed to ECO-P1 (and is supportive of the mitigation hierarchy approach within ECO-P1 on the basis biodiversity offsets and compensation are only a consideration as opposed to a mandatory requirement). However, given the uncertainty as to what form ECO-P1 will take and the significant implications of any policy changes to policy ECO-P1 to the National Grid, Transpower seeks to include Significant Natural Areas within the 'seek to avoid' policy directive of the sought National Grid specific policies, as opposed to being subject to ECO-P1. By deleting the ECO specific clause within INF-ECO-P36 and P37, the policy directive would be to 'seek to avoid' the SNA's as applying to the National Grid. Considers this would be the most efficient and effective solution in respect of the NPS-ET. While NPS-ET Policy 8 does not specifically reference indigenous biodiversity, given the high value of the areas within the policy, considers it would be consistent to include SNA's within the sought "seek to avoid" policy directive. Considers the inclusion would be consistent for the intent of the NPS-ET to provide a comprehensive enabling regime for the National Grid recognising its national significance, and for the 'seek to avoid' policy to address RMA section 6 matters in a consistent manner. Considers policies 1-5 of the NPS-ET require some tempering of plan provisions that may otherwise be applied to the National Grid, in order to provide for the need to operate, maintain, develop and upgrade the electricity transmission network as a matter of national significance.</p>	Retain Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified, subject to deletion of reference to the policy within INF-ECO-P36 and INF-ECO-P37.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.187	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Support	<p>Considers this policy needs to be limited to situations where policy 11 NZCPS does not apply. The Auckland Unitary Plan provides an example of how this can be achieved. It is currently not clear that ECO-P5 would apply as a first step in the coastal environment. As such, a specific clause is required. The SNA provisions should apply to any area of significant biodiversity that meets the Policy 23 RPS criteria. There may be areas that have been missed in the scheduling process, and could be discovered for example via the consenting process. In order to meet the requirements of the Act, the SNA provisions must also apply to these areas. The SNA provisions also need to apply to the deleted SCHED9 areas. This can be achieved by either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amending the SNA definition as sought above to incorporate SCHED 8, SCHED9, and any other area that meets the Policy 23 RPS criteria, and simply referring to the defined term in the provisions (as opposed to the current approach, which specifically references SCHED8 repeatedly) (preferred option); or - Amending every provision in the Plan that refers to SCHED8, to also refer to SCHED9 and any area that meets Policy 23 RPS criteria. <p>The effects management hierarchy in ECO-P1 only requires for avoidance of effects where practicable. That low standard is not sufficient to ensure the requirements of the Act (including s6 and s31) are met. Some effects must actually be avoided in order to meet these requirements. We seek changes to meet these requirements. We note that the recent PC18 to the Porirua DP includes such limits.</p> <p>We note that this policy applies to subdivision. Please see our submission points on the Subdivision chapter.</p> <p>The effects management hierarchy in this policy uses the term “minimised” rather than the RMA term “mitigated”. The term mitigation comes directly from s 5 RMA. There is extensive jurisprudence on what it means and how it sits within the RMA’s system alongside avoidance and remediation for managing adverse effects of activities. Conversely, the term “minimise” is not in s 5 RMA. This raises a question of the vires of substituting mitigate for minimise.</p> <p>Continued use of mitigate, alongside avoidance and remediation, will preserve case law and knowledge as to their meaning. The term ‘minimise’ or minimisation of effects refers to what effects management should achieve, rather than being an effects management step itself.</p> <p>We do not support providing for compensation, as it is not an effective tool to adequately manage adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity. Forest & Bird’s primary position is that biodiversity compensation should not be part of the effects management hierarchy, because it is inherently uncertain as to whether it will maintain indigenous biodiversity. This is particularly the case where the policy itself does not include any effects which must be avoided (only avoided where practicable).</p> <p>Support the mandatory requirements in 4 and 5 that the offsetting and compensation (if compensation is to be retained) principles must be met for an offsetting/compensation proposal to meet the policy.</p>	<p>Amend ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas):</p> <p>Protect the biodiversity values of the identified significant natural areas within SCHED8 by requiring subdivision, use and development to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity in the coastal environment to the extent stated in ECO P5; 2. Avoid the following adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Loss of ecosystem representation and extent; b. Disruption to sequences, mosaics or ecosystem function; c. Fragmentation or loss of buffering or connectivity within the SNA and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems; and d. A reduction in population size or occupancy of threatened species using the SNA for any part of their life cycle. 3. Avoid other adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values where practicable 4. Minimise Mitigate adverse effects on the biodiversity values where avoidance is not practicable; Remedy adverse effects on the biodiversity values where they cannot be avoided or mitigated minimised; Only consider biodiversity offsetting for any residual adverse effects that cannot otherwise be avoided, mitigated minimised or remedied and where the principles of APP2 – Biodiversity Offsetting are met; and 7. Only consider biodiversity compensation after first considering biodiversity offsetting and where the principles of APP2 – Biodiversity Compensation are met.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.129	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose	The proposed amendment conflicts, in part, with the amendments Meridian seeks to policy ECO-P1.	Disallow / Allow the amendments only to the extent that they align with the amendments requested by Meridian in its submission point 228.73.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.153	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Amend	The wording ‘where practicable’ is unnecessary in clause 1 as it is restated in clause 2.	Seeks to amend wording to remove ‘where practicable’ from clause 1.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.130	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose	Considers that the deletion of 'where practicable' from clause 1 would not give effect to the objective of the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity (it would fail to consider clause (1) (b)). The words 'where practicable' in clause 2 of Policy ECO-P1 address the subsequent step in the hierarchy (not the first 'avoid' step).	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.120	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Amend	In relation to Point 3, the submitter considers that environmental damage cannot be remedied in a way that is different to biodiversity offsetting.	Amend Point 3 of ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) to be clearer as to how remedying may exist, or remove entirely.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.131	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose	Considers that it is relevant to include 'remediation' in the mitigation hierarchy, even if it is unlikely to be employed in most cases. Biodiversity compensation is a valid response, endorsed by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity and numerous Environment Court decisions.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.216	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose	The RVA opposes this submission point as the current policy provides an appropriate hierarchy for avoiding, minimising, remedying, offsetting and compensating for biodiversity values. Compensation is an appropriate mechanism to be considered that can lead to enhanced biodiversity outcomes	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.216	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose	Ryman opposes this submission point as the current policy provides an appropriate hierarchy for avoiding, minimising, remedying, offsetting and compensating for biodiversity values. Compensation is an appropriate mechanism to be considered that can lead to enhanced biodiversity outcomes	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.121	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Amend	Considers that biodiversity compensation should not be available. It should not be possible for destruction of biodiversity to be available at a price.	Remove Point 5, biodiversity compensation, of ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) in its entirety.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.132	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose	Considers that it is relevant to include 'remediation' in the mitigation hierarchy, even if it is unlikely to be employed in most cases. Biodiversity compensation is a valid response, endorsed by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity and numerous Environment Court decisions.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.217	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose	The RVA opposes this submission point as the current policy provides an appropriate hierarchy for avoiding, minimising, remedying, offsetting and compensating for biodiversity values. Compensation is an appropriate mechanism to be considered that can lead to enhanced biodiversity outcomes	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.217	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose	Ryman opposes this submission point as the current policy provides an appropriate hierarchy for avoiding, minimising, remedying, offsetting and compensating for biodiversity values. Compensation is an appropriate mechanism to be considered that can lead to enhanced biodiversity outcomes	Disallow
Director-General of Conservation	385.40	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Oppose in part	Considers that the use of policy that implements an effects management hierarchy is supported, provided that, Policy ECO-P1 is amended to be in line with the wording in the exposure draft for the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity.	Opposes in part ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas), in its current form and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.41	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Amend	Considers that the use of policy that implements an effects management hierarchy is supported, provided that, Policy ECO-P1 is amended to be in line with the wording in the exposure draft for the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity.	Amend Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) to be in line with the wording set out in the exposure draft for the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.133	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Support	Meridian agrees that any amendments to the wording of ECO objectives and policies must be aligned with the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity once that is gazetted. The issue will be in the timing of the Plan hearings/decisions and gazettal of the NPS.	Allow
Paul M Blaschke	435.8	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P1	Support	ECO-P1 is particularly supported.	Retain ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.37	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.74	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Support in part	Considers that the removal of vegetation may also be appropriate where necessary to provide for the functional or operational needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including vegetation removal from around structures.	Retain Policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.75	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Amend	Considers that the removal of vegetation may also be appropriate where necessary to provide for the functional or operational needs of regionally significant infrastructure, including vegetation removal from around structures.	Amend Policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) as follows (or similar to provide for the functional and operational needs of regionally significant infrastructure): Enable vegetation removal within significant natural areas identified within SCHED8 where it is of a scale and nature that maintains the biodiversity values, including to provide for: 1. Maintenance around existing buildings and structures; or 2. Safe operation of roads, tracks and access ways; or 3. <u>Functional or operational needs in operating, maintaining, repairing, or upgrading regionally significant infrastructure; or</u> <u>4. ...</u>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	FS27.8	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Support	WELL support the submission point in that the removal of vegetation may also be appropriate where necessary to provide for the functional or operational needs of regionally significant infrastructure. WELL is guided by the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003, and therefore consider that the submission point to amend Policy ECO-P2 so as to allow appropriate vegetation removal in SNA areas is appropriate for the safe and secure supply of electricity.	Allow
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.11	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Oppose	Infrastructure in relation to SNAs is detailed under the "Infrastructure – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity" chapter of the PDP. To avoid confusion, it should continue to be included in a separate chapter and not referenced in the "Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity" chapter.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.102	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it enables the removal of vegetation within significant natural areas to reduce wildfire risk through the removal of highly flammable vegetation near existing residential units or on rural property	Retain ECO-P2 (appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) as notified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.15	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Amend	Considers that ECO-P2 is unlikely to apply to quarrying activities. Adding a point that enables vegetation clearance where the existing activity is a legal activity will achieve the right balance between protection of appropriate vegetation and allowing essential economic activities.	Amend ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) to add a sub-point enabling vegetation clearance where the existing activity is a legal activity.
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.12	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Oppose	It is unclear what the submitter considers to be a legal activity. However, if an activity is able to take place by an approved resource consent, by being a Permitted Activity, or by having existing use rights, then the activity is already able to go ahead, and this wording is therefore not necessary in the PDP. If the proposed vegetation clearance is not enabled by one of the points above, it should be considered separately under the District Plan and not enabled.	Disallow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.164	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Not specified	Considers that, on the basis ECO-P2 is not applicable to Infrastructure, Transpower is neutral on the policy. However, if the intent is that it does and should apply to the National Grid, seeks amendment to recognise vegetation removal to enable the safe and efficient operation and maintenance of the National Grid. [position is specified as neutral]	Retain Policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas). [Subject to amendment if the intent is that the policy applies to the National Grid]
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.165	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Not specified	Considers that, on the basis ECO-P2 is not applicable to Infrastructure, Transpower is neutral on the policy. However, if the intent is that it does and should apply to the National Grid, seeks amendment to recognise vegetation removal to enable the safe and efficient operation and maintenance of the National Grid. [position is specified as neutral]	Seeks that if the intent is that Policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) applies to the National Grid, it is amended to recognise vegetation removal to enable the safe and efficient operation and maintenance of the National Grid.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.188	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Support in part	Considers the policy should not start from a point of enabling because this policy will be considered when consenting the listed activities where they are no longer permitted: the matters of discretion for ECO R1.4, 1.5, 2.2, 3.2 refer to this policy. Considers it is not clear whether all or some of these references are in error, because of the deletion of some policies just prior to notification. Considers it is not appropriate to provide for new roads etc through SNAs as of right, this should be limited to maintenance of existing roads and tracks. It is not clear why conservation activities are referred to in this policy. The rules provide for restoration activities, not conservation activities. If 'conservation activities' is to be retained, see submission point on its definition. Considers the list should be exhaustive, so that it only provides for the intended activities.	Amend ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas): Consider enabling Enable vegetation removal within significant natural areas identified within SCHEDULES where it is of a scale and nature that maintains the biodiversity values, including to provide for: 1. Maintenance around existing buildings; or 2. Safe operation of <u>existing</u> roads, tracks and access ways; or 3. Restoration and conservation activities including plant and animal pest control activities; or 4. Natural hazard management activities; or 5. Reduction of wildfire risk through the removal of highly flammable vegetation near existing residential units on rural property; or 6. Opportunities to enable tangata whenua to exercise customary harvesting practices (excluding commercial use).
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	FS14.4	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Oppose	Fire and Emergency consider that amending the wording of ECO-P2, as sought by the RFBPS, to 'consider enabling' the removal of highly flammable vegetation could be problematic for reducing the risk of wildfire and would be inconsistent with the provisions of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017.	Disallow / Retain ECO-P2 as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.134	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Oppose	Considers that the policy is deliberately enabling: it provides the policy 'hook' for the rules and standards managing vegetation clearance. Inserting the words 'consider enabling' is at odds with the policy's function. The policy should address the areas identified in the Schedule. Meridian's own submission point 228.75 supports inclusion of the word 'including'. Meridian agrees the policy should be addressing roads.	Allow / Seeks that part of the submission be allowed to include the insertion of roads, and otherwise and, otherwise, disallow the requested amendments.
Paul M Blaschke	435.9	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Support	ECO-P2 is particularly supported.	Retain ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.52	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) to: Enable vegetation removal within significant natural areas identified within SCHED8 where it is of a scale and nature that maintains the biodiversity values, including to provide for: 1. Maintenance around existing buildings; or 2. Safe operation of roads, tracks and access ways; or 3. Restoration and conservation activities including plant and animal pest control activities; or 4. Natural hazard management activities; or 5. Reduction of wildfire risk through the removal of highly flammable vegetation near existing residential units on rural property; or 6. Opportunities to enable Provide for tangata whenua to exercise customary harvesting practices (excluding commercial use).
Tyers Stream Group	221.38	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-P3 (Subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.76	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P3	Support	Considers Policy ECO-P3 (Subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas) gives effect to the objectives.	Retain Policy ECO-P3 (Subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.23	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P3	Support	Supports policy ECO-P3 (Subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas) as it provides a clear framework in which to address the effects of activities within an SNA.	Retain ECO-P3 (Subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.189	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P3	Support in part	Considers the policy should not start from a presumption of allowing activities. It should also include SNAs in SCHED8, 9 and areas that meet Policy 23 criteria that have not yet been defined, as per the relief sought for the SNA definition. We seek the following change to the pōtai: We note that this policy applies to subdivision. Please see our submission points on the Subdivision chapter. Paragraph 1 should refer to ECO-P1. Paragraph 1 is supported, as long as ECO-P1 is amended in the way sought above, including with reference to the policy giving effect to NZCPS policy 11, ECO P5. Paragraph 2 suggests the activity will be demonstrated to be appropriate solely by considering an ecologist's report. A report is not the only consideration in determining appropriateness. Paragraph 3 needs amendment as it could be taken to suggest that no net loss via offsetting is the end goal, whereas there needs to be some effects built into the effects management hierarchy that must be avoided (in line with submission points above). Paragraph 4 is strongly supported. However, it would make more sense to include in ECO-P1. The concepts contained in paragraph 4 are what we have sought for inclusion in ECO-P1, albeit expressed as adverse effects that must be avoided.	Amend ECO-P3 (Subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas): <u>Only a</u> Allow for subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas listed in SCHED8 where it: 1. Applies the effects management hierarchy approach in ECO-P21; and 2. Demonstrates that it is appropriate, <u>including</u> by taking into account the findings of an ecological assessment for the activity in accordance with APP15; and 3. Ensures the activities effects on biodiversity values are appropriately managed in accordance with the effects management hierarchy, <u>and where residual effects remain after avoiding, remedying or mitigating</u> , to achieve no net loss of biodiversity values of the identified significant natural area; and 4. Ensures that the ecological processes, functions and integrity of the significant natural area are maintained.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.135	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P3	Oppose	Considers that the policy should apply to areas identified in the Schedule. The proposed amendments unnecessarily replicate elements of the APP2 and APP3 management hierarchies (which apply anyway and do not require the embellishment proposed in Policy ECO-P3).	Allow / Seeks that part of the submission be allowed to include correction of the ECO-P1 policy reference and, otherwise, disallow the requested amendments.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.122	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P3	Support	SNAs must be protected usually, however, this policy strikes a fair balance between interests in use and interests in protection. It is important that the effects management hierarchy is applied.	Retain ECO-P3 (Subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.42	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P3	Amend	Policy ECO-P3 references the effects management hierarchy approach in ECO-P2, however the effects management approach is referenced ECO-P1.	Amend Policy ECO-P3 as follows: "Applies the effects management hierarchy approach in ECO-P21; and"
Paul M Blaschke	435.10	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P3	Support	ECO-P3 is particularly supported.	Retain ECO-P3 (Subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas) as notified.
Paul Van Houtte	92.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P4	Amend	Considers that free roaming of cats should be restricted in ECO-P4 due to their killing of native birds and lizards when roaming, and for their spread of the toxoplasmosis disease.	Seeks that ECO-P4 (Protection and restoration initiatives) be amended to restrict free roaming of cats.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.41	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P4	Amend	Considers that ECO-P4 should be amended to allow for the practice of rāhui to be implemented when there is a threat to biodiversity from human activity. This is an important addition as rāhui is an important part of Māori conservation practice. This will allow certain protected species to thrive and be free from human interference for brief periods when there may be a threat of particular vulnerability.	Amend ECO-P4 (Protection and restoration initiatives) to include a provision that allows for the practice of rāhui to be implemented when there is a threat to biodiversity from human activity.
Tyers Stream Group	221.39	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-P4 (Protection and restoration initiatives) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.77	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P4	Support in part	Supports Policy ECO-P4 (Protection and restoration initiatives), provided the amendments requested to the mitigation hierarchy in Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) are adopted.	Retain Policy ECO-P4 (Protection and restoration initiatives), provided the amendments requested to Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas) are adopted.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.190	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P4	Support	Supports that this policy is not limited to restoration in SNAs.	Retain ECO-P4 (Protection and restoration initiatives) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.123	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P4	Amend	Generally supportive and particularly supportive of the recognition of mana whenua and land owners as key players in the wording. However, the submitter considers it vital that SNAs are not only protected but also restored.	Amend ECO-P4 (Protection and restoration initiatives) to add a fourth point as follows: <u>4. Where possible, recognise and assist with the financial costs associated with protection and restoration initiatives incurred by mana whenua, landowners and community groups.</u>
Steve West	FS110.20	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P4	Support	The original submitter seeks that where possible WCC recognises and assists with the financial costs associated with protection and restoration initiatives incurred by landowners. Steve West does not support the creation of SNAs on private urban land, if these are included, Steve West support the requirement for WCC to provide compensation, including for: - Substantial annual rates relief to fully compensate the landowner for costs incurred with protecting the SNA area. - Fully covering resource consent and ecologist reports, where required to support ongoing maintenance of the SNA. - Full compensation to the landowner at time of sale for the loss of land value (for the first sale of the private urban SNA). Noting that Darroch has assessed these losses could be up to 30%	Allow / Seeks that if SNAs are implemented on private urban land that WCC establish a full compensation scheme to offset the losses that impacted landowners will face because of SNAs being created.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.27	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P4	Support	The submitter seeks for ECO-P4 (protection and restoration initiatives) to be amended with the addition of a fourth point as follows: where possible, recognise and assist with the financial costs associated with protection and restoration initiatives incurred by mana whenua, landowners and community groups. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because supporting these initiatives would support protection and restoration which aligns with tikanga Māori. This would also support tino rangatiratanga and the ability for mana whenua to achieve their aspirations in relation to protecting and restoring te taiao.	Allow
Tyers Stream Group	221.40	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-P5 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.78	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P5	Support in part	Considers that policy ECO-P5 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment) gives effect to the NZCPS. Considers that there is a minor editorial amendment required in clause 3 and there appears to be an error in the reference to Policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas). It may be that this should be 'ECO-P1' (Protection of significant natural areas) (i.e. the mitigation hierarchy).	Retain Policy ECO-P5 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.79	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P5	Amend	Considers that policy ECO-P5 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment) gives effect to the NZCPS. Considers that there is a minor editorial amendment required in clause 3 and there appears to be an error in the reference to Policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas). It may be that this should be 'ECO-P1' (Protection of significant natural areas) (i.e. the mitigation hierarchy).	Amend Policy ECO-P5 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment) as follows (or similar): Only allow activities within an identified significant natural area within SCHED8 in the coastal environment where it can be demonstrated that they; 1. Avoid adverse effects on the matters in Policy 11(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010; 2. Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on the matters in Policy 11(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010; and 3. Protects the other indigenous biodiversity values in accordance with ECO-P1 ECO-P2 .
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.24	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P5	Oppose	Considers that given the nature of the existing quarrying activities undertaken and modified nature of the environment, parts of the Coastal Overlay as it relates to part of the exiting quarry site is opposed.	Seeks that the Significant Natural Area overlay and Coastal Environment overlay be amended as they relate to the Horokiwi quarry site. [Refer to original submission, including figure and attachments]
Director-General of Conservation	FS106.13	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P5	Oppose	The methodology used to determine the extent of the Coastal Environment for the PDP should align with the criteria under Policy 1 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS). Removal or amendments to the extent of any Coastal Environment area is not supported without the site being ground-truthed by a suitably qualified ecologist to confirm the accuracy of the current Coastal Environment mapping. The Coastal Environment area opposed by Horokiwi Quarries Ltd should be ground-truthed and assessed by WCC before a determination is made to retain, amend, or remove the Coastal Environment area. If the site does not meet the Coastal Environment criteria under Policy 1 of the NZCPS, only then should it be removed.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission is disallowed, unless it can be confirmed that the site does not meet the Coastal Environment criteria under Policy 1 of the NZCPS
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.191	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P5	Support in part	Considers the policy should refer to ECO-P1. In order to give effect to the NZCPS, this policy needs to apply in all zones, including residential. As noted above, this can be achieved by amending the definition of SNA to include SCHED8 and 9, and to any other area that meets Policy 23 RPS. The relationship between this policy and the general effects management hierarchy needs to be more clear. Currently the policies could allow for an argument that policy 11 NZCPS values could be managed in accordance with the general effects management hierarchy, which is incorrect. Amendments are sought to this policy and to ECO P1 above to achieve this.	Amend ECO-P5 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment): Only allow activities within an identified significant natural area within SCHED8 in the coastal environment where it can be demonstrated that they; 1. Avoid adverse effects on the matters in Policy 11(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010; 2. Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on the matters in Policy 11(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010; and 3. Protects other the indigenous biodiversity values in accordance with ECO-P2 ECO-P1

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.136	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P5	Oppose	Considers that the policy should apply to areas identified in the Schedule. The proposed amendments unnecessarily replicate elements of the APP2 and APP3 management hierarchies (which apply anyway and do not require the embellishment proposed in Policy ECO-P3).	Allow / Seeks that part of the submission be allowed to include correction of the ECO-P1 policy reference and, otherwise, disallow the requested amendments.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.124	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P5	Support	Supportive as the Policy is consistent with national direction and it ensures the protection of coastal SNAs in accordance with the NZCPs.	Retain ECO-P5 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.43	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P5	Support	Supports proposed Policy ECO-P5 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment).	Retain policy ECO-P5 (Significant natural areas within the coastal environment) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.41	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P6	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-P6 (New plantation forestry) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.192	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P6	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain ECO-P6 (New plantation forestry) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.125	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P6	Support	The submitter supports the intention that SNAs must be protected from new plantation forestry.	Retain ECO-P6 (new plantation forestry) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.42	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-P7 (Existing plantation forestry) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.193	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P7	Oppose	Considers it is not clear what activities this provision is intended to provide a policy basis for. While Forest & Bird may be able to support a policy such as this one, without the context of what rules/activities the policy provides for, the policy is opposed.	Delete ECO-P7 (Existing plantation forestry).
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.194	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-P7	Amend	If the relief sought above to delete ECO-P7 is not accepted, seeks deletion of the word "identified" in the policy.	Amend ECO-P7 (Existing plantation forestry): Provide for existing plantation forestry and associated activities where these maintain or restore the identified biodiversity values of significant natural areas.
Steve West	2.9	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Not specified	Considers that ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area) is too restrictive. Native trees can grow over 15m tall and are not suited to small plots of urban land. The rules do not account for regular trimming which is important for maintaining bush in an urban environment.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Peter Kelly	16.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Amend	Councillors have a democratic mandate to balance the interests of WCC residents against the important natural environment values represented by significant natural areas (SNAs). The Proposed Rules are essentially the Officer Draft Rules, but with the SNA designation removed from all residential zoned land. Requests that if SNAs are returned to residentially zoned land, the provisions in the draft District Plan are reinstated and fine-tuned.	If the Proposed District Plan is amended to allow Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land: Seeks that changes are made to ECO (Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity) to give effect to the following provision: Add Draft District Plan ECO-R1: <u>c) where trimming or removal of vegetation is required to allow subdivision approved under SUB R-1 within an Significant Natural Area that minimises vegetation loss.</u>
Oliver Sangster	112.11	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Amend	Considers that it is important to strike a balance to ensure people can tend to growing bush in close proximity to existing buildings (e.g. houses) and structures (including underground pipes) to prevent damage due to tree roots growing around pipes and foundations, dead branches falling on roofs etc. Accordingly, the PDP should include provisions that this kind of maintenance be permitted to a reasonable level.	Seeks that ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area) be expanded to account for damage to underground property (e.g. pipes/foundations/driveways) from growing tree roots (whether "imminent" or otherwise).
Tyers Stream Group	221.43	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.25	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Amend	Considers that in its current drafting, the activity status for works within a SNA outside the CE, that are not provided for within R1.1 or R1.2, is not clear as rules R1.4, R1.5 and R1.6 all apply to vegetation within the CE. R1.3 only applies to certain activities. Horokiwi understands the intent of the rule ECO-R1.4 and 1.5 may be that if you do not meet R1.1 or R1.2 and you are not affecting any NZCPS policy 11(a) matters, you are permitted regardless of whether you are within or outside the CE. However, this is not clear and open to interpretation. As proposed, the cascade rule approach does not work for vegetation work outside the CE in that there is no clear activity status and ECO-R1 is open to interpretation issues.	Seeks amendment to the activity status within ECO-R1 from non-complying under clause 6. to discretionary if amendments sought to the areas identified as SNAs (as outlined in Appendix C of the submission) and amendment to the Coastal Environment Boundary (as identified in Appendix D of the submission) are not accepted.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.26	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Amend	Considers that in its current drafting, the activity status for works within a SNA outside the CE, that are not provided for within R1.1 or R1.2, is not clear as rules R1.4, R1.5 and R1.6 all apply to vegetation within the CE. R1.3 only applies to certain activities. Horokiwi understands the intent of the rule ECO-R1.4 and 1.5 may be that if you do not meet R1.1 or R1.2 and you are not affecting any NZCPS policy 11(a) matters, you are permitted regardless of whether you are within or outside the CE. However, this is not clear and open to interpretation. As proposed, the cascade rule approach does not work for vegetation work outside the CE in that there is no clear activity status and ECO-R1 is open to interpretation issues.	Seeks an amendment to ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area) to clarify the activity status for trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area that is not within the Coastal Environment and does not comply with ECO-R1.1 or ECO-R1.2.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.103	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Support in part	Supports the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life through providing for the clearance of vegetation as a permitted activity (all zones) in circumstances where FENZ is required to remove vegetation for the purposes of extinguishing or preventing the spread of fire or, where a notice has been served on a landholder to clear vegetation from a firebreak, in accordance with relevant sections of the FENZ Act.	Supports ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.104	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Amend	Supports the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life through providing for the clearance of vegetation as a permitted activity (all zones) in circumstances where FENZ is required to remove vegetation for the purposes of extinguishing or preventing the spread of fire or, where a notice has been served on a landholder to clear vegetation from a firebreak, in accordance with relevant sections of the FENZ Act.	Amend ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: vi. Enable the ongoing restoration work within the Zealandia sanctuary where undertaken by the Karori Sanctuary Trust; or vii. To enable the maintenance of public walking or cycling tracks and parks maintenance and repair undertaken by the Department of Conservation, a Regional or Territorial Authority, or their approved contractor, and in accordance with ECO-S2; or viii. It is necessary to avoid loss of life, injury or serious damage to property, including from the risk of fire.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.195	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Support in part	Supports that the rules under ECO-R1 apply to 'vegetation' within SNAs, not only indigenous vegetation. That is appropriate because exotic vegetation can provide significant habitat, and also can contribute to the ecosystem functioning of the SNA. Comment on each section of the rule are set out in the following submission points.	Not specified.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.137	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Not specified	Considers that the original submission does not specify the relief requested. Any amendments need to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity.	Allow / Seeks that the submission point be allowed to the extent that the amendments are necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity.
Steve West	FS110.8	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Oppose	The original submitter seeks to include non-indigenous vegetation (other than pest plants) into the proposed trimming standards for SNAs and where an arborist is required this be a Technician Arborist, rather than a Works Arborist or a suitably qualified arborist as defined currently. Steve West does not support these proposals for the following reasons: - The trimming standards for native trees in the SNA, already places a very heavy burden on landowners through the requirements for a resource consent and ecologist's report. Adding exotic vegetation and even more stringent requirements for the type of arborist used to those requirements will further magnify this burden. - New Zealand native trees are large (many grow over 15m tall) and are not well suited to private urban land, if left unchecked. The reality is that trimming of both native and exotic trees is an important part of maintaining bush in the urban environment. - Planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNA areas and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.196	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Support in part	Seeks that Council consider whether any activities should be permitted in residential areas, given our submission that residential SNAs must be reinserted. The April 2022 version of the plan (attached) included PAs for trimming or clearance for maintenance of buildings, within 5m of the building; and trimming or pruning only to maintain sunlight where a standard was complied with (then called ECO-54, which regulated how trimming was to occur, and no branches less than 50mm wide, and over 50mm wide needs to be done by a works arborist and WCC notified prior). In residential areas, we would accept a PA for maintenance or repair of services (telecoms, wastewater etc), however for installation we submit this is better as a controlled activity, and for existing residential units only. This allows the Council more control over where and how the services are installed, so that the vegetation clearance can be kept to the absolute minimum. Providing for it as a PA does not encourage this. For services to residential units that are not existing at the time of plan notification, a higher consenting standard should apply, at least RDA. There was also a PA for a private access track, provided it complied with a standard (no wider than 1m, no trees removed where they have a trunk diameter exceeding that in Schedule 10 at 1.4m above ground). We submit this would be better as a controlled activity, to give the Council greater opportunity to ensure that any higher value parts of the SNA are avoided.	Reinstate the Draft Plan's provisions for trimming, pruning, clearance, and maintenance of buildings in Residential Areas, given the submitter is seeking to reinstate residential Significant Natural Areas.
Steve West	FS110.11	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Oppose	The original submitter also seeks to amend the rules that were provided for allowing landowners to create some access tracks on private urban SNA land, to make these a controlled activity. Steve West does not support this, and considers that it is unreasonable to expect private landowners to obtain a resource consent (presumably with an ecologist's report) to create a track on their land. Considers that the tracks created have allowed for placement of predator traps and weed eradication, but without these tracks, neither would have occurred due to the difficult site access.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.197	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Support in part	Considers the rule should refer to "lawfully established" public roads.	Amend ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area): 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation is to: i. Ensure the operation of any <u>lawfully established</u> formed public road or rail corridor, private access leg, driveway or right of way where removal of vegetation is limited to within the formed width of the road, rail corridor or access; or...
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.198	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Oppose in part	Considers that new fences can involve the clearing of very large amounts of significant vegetation, and without some kind of limit, this activity is not appropriate as a PA. It should become a discretionary activity. The amount of allowed trimming/removal for maintenance should also be limited to what is strictly necessary, given that it could cover a very large area. We seek that the rule is clarified to ensure that the 2m limit is the total allowed, rather than 2m on either side of the fence. Paragraph (ii) should also include a limit, that the removal/trimming is only what is strictly necessary. Opposes the PA in (iv) applying to new access tracks; this activity should be discretionary. Queries whether this provision was intended to use the defined term 'access strip'?	Amend ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area): 2. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The trimming or removal of vegetation is to: i. Construct new perimeter fences for stock or pest animal exclusion from areas or maintenance of existing fences for stock or pest animal exclusion provided the trimming or removal of any vegetation does not exceed 2m in width (<u>1m maximum on either side of the fence</u>); or ii. Maintain an existing farm drain, septic tank disposal field, or constructed stormwater management or treatment device, <u>provided that the removal or trimming is limited to that which is necessary for the maintenance</u> ; or iii. To create a firebreak within 10m of an external wall or roof of a residential unit that existed at 18 July 2022; or iv. Maintain, upgrade or create a new <u>an</u> access track for agricultural, pastoral or horticultural activities in accordance with ECO-S3.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.199	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Oppose	Considers the activity has the potential to remove large amounts of significant vegetation or habitat, even where the ECO S4 is applied. It is not appropriate to be a controlled activity, as the Council will not be able to refuse consent, regardless of the effects. In the coastal environment, providing for this activity as a controlled activity fails to give effect to policy 11 NZCPS.	Amend ECO-R1.3 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area) to a higher activity status to align with policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.200	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Support in part	Notes the rule appears to refer to ECO-P2 in error. Considers this rule should not be limited to excluding situations where policy 11(a) NZCPS is engaged because both paragraphs (a) and (b) of policy 11 require a different management approach than is set out in the effects management hierarchy of ECO-P1. Under ECO-P1, adverse effects only need to be avoided where practicable. That is contrary to the policy 11(a) requirement to avoid certain effects, and also to the policy 11(b) requirement to avoid significant adverse effects. Support matter of discretion reference to ECO-P1 (assuming that was intended)	Amend ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area): 5. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of ECO-R1.1 cannot be achieved; and b. The significant natural area does not contain any matters identified in Policy 11(4) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the coastal environment. Matters of discretion are: The matters in ECO-P21, ECO-P3 and ECO-P4; and The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard not met as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.201	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Support in part	Notes the rule appears to refer to ECO-P2 in error. Considers this rule should not be limited to excluding situations where policy 11(a) NZCPS is engaged because both paragraphs (a) and (b) of policy 11 require a different management approach than is set out in the effects management hierarchy of ECO-P1. Under ECO-P1, adverse effects only need to be avoided where practicable. That is contrary to the policy 11(a) requirement to avoid certain effects, and also to the policy 11(b) requirement to avoid significant adverse effects. Support matter of discretion reference to ECO-P1 (assuming that was intended)	Amend ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area): 5. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of ECO-R1.1 cannot be achieved; and b. The significant natural area does not contain any matters identified in Policy 11(4) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the coastal environment. Matters of discretion are: The matters in ECO-P21, ECO-P3 and ECO-P4; and The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard not met as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.202	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Amend	Supports non-complying status attaching to this activity. Opposes the application of this rule being limited to policy 11(a) NZCPS situations. Considers non-complying status should also apply where policy 11(b) is engaged. Also opposes the application of the effects management hierarchy in ECO-P1 applying to biodiversity that is required to be protected in accordance with policy 11(a) or (b) NZCPS as the policy requires that adverse effects (a)/significant adverse effects (b) are avoided, whereas ECO-P1 only requires avoidance of adverse effects where practicable. Considers the provisions need to be clear that the policy applying to the coastal environment (currently ECO P5) applies as a first step for these activities.	Amend ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area): 6. Activity status: Non Complying Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of ECO-R1.1 or ECO-R1.2 or ECO-R1.4 cannot be achieved; and b. The significant natural area includes matters identified in Policy 11(4) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 where located within the Coastal Environment. Section 88 information requirements for applications: Applications for activities within an identified significant natural area must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, an ecological assessment in accordance with APP15: 1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and 2. Demonstrating that <u>ECOP5 has first been met</u> , and the effects management hierarchy at ECO-P2 has been applied <u>to other adverse effects</u> .
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.126	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Amend	The submitter considers these rules largely strike a good balance between protection and use, however, in the interests of the primacy of indigenous biodiversity, we propose changing the activity status of R1.4 and R1.5.	Amend ECO-R1.4. (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area) from Restricted Discretionary to Non-Complying.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.218	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Oppose	The RVA opposes this submission point on the basis that it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages and is too stringent a control.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.218	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Oppose	Ryman opposes this submission point on the basis that it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages and is too stringent a control.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.127	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Amend	The submitter considers these rules largely strike a good balance between protection and use, however, in the interests of the primacy of indigenous biodiversity, we propose changing the activity status of R1.4 and R1.5.	Amend ECO-R1.5. (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area) from Restricted Discretionary to Non-Complying.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.219	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Oppose	The RVA opposes this submission point on the basis that it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages and is too stringent a control.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.219	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Oppose	Ryman opposes this submission point on the basis that it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages and is too stringent a control.	Disallow
Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	486.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R1	Support	Supports ECO-R1.a.vi. as notified. Considers that this allows for adequate biosecurity and proactive work to protect the integrity of the predator-proof fence and to mitigate the biosecurity risk. It also enables occasional trimming specific areas to allow interpretation, enable viewsheds, or to maintain wetland areas.	Retain ECO-R1.a.vi. (Trimming or Removal of Indigenous Vegetation within a Significant Natural Area) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.44	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-R2 (Removal of non-indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.203	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R2	Support in part	Supports this Permitted activity being limited to pest plants. Non-indigenous vegetation can provide habitat for indigenous fauna, and can otherwise form part of the ecosystem making up the SNA, and should not be able to be removed as of right. Considers this PA would be better incorporated into ECO-R1.1, given the issue below. Vegetation removal that did not comply with it would then become RDA (under ECO R1.4), or non-complying (under ECO R1.6).	Amend ECO-R2.1 (Removal of non-indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area) to be incorporated within ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.9	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R2	Oppose	<p>The original submitter seeks to include non-indigenous vegetation (other than pest plants) into the proposed trimming standards for SNAs and where an arborist is required this be a Technician Arborist, rather than a Works Arborist or a suitably qualified arborist as defined currently.</p> <p>Steve West does not support these proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The trimming standards for native trees in the SNA, already places a very heavy burden on landowners through the requirements for a resource consent and ecologist's report. Adding exotic vegetation and even more stringent requirements for the type of arborist used to those requirements will further magnify this burden. - New Zealand native trees are large (many grow over 15m tall) and are not well suited to private urban land, if left unchecked. The reality is that trimming of both native and exotic trees is an important part of maintaining bush in the urban environment. - Planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNA areas and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules. 	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.204	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R2	Support in part	Notes the rule appears to refer to ECO-P2 in error. Considers it is also not clear whether the reference to ECO-P4 is therefore also in error – it appears that the appropriate references in the matters of discretion should be ECO-P1 and ECO-P3. If that is the case, we support those references.	<p>Amend ECO-R2.2 (Removal of non-indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area):</p> <p>2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with ECO-R2.1</p> <p>Matters of discretion are: The matters in ECO-P2 and ECO-P43.</p> <p>Section 88 information requirements for applications: Applications for activities within an identified significant natural area must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, an ecological assessment in accordance with APP15</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and 2. Demonstrating that effects management hierarchy at ECO-P2 has been applied.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.205	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R2	Support in part	Considers is not clear when this rule would apply. The rules in ECO-R1 already appropriately apply to the removal of all vegetation, including exotic vegetation. This rule states that it applies when compliance with ECO-R2.1 is not achieved. That suggests that the exotic vegetation at issue is not a pest plant. But if that is the case, it is already regulated by ECO R1. As noted above, we suggest that the PA ECO R2.1 is incorporated into ECO R1.1. it would then default to RDA under ECO R1.4 where the vegetation was not a pest plant. This would have he added benefit of engaging the required protections for the coastal environment, which are absent from this rule. ECO R2.2 could then be deleted. If this rule is retained, we seek that it replicates the approach of ECO R1.4, in that it does not apply where policy 11 NZCPS is relevant. We also seek an accompanying non-complying rule, to replicate ECO R1.6. That rule should refer to the coastal environment policy, ECO-P5, in the information requirements	<p>Amend ECO-R2.2 (Removal of non-indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area) to be incorporated within ECO-R1 (Trimming, pruning or removal of vegetation within a significant natural area).</p> <p>Add new parallel non-complying rule to ECO-R1.6.</p>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.128	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R2	Amend	Considers that non-indigenous and old-growth vegetation (such as Pinus radiata) can be important habitat for indigenous species (such as Nestor meridionalis). It is important that removal of these large individuals is considered in that context.	<p>Amend ECO-R2.2 (Removal of non-indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area) as follows:</p> <p>Matters of discretion are: The matters in ECO-P1, ECO-P2 and ECO-P4.</p>
Steve West	2.10	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R3	Not specified	Considers that requirements such as needing "eco-sourced local indigenous" plants, will further discourage native planting.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Nga Kaimanaaki o te Waimapihi	215.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R3	Amend	Considers that we need to preserve and restore indigenous native fauna. As well as preying on our native birds, cats also eat a large number of our native lizards and wētā (which are still in decline).	Seeks amendment to ECO-R3 (Restoration and maintenance of a significant natural area) to add provisions that restrict pets from roaming in Significant Natural Areas.
Tyers Stream Group	221.45	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-R3 (Restoration and maintenance of a significant natural area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.206	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R3	Support in part	Notes this provision (and others) refers to 'identified values'. It is not clear what these are. The descriptions in SCHED 8 are often brief and high level. We seek that a greater level of detail for each SNA is provided in the schedules.	Clarify ECO-R3 (Restoration and maintenance of a significant natural area) to provide further detail on "identified values".
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.207	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R3	Support in part	Considers the matters of discretion also need to refer to the policy giving effect to policy 11 NZCPS, currently ECO-P5.	Amend ECO-R3 (Restoration and maintenance of a significant natural area): 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of ECO-R3.1 cannot be achieved Matters of discretion are: The matters in ECO-P2 and ECO-P4 Section 88 information requirements for applications: Applications for activities within an identified significant natural area must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, an ecological assessment in accordance with APP15: 1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and 2. Demonstrating that effects management hierarchy at ECO-P2 has been applied; <u>and</u> 3. <u>Demonstrating the effects of the proposal give effect to ECO-P5 in relation the requirements of Policy 11 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.129	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R3	Support	Considers it is important to allow and encourage the restoration and maintenance of SNAs, and this provides a fair rule framework to do so.	Retain ECO-R3 (Restoration and maintenance of a significant natural area) as notified.
Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	486.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R3	Amend	Considers that ECO-R3 should be amended with an additional clause that enables Zealandia operations to continue, as per other areas in the plan. Considers that ECO-R3 may limit activities such as reintroductions of fauna species, and other related activities, as Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne is not subject to the Reserves Act, Conservation Act nor the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act.	Amend ECO-R3 (Restoration and Maintenance of a Significant Natural Area) by adding a clause that enables the ongoing restoration work within the Zealandia sanctuary where undertaken by the Karori Sanctuary Trust.
Tyers Stream Group	221.46	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-R4 (New plantation forestry within a significant natural area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.208	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R4	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain ECO-R4 (New plantation forestry within a significant natural area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.130	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-R4	Support	Considers that protection and restoration must come first in SNAs, but recognises there will be essential needs for the removal of vegetation. The submitter considers these standards are clear and comprehensive and strike a good balance between the two interests.	Retain ECO-R4 (Significant Natural Areas are maintained or restored by mana whenua in accordance with kaitiakitanga) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.47	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-S1 (Trimming, pruning or removal where there is the imminent threat to the safety of people or property) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.209	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S1	Support in part	Supports this standard, with the following amendment - Notes that both 'Technician Arborist' and 'Works Arborist' are defined in the Interpretation section of this Plan. Paragraph 3 of this standard should use the defined term 'Technician Arborist', as the definition requires the skills appropriate for risk assessment relevant to this activity. It is also clearer to refer to a defined term	Amend ECO-S1 (Trimming, pruning or removal where there is the imminent threat to the safety of people or property): ... 3. Any removal is undertaken or supervised by a suitably qualified arboricultural expert <u>Technician Arborist</u> .
Steve West	FS110.10	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S1	Oppose	The original submitter seeks to include non-indigenous vegetation (other than pest plants) into the proposed trimming standards for SNAs and where an arborist is required this be a Technician Arborist, rather than a Works Arborist or a suitably qualified arborist as defined currently. Steve West does not support these proposals for the following reasons: - The trimming standards for native trees in the SNA, already places a very heavy burden on landowners through the requirements for a resource consent and ecologist's report. Adding exotic vegetation and even more stringent requirements for the type of arborist used to those requirements will further magnify this burden. - New Zealand native trees are large (many grow over 15m tall) and are not well suited to private urban land, if left unchecked. The reality is that trimming of both native and exotic trees is an important part of maintaining bush in the urban environment. - Planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNA areas and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.154	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S1	Amend	Vegetation trimming standards and rules should be amended so that they also apply to both indigenous and non-indigenous vegetation. This would make it clear that all vegetation (aside from pest plants) is to be protected in these areas, except where otherwise specified for restoration or other purposes. Any non-indigenous plants within SNAs that are not pest plants may provide significant habitat for indigenous biodiversity such as birds, bats and lizards. This understanding is recognised in section 6(c) of the Act which directs the protection of the "significant habitats of indigenous fauna" not the significant indigenous habitats of indigenous fauna.	Seeks to amend standard (where relevant) to change 'indigenous vegetation' to 'vegetation'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.14	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S1	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to include non-indigenous vegetation into the proposed trimming standards for SNAs, in addition to indigenous vegetation. The submitter has also recommended additional controls be applied in areas adjacent to SNAs, such as buffer zones and ecological corridors.</p> <p>Do not support these proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The trimming standards, while intended to protect native trees, places a very heavy burden on landowners through the requirements for a resource consent and ecologist's report. Adding exotic vegetation to those requirements would add to this burden. - New Zealand native trees are large (many grow over 15m tall) and are not well suited to private urban land, if left unchecked. The reality is that trimming is an important part of maintaining bush in the urban environment. - The likelihood of urban native bush being cleared by landowners prior to the district plan coming into effect will be magnified by including exotics. Whether urban bush remains or is removed will likely come down to whether the landowner loves their bush more than they hate SNAs, or if they hate SNAs more than they love their bush. - Planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNA areas and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules. - Rather than becoming a world-renowned "nature city", Wellington could well become known as "the exotic city", where indigenous biodiversity gains were squandered through implementation of the poorly developed SNA policy. <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.131	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S1	Support	Considers that protection and restoration must come first in SNAs, but recognises there will be essential needs for the removal of vegetation. The submitter considers these standards are clear and comprehensive and strike a good balance between the two interests.	Retain ECO-S1 (Trimming, pruning or removal where there is the imminent threat to the safety of people or property) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.48	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-S2 (Vegetation removal associated with maintenance or repair of public walking and cycling tracks including parks maintenance and repair) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.210	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S2	Support in part	Considers the standard could be more clear as to how much clearance is allowed.	<p>Amend ECO-S2 (Vegetation removal associated with maintenance or repair of public walking and cycling tracks including parks maintenance and repair):</p> <p>Vegetation removal <u>or trimming</u> must:</p> <p>1. Not be greater than 2.5m in width <u>in total</u>, to accommodate the track</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.155	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S2	Amend	<p>Vegetation trimming standards and rules should be amended so that they also apply to both indigenous and non-indigenous vegetation. This would make it clear that all vegetation (aside from pest plants) is to be protected in these areas, except where otherwise specified for restoration or other purposes.</p> <p>Any non-indigenous plants within SNAs that are not pest plants may provide significant habitat for indigenous biodiversity such as birds, bats and lizards. This understanding is recognised in section 6(c) of the Act which directs the protection of the "significant habitats of indigenous fauna" not the significant indigenous habitats of indigenous fauna.</p>	Seeks to amend standard (where relevant) to change 'indigenous vegetation' to 'vegetation'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.15	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S2	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to include non-indigenous vegetation into the proposed trimming standards for SNAs, in addition to indigenous vegetation. The submitter has also recommended additional controls be applied in areas adjacent to SNAs, such as buffer zones and ecological corridors.</p> <p>Do not support these proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The trimming standards, while intended to protect native trees, places a very heavy burden on landowners through the requirements for a resource consent and ecologist's report. Adding exotic vegetation to those requirements would add to this burden. - New Zealand native trees are large (many grow over 15m tall) and are not well suited to private urban land, if left unchecked. The reality is that trimming is an important part of maintaining bush in the urban environment. - The likelihood of urban native bush being cleared by landowners prior to the district plan coming into effect will be magnified by including exotics. Whether urban bush remains or is removed will likely come down to whether the landowner loves their bush more than they hate SNAs, or if they hate SNAs more than they love their bush. - Planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNA areas and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules. - Rather than becoming a world-renowned "nature city", Wellington could well become known as "the exotic city", where indigenous biodiversity gains were squandered through implementation of the poorly developed SNA policy. <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.132	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S2	Support	Considers that protection and restoration must come first in SNAs, but recognises there will be essential needs for the removal of vegetation. The submitter considers these standards are clear and comprehensive and strike a good balance between the two interests.	Retain ECO-S2 (Vegetation removal associated with maintenance or repair of public walking and cycling tracks including parks maintenance and repair) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.49	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-S3 (Vegetation removal associated with farm access tracks) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.211	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S3	Support in part	Supports the standard, though notes opposition to new tracks being a Permitted activity noted in previous submission points on ECO rules.	Retain ECO-S3 (Vegetation removal associated with farm access tracks) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.156	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S3	Amend	<p>Vegetation trimming standards and rules should be amended so that they also apply to both indigenous and non-indigenous vegetation. This would make it clear that all vegetation (aside from pest plants) is to be protected in these areas, except where otherwise specified for restoration or other purposes.</p> <p>Any non-indigenous plants within SNAs that are not pest plants may provide significant habitat for indigenous biodiversity such as birds, bats and lizards. This understanding is recognised in section 6(c) of the Act which directs the protection of the "significant habitats of indigenous fauna" not the significant indigenous habitats of indigenous fauna.</p>	Seeks to amend standard (where relevant) to change 'indigenous vegetation' to 'vegetation'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.16	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S3	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to include non-indigenous vegetation into the proposed trimming standards for SNAs, in addition to indigenous vegetation. The submitter has also recommended additional controls be applied in areas adjacent to SNAs, such as buffer zones and ecological corridors.</p> <p>Do not support these proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The trimming standards, while intended to protect native trees, places a very heavy burden on landowners through the requirements for a resource consent and ecologist's report. Adding exotic vegetation to those requirements would add to this burden. - New Zealand native trees are large (many grow over 15m tall) and are not well suited to private urban land, if left unchecked. The reality is that trimming is an important part of maintaining bush in the urban environment. - The likelihood of urban native bush being cleared by landowners prior to the district plan coming into effect will be magnified by including exotics. Whether urban bush remains or is removed will likely come down to whether the landowner loves their bush more than they hate SNAs, or if they hate SNAs more than they love their bush. - Planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNA areas and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules. - Rather than becoming a world-renowned "nature city", Wellington could well become known as "the exotic city", where indigenous biodiversity gains were squandered through implementation of the poorly developed SNA policy. <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.133	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S3	Support	Considers that protection and restoration must come first in SNAs, but recognises there will be essential needs for the removal of vegetation. The submitter considers these standards are clear and comprehensive and strike a good balance between the two interests.	Retain ECO-S3 (Vegetation removal associated with farm access tracks) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.50	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain ECO-S4 (Vegetation removal associated with upgrading of existing and creation of new public walking and cycling tracks and associated buildings and structures) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.212	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S4	Support in part	Supports the standard with minor amendment, though notes opposition to new tracks being a Permitted activity noted in previous submission points on ECO rules.	Amend ECO-S4 (Vegetation removal associated with upgrading of existing and creation of new public walking and cycling tracks and associated buildings and structures): Vegetation removal <u>or trimming</u> must: 1. Not be greater than 2.5m in width <u>in total</u> , to accommodate the track
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.157	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S4	Amend	<p>Vegetation trimming standards and rules should be amended so that they also apply to both indigenous and non-indigenous vegetation. This would make it clear that all vegetation (aside from pest plants) is to be protected in these areas, except where otherwise specified for restoration or other purposes.</p> <p>Any non-indigenous plants within SNAs that are not pest plants may provide significant habitat for indigenous biodiversity such as birds, bats and lizards. This understanding is recognised in section 6(c) of the Act which directs the protection of the "significant habitats of indigenous fauna" not the significant indigenous habitats of indigenous fauna.</p>	Seeks to amend standard (where relevant) to change 'indigenous vegetation' to 'vegetation'.

Natural Environment Values - Natural Character

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.17	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S4	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to include non-indigenous vegetation into the proposed trimming standards for SNAs, in addition to indigenous vegetation. The submitter has also recommended additional controls be applied in areas adjacent to SNAs, such as buffer zones and ecological corridors.</p> <p>Do not support these proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The trimming standards, while intended to protect native trees, places a very heavy burden on landowners through the requirements for a resource consent and ecologist's report. Adding exotic vegetation to those requirements would add to this burden. - New Zealand native trees are large (many grow over 15m tall) and are not well suited to private urban land, if left unchecked. The reality is that trimming is an important part of maintaining bush in the urban environment. - The likelihood of urban native bush being cleared by landowners prior to the district plan coming into effect will be magnified by including exotics. Whether urban bush remains or is removed will likely come down to whether the landowner loves their bush more than they hate SNAs, or if they hate SNAs more than they love their bush. - Planting of new trees (both indigenous and exotic) in the urban environment will likely diminish over time, both within the SNA areas and elsewhere as other landowners in Wellington become aware of the extent and onerous nature of the rules. - Rather than becoming a world-renowned "nature city", Wellington could well become known as "the exotic city", where indigenous biodiversity gains were squandered through implementation of the poorly developed SNA policy. <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.134	Natural and Environmental Values / Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity / ECO-S4	Amend	<p>Considers that it is vital that any new tracks and associated buildings and structures are well considered from an ecological perspective, to avoid high-value biodiversity being inadvertently damaged.</p>	<p>Amend ECO-S4 (Vegetation removal associated with upgrading of existing and creation of new public walking and cycling tracks and associated buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Split ECO-S4 into two new standards, reading:</p> <p><u>ECO-S4: vegetation removal associated with upgrading of existing public walking and cycling tracks and associated buildings and structures</u></p> <p><u>Vegetation removal must:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Not be greater than 2.5m in width to accommodate the track and associated track structures; and</u> <u>2. Not be greater than 5m2 in area to accommodate any ancillary buildings or structures.</u> <p><u>ECO-S5: Vegetation removal must:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Not be greater than 2.5m in width to accommodate the track and associated track structures;</u> <u>2. Not be greater than 5m2 in area to accommodate any ancillary buildings or structures; and</u> <u>3. Demonstrate that it is appropriate by taking into account the findings of an ecological assessment for the activity in accordance with APP15.</u>
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.16	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Amend	<p>Considers that protection of the biodiversity and ecology is important.</p> <p>These SNA's risk encroachment upon and destruction if not specifically protected given the planned development of the site, shows an urban road being built across an area marked SNA.</p>	<p>Seeks absolute protection of the Significant Natural Areas present at 395 Middleton Road.</p>
Tawa Community Board	294.12	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP relies on GWRC requirements which WCC officers have been unclear on, which appear to have been reduced since the above report was written, and which do not adequately take into account the impact of historical development on current and probable future stream bank erosion.</p>	<p>Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provides adequate setback distances from stream edge for new structures.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.213	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Oppose	Considers the Introduction is uncertain and mainly says what this chapter doesn't manage. Considers the scope of this chapter is very unclear, particularly in regard to the coastal environment. It says areas of natural character within the coastal environment are identified and managed in the Coastal Environment Chapter but needs to be explicit about whether the coastal environment is therefore excluded from this chapter. Amend to say this chapter applies outside the coastal environment and recognise that activities landward of the coastal environment may have downstream effects which are recognised in the activity focussed chapters having regard to the policy direction in this chapter and the Coastal Environment Chapter. Furthermore, the introduction mentions NES-F and NRP regulations manage vegetation removal, earthworks, natural hazards works, infrastructure and public access structures within 10 metres of natural wetlands as well as earthworks within 5 metres of surface water bodies but doesn't mention where in the Plan these are managed. As this chapter applies outside the coastal environment, we suggest NES-F and NRP regulations should be given effect to through the NATC policies to ensure integration of the policy direction across the Plan. Seek amendment accordingly.	Amend NATC - Introduction: Clarify scope of chapter and amend give effect to NES-F and NRP though the NATC policies.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.138	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Not specified	Considers that the original submission does not specify the relief requested. Any amendments need to give effect to the relevant higher order policy instruments.	Disallow / In the absence of specific wording, disallow the submission point.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.76	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Support in part	Supports the general direction of chapter, with amendments.	Retain Natural Character chapter with amendments.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.77	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Oppose	Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford. Submitter supports the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui. Concerns there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their ancestral lands.	Seeks that any other relief to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their properties in Te Motu Kairangi.
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.10	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Oppose	Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opp oses the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford." It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites a nd Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and L andscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.27	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.46	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lance Lones	FS81.12	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / General NATC	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.158	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / New NATC	Amend	Considers that WCC needs to identify natural character ratings, at both site and area scales, in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment, as required by section 6(a) of the RMA. This work has not yet been undertaken and is necessary to managing adverse effects on natural character in riparian margins.	Include a new process policy as follows: <u>Identification of natural character ratings in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.159	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / New NATC	Amend	Considers it appropriate to insert a policy in the PDP to direct this work to commence. This policy should also direct Council officers to work with resource consent applicants to determine whether a natural character assessment is required in the meantime. This will indicate to Plan users that this mapping work has not yet been undertaken, and ensure that the natural character in riparian margins is appropriately preserved and protected in the interim.	Include a new process policy as follows: <u>Until natural character ratings in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment are mapped in this Plan, an assessment may be required as to whether an activity is within an area of high or outstanding natural character. Wellington City Council officers will assist resource consent applicants in determining whether an assessment is required. The need for such an assessment will depend on the level or scale of potential effects and the sensitivity of the receiving environment. Any assessment shall be commensurate with the scale and significance of the effects that the use or development may have on the environment.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.160	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / New NATC	Amend	Considers it appropriate to identify natural character ratings of riparian margins is consistent with the approach taken by Greater Wellington in Method M24(a) of the Natural Resources Plan, to identify natural character ratings in the beds of lakes and rivers, and wetlands landward of the coastal environment.	Include a new process policy as follows: <u>Identify in the Plan natural character ratings in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment.</u>
Tyers Stream Group	221.51	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-01	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NATC-01 (Natural character) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.214	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-01	Support in part	Considers natural character within riparian margins should also be focussed on maintaining or enhancing the ecological functions of riparian margins to give effect to policy 43 of the RPS but also to contribute to flood management and improve water quality to give effect to the NPS-FM and provide for Te Mana o Te Wai. Considers riparian margins should be protected from stock via fencing to protect their natural character in the rural zone and to allow for protection and enhancement.	Amend NATC-01 (Natural character): The natural characteristics and qualities that contribute to the natural character within riparian margins are preserved and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, and <u>the ecological functions of riparian margins</u> maintained or enhanced where appropriate
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.161	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-01	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of an objective to manage the potential effects of activities on natural character in riparian margins.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.162	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-O1	Amend	<p>Considers it is unclear as to whether the scope of the objective relates to riparian margins both inside and outside of the coastal environment. Greater Wellington requests that amendments are made as necessary to provide clarity to plan users on which objectives apply to riparian margins in the coastal environment (CE-O1 or NATCO1). These objectives set out the outcomes sought which the remaining provides then contribute to achieving, so it should be clear where they apply.</p> <p>Also notes that the outcomes of NATC-O1 cannot be achieved by plan provisions, given natural character values in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment have not been identified by WCC (or mapped or scheduled in the PDP), nor is there any indication that natural character assessments will be required as part of resource consent and restoration processes, to give effect to the outcomes in which NATC-O1 seeks to achieve. Please refer to reasons and decision sought on a new process policy for riparian margin natural character mapping to commence.</p>	Seeks to Amend NATC-O1 (Natural character) as is necessary to clarify which objective applies to riparian margins in the coastal environment, or any other amendments to the same effect.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.163	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-O1	Amend	Considers that consistent terminology should be used across the PDP when referring to restoring and rehabilitating natural character, both within and landward of the coastal environment	Amend NATC-O1 (Natural character) to reflect the terminology recommended elsewhere in this submission, as follows: The natural characteristics and qualities that contribute to the natural character within riparian margins are preserved and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, and <u>restored or rehabilitated</u> maintained or enhanced where appropriate.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.135	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-O1	Support	Considers Wellington's natural waterways are a valuable, and seriously compromised part of the city, and need considerable work to be restored both in terms of quality and amenity. The focus on maintaining and enhancing is particularly important in this objective.	Retain NATC-O1 (Natural Character) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.52	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-O2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NATC-O2 (Customary Harvesting) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.215	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-O2	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain NATC-O2 (Customary Harvesting) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.136	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-O2	Support	Considers this objective helps redress the imbalance that has existed, compromising the ability of tangata whenua to exercise customary harvesting.	Retain NATC-O2 (Customary Harvesting) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.78	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-O2	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Not specified [please refer to original submission].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tyers Stream Group	221.53	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P1	Amend	Considers that these matters should be provided for, rather than their non-provision be avoided. In other words, matters such as good riparian management and public access to and along water bodies should be an active duty in development, not something to avoid adverse effects to. This is not achieving, for example section 6(d) of the RMA or the Council's own objective PA – 01.	Amend NATC-P1 (Appropriate use and development) as follows: Provide for <u>Protect natural character, avoid natural hazards and provide for biodiversity and public access to and along water bodies by only allowing</u> use and development within riparian margins <u>which are</u> : 1. It protects the natural character and integrates with the landform <u>AND</u> ; 2. It provides for planned natural hazard mitigation works where undertaken by Wellington City Council, Greater Wellington Regional Council or their nominated agents <u>AND</u> ; 3. It has a functional or operational need to be located within the riparian margin; and 4. It does not limit or prevent <u>Improves practical</u> public access to, along or adjacent to waterbodies.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.216	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P1	Oppose in part	Considers activities within riparian margins should be provisional on meeting these policy requirements, to ensure their natural character values and ecological functions are maintained	Amend NATC-P1 (Appropriate use and development): <u>Only provide</u> for use and development within riparian margins where: 1. It protects the natural character and integrates with the landform; 2. It provides for planned natural hazard mitigation works where undertaken by Wellington City Council, Greater Wellington Regional Council or their nominated agents; 3. It has a functional or operational need to be located within the riparian margin; and 4. It does not limit or prevent public access to, along or adjacent to waterbodies; <u>and</u> 5. It maintains or enhances the ecological functions of the riparian margin.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.137	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P1	Support	Considers Wellington's natural waterways are a valuable, and seriously compromised part of the city, and need considerable work to be restored both in terms of quality and amenity. The focus on maintaining and enhancing is particularly important in this objective.	Retain NATC-P1 (appropriate use and development) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.54	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NATC-P2 (Restoration and enhancement) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.217	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P2	Support in part	Supports the intent of this policy and suggest amending 1. to be consistent with the definition in the plan, subject to our submission point on the definition,	Amend NATC-P2 (Restoration and enhancement): Provide for restoration and enhancement of natural character within riparian margins where appropriate including: 1. The replanting of riparian margins with indigenous <u>vegetation species</u> ; 2. The removal of pest plant and animal species; and 3. The removal of redundant buildings or structures in riparian margins.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.138	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P2	Support	Considers Wellington's natural waterways are a valuable, and seriously compromised part of the city, and need considerable work to be restored both in terms of quality and amenity. The focus on maintaining and enhancing is particularly important in this objective.	Retain NATC-P2 (Restoration and enhancement) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.55	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NATC-P3 (Customary harvesting) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.218	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P3	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain NATC-P3 (Customary Harvesting) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.139	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P3	Support	NATC-P3 is supported as it helps redress the imbalance that has existed, compromising the ability of tangata whenua to exercise customary harvesting.	Retain NATC-P3 (Customary harvesting) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.79	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-P3	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Not specified [please refer to original submission].
Tyers Stream Group	221.56	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R1	Amend	Considers that this rule needs to be amended to meet the submitted requirements of NATC-P1.	Seeks Amendment to NATC-R1 (Activities within riparian margins) to meet the submitted requirements of NATC-P1.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.219	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R1	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain NATC-R1 (Activities within riparian margins) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.140	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R1	Support	NATC-R1 is supported as it gives effect to the objectives and policies and is therefore supported.	Retain NATC-R1 (Activities within riparian margins) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.57	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NATC-R2 (Restoration and enhancement activities within riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.220	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R2	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain NATC-R2 (Restoration and enhancement activities within riparian margins) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.164	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R2	Oppose in part	Considers it is likely that not all restoration activities will restore natural character ratings.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.165	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R2	Amend	Considers that the construction of a structure (provided it is blocked off from human interference) in the coastal environment may provide roosting area for birds and thus improve the biotic values, but it may also have an impact on the abiotic and experiential values, thus may not restore the overall natural character rating of the wider character area.	Seeks to include permitted activity conditions to clarify which restoration activities are permitted.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.141	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R2	Support	NATC-R2 is supported as it encourages efforts to restore and enhance waterways, and is strongly supported.	Retain NATC-R2 (Restoration and enhancement activities within riparian margins) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.58	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NATC-R3 (Customary harvesting within riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.221	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R3	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain NATC-R3 (Customary harvesting within riparian margins) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.142	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R3	Support	NATC-R3 is supported as it helps redress the imbalance that has existed, compromising the ability of tangata whenua to exercise customary harvesting.	Retain NATC-R3 (Customary harvesting within riparian margins) as notified.

Natural Environment Values - Natural Features and Landscapes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tyers Stream Group	221.59	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NATC-R4 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings or structures for natural hazard mitigation purposes where carried out within riparian margins by a Regional or Territorial Authority, or an agent on their behalf) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.222	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R4	Support in part	Seeks a qualifier as per NATC-R1 to ensure effects are appropriately addressed.	Amend NATC-R4 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings or structures for natural hazard mitigation purposes where carried out within riparian margins by a Regional or Territorial Authority, or an agent on their behalf): 1. Activity status: Permitted <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance is achieved with the rules and standards for activities in the underlying zone</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.143	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R4	Support	NATC-R4 is supported as it is necessary for practical purposes in helping safeguard life and property.	Retain NATC-R4 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings or structures for natural hazard mitigation purposes...) as notified.
Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	486.3	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R4	Amend	Considers that NATC-R4 should be amended with an additional clause that enables Zealandia operations to continue as per other areas in the plan. Considers that NATC-R4 may prevent maintenance and management work of bridges and associated infrastructure within Zealandia.	Amend NATC-R4 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings or structures for natural hazard mitigation purposes where carried out within riparian margins by a Regional or Territorial Authority, or an agent on their behalf) to list the Karori Sanctuary Trust as an approved operator.
Tyers Stream Group	221.60	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NATC-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures within riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.223	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R5	Oppose	Considers construction of new buildings should be non-complying within riparian margins.	Amend NATC-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures within riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Non-complying</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.224	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R5	Oppose	If relief for a non-complying activity status is not accepted, considers the matters of discretion should be widened to include policies from ECO chapter.	Amend NATC-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures within riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in NATC-P1, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3 <u>[add appropriate ECO policy references]</u> ; and 2. Any measures proposed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects. This rule does not apply to agricultural fences used to separate livestock from rivers and streams.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.144	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Character / NATC-R5	Support	NATC-R5 is supported as it gives effect to the objectives and policies and is supported.	Retain NATC-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures within riparian margins) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.42	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	Supports greatly increasing the protection given to Outstanding Natural Features. These are important features that frequently house ecological biodiversity, act as carbon sinks, and add to the vibrant character of Wellington City.	Seeks that the activities that can occur within natural landscapes are limited by requiring extra resource consents for additional buildings or earthworks.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.139	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Considers that the reason for requiring 'extra resource consents for additional buildings or earthworks' within 'natural landscapes' is not provided.	Disallow
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.43	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	Supports greatly increasing the protection given to Special Amenity Landscapes. These are important features that frequently house ecological biodiversity, act as carbon sinks, and add to the vibrant character of Wellington City.	Seeks that the activities that can occur within natural landscapes are limited by requiring extra resource consents for additional buildings or earthworks.
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.10	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	Supports this specific aspect of VUWSA's submission. The submitter's contention is that logically 22 Alexandra Road forms a highly visual part of the Mount Victoria ridgeline directly above the Central City and suburbs of Mount Victoria, Oriental Bay and Roseneath. The Town Belt is a Special Amenity Landscape. Logically and visually Lookout Road including 22 Alexandra Road is without question one of the significant landscapes of our city, and is covered by the broad sweep of VUWSA's request. Supporting VUWSA's request for greatly increasing protection to our most significant landscapes the Mount Victoria Ridgeline should retain the same protections from development as it has had for decades. Number 22 Alexandra Road should retain the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it has in the Operative District Plan. [Inferred reference to submission point 123.43]	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.140	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Considers that the reason for requiring 'extra resource consents for additional buildings or earthworks' within 'natural landscapes' is not provided.	Disallow
John Tiley	142.6	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Not specified	Considers that a lay person could reasonably expect that ONFL and SAL areas are exempt from any activities except for the minimum required to maintain and protect the area.	Not specified.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.75	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	The submissions identify the need for greater clarity and better protection in the Plan for the city's identified ridgelines and hilltops. Wellington Civic Trust supports these points	Allow
John Tiley	142.7	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	Notes that the 18 ridgelines and hilltops set out in the introduction to the chapter are listed without comment or explanation of selection criteria.	Seeks that comments or explanation of selection criteria are included for the 18 ridgelines and hilltops. [Inferred decision requested].
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.76	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	The submissions identify the need for greater clarity and better protection in the Plan for the city's identified ridgelines and hilltops. Wellington Civic Trust supports these points	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.28	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.7].	Allow
John Tiley	142.8	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	Considers that given its importance in other council policies and plans, Marshalls Ridge should be included as an identified ridgeline. Notes that Marshalls Ridge is mentioned several times in the NRMP with various references to its importance as an open space. Council documents show Marshalls Ridge valued as a critical reserve, contributing to landscape coherence and amenity. The NRMP 2008 provides (8.3.2.1) a clear policy statement for protecting the open space character of Marshalls Ridge and the steeper ridges and spurs falling to Stebbings Valley and Middleton Road. The PDP dismisses Marshalls Ridge as of no account, not listing it with other city ridgelines, and designating it as a Future Urban Zone. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments].	Amend the list of identified ridgelines and hilltops to include Marshalls Ridge.
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.3	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	Supports Mr Tiley's submission about the importance of these listed ridgelines to Wellington's landscape, environment, and liveability. Mount Victoria ridgeline is one of the identified ridgelines in the Proposed District Plan, as it is also in the Operative District Plan. The submitter seeks that number 22 Alexandra Road must remain within the identified Mount Victoria Ridgeline as it is in the Operative Plan, rather than be removed from it as is proposed under the Proposed District Plan. The submitter also considers that the intention to remain relatively undeveloped as a crucially important ridgeline should be achieved by retaining the Operative District Plan Open Space zoning rather than rezoning to Residential as is proposed in the Proposed District Plan. [Inferred reference to submission point 142.8]	Allow / Seeks that that number 22 Alexandra Road retains the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.3	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	Supports Mr Tiley's submission about the importance of these listed ridgelines to Wellington's landscape, environment, and liveability. Mount Victoria ridgeline is one of the identified ridgelines in the Proposed District Plan, as it is also in the Operative District Plan. The submitter seeks that number 22 Alexandra Road must remain within the identified Mount Victoria Ridgeline as it is in the Operative Plan, rather than be removed from it as is proposed under the Proposed District Plan. The submitter also considers that the intention to remain relatively undeveloped as a crucially important ridgeline should be achieved by retaining the Operative District Plan Open Space zoning rather than rezoning to Residential as is proposed in the Proposed District Plan. [Inferred reference to submission point 142.8] [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Allow / Seeks that number 22 Alexandra Road retains the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.77	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	The submissions identify the need for greater clarity and better protection in the Plan for the city's identified ridgelines and hilltops. Wellington Civic Trust supports these points	Allow
Andy Foster	FS86.29	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.8].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thomas Brent Layton	164.5	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Opposes the application of the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay to 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road on the basis that this is inconsistent with the policy intention to preserve the visible ridgelines and hilltops being natural. The ridgelines on these properties are not visible or prominent and there are no hilltops.	Seeks the removal of the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay from 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.
Thomas Brent Layton	164.6	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	Considers that the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay should be removed from the sites at 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.	Seeks the removal of the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay from 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.
Churton Park Community Association	189.6	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Not specified	Considers that a lay person could reasonably expect that ONFL and SAL areas are exempt from any activities except for the minimum required to maintain and protect the area.	Not specified.
Churton Park Community Association	189.7	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	Notes that the 18 ridgelines and hilltops set out in the introduction to the chapter are listed without comment or explanation of selection criteria.	Seeks that comments or explanation of selection criteria are included for the 18 ridgelines and hilltops. [Inferred decision requested].
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.5	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	Supports submission 189 in seeking to change the Proposed District Plan to more fully protect and enhance the City's natural landscapes including Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes and Ridgelines and Hilltops, and request that all the CPCA proposals are adopted. It is the view of the submitter that the only new activities to be allowed in these areas should be those essential pieces of infrastructure that cannot be located anywhere else. Housing development should not be allowed. [Inferred reference to submission point 189.7]	Allow
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.6	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Support	Supports submission 189 in seeking to change the Proposed District Plan to more fully protect and enhance the City's natural landscapes including Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes and Ridgelines and Hilltops, and request that all the CPCA proposals are adopted. It is the submitters view that the only new activities to be allowed in these areas should be those essential pieces of infrastructure that cannot be located anywhere else. Housing development should not be allowed. [Inferred reference to submission point 189.10]	Allow
Andy Foster	FS86.39	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 189.7].	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Churton Park Community Association	189.8	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	<p>Considers that given its importance in other council policies and plans, Marshalls Ridge should be included as an identified ridgeline.</p> <p>Notes that Marshalls Ridge is mentioned several times in the NRMP with various references to its importance as an open space.</p> <p>Council documents show Marshalls Ridge valued as a critical reserve, contributing to landscape coherence and amenity. The NRMP 2008 provides (8.3.2.1) a clear policy statement for protecting the open space character of Marshalls Ridge and the steeper ridges and spurs falling to Stebbings Valley and Middleton Road. The PDP dismisses Marshalls Ridge as of no account, not listing it with other city ridgelines, and designating it as a Future Urban Zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments].</p>	Amend the list of identified ridgelines and hilltops to include Marshalls Ridge.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.80	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose in part	<p>Considers the statement in the preamble does not include existing infrastructure within the ridgeline and hilltops overlay which seems to be captured by Rule NFL-R2. This suggests that existing renewable electricity generation activities within ridgeline and hilltop overlays are intended to be captured by these NFL rules. Meridian understood this was not the intention of this Plan. Meridian prefers the approach whereby all rules for renewable generation activities are contained in the bespoke REG Renewable Electricity Generation chapter. Meridian accepts that the objectives and policies of the NFL chapter apply to renewable electricity generation activities in overlay areas.</p>	Retain the Introduction of the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter, with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.81	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	<p>Considers the statement in the preamble does not include existing infrastructure within the ridgeline and hilltops overlay which seems to be captured by Rule NFL-R2. This suggests that existing renewable electricity generation activities within ridgeline and hilltop overlays are intended to be captured by these NFL rules. Meridian understood this was not the intention of this Plan. Meridian prefers the approach whereby all rules for renewable generation activities are contained in the bespoke REG Renewable Electricity Generation chapter. Meridian accepts that the objectives and policies of the NFL chapter apply to renewable electricity generation activities in overlay areas.</p>	<p>Amend the Introduction of the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter, under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions', by inserting the following (or similar) clarification note:</p> <p><u>The rules applicable to renewable electricity generation activities (including in Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Special Amenity Landscapes) are contained in Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation. The rules in Chapter NFL Natural Features and Landscapes do not apply to renewable electricity generation activities.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.94	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	Considers the introduction of the NFL chapter needs to have the list of Ridgelines and Hilltops deleted. This is because there is a map overlay that already identifies these areas. Clarification is also needed to ensure this overlay does not apply to Lincolnshire Farm Development Area or the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area.	<p>Amend the Introduction to Natural Features and Landscapes chapter as follows:</p> <p>The purpose of the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter is to manage the effects of activities on the identified outstanding natural features and landscapes (ONFL), special amenity landscapes (SAL), and ridgelines and hilltops. These are identified within SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes.</p> <p><u>The Ridgelines and Hilltops are identified in an overlay on the District Plan Maps.</u></p> <p><u>The location of Ridgelines and Hilltops have informed the master planning and resultant Development Plans in the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area and the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area. However the overlays are not located within the Development Areas. In Upper Stebbings and Glenside West, natural features are recognised by distinguishing the Build and the No Build areas. A site-specific Ridgetop area is subject to separate protection and management in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area through requirements in the DEV3 chapter, EW chapter and in APP13.</u></p> <p>(...)</p> <p>The following ridgelines and hilltops have been identified in Wellington City: Bests Ridge Horokiwi Ridge Mt Albert Ridge Mt Crawford / Point Halswell Mt Victoria Ngaio Reserve Oku Street Reserve Orongo Ridge Point Dorset Pipinui Point & Coastal Hills South Headland Reserve Tawatawa Ridge Te Kopahu Ridge Te Wharangi Ridge & Totara / Bests / Spicers Ridge Tinakori Hill Upper Ngauranga Western Harbour Hills (Brandon's Rock / Woodridge) White Rock Hill / Quartz Hill / Outlook Hill Wrights Hill</p>
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.27	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Not specified	Considers that, in relation to objectives and policies in the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter, while the values for particular sites are outlined in Schedule 11, the characteristics are not. Clarification on the characteristics would assist with plan interpretation and application.	Clarify what characteristics of special amenity landscapes are in the PDP, and in particular the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.28	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Considers that there is a lack of higher order document policy support for the policy and rule framework for Ridgelines and Hilltops assuming that Special Amenity Landscapes capture RMA S6(c) matters); and a lack of identified values within the PDP for the Ridgelines and Hilltops (noting they are not scheduled) and therefore lack of clarity for plan users as to the values. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Clarify the policy and rule framework for Ridgelines and Hilltops and review the appropriateness of Hilltops and Ridgelines within the PDP.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.17	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	Considers that open space activity will be greatly reduced without the protection of Marshall Ridge as a natural connected open space with similar protections afforded to the ridgelines in Stebbings Valley and Tawa.	Amend the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter to recognise Marshall's Ridge as an identified ridgeline and hilltop.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.18	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	<p>Retain the protections afforded to ridgelines and hilltops as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.19	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	<p>Considers that excluding Marshall's Ridge from protections afforded to other connected hilltops and ridgelines makes no sense in the face of the Introduction, DEV-04; DEV3-P4. Where the connective network of geographical features have been specified as needing protection and incorporation into a network for open spaces and reserves.</p> <p>Opening it up instead for housing development which will irreversibly reduce the visual amenity of the area, have a huge reverse sensibility effect and remove it from the network of accessible public open spaces.</p>	<p>Seeks that Marshalls Ridge is included within the list of ridgelines and hilltops in the introduction to the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter.</p> <p>[Inferred decision sought]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.225	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Not specified	Supports any provisions in the Plan that would ensure the values of ONFLs are maintained and enhanced and would not enable modification of their outstanding values. We also support the identification and protection of Special Amenity Landscapes and seek to ensure provisions in the NFL chapter adequately protect the ONFLs and SALs in Wellington and are well integrated in the ECO chapter to ensure no-net-loss of biodiversity.	Not specified.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.141	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Considers that the submission point suggests the purpose of the ONFL overlays is to prevent any modification of their outstanding values. The policy framework is more nuanced: it seeks to protect the values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Disallow / In the absence of specific wording, disallow the submission point.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.226	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	Considers the Introduction should include the Outer Green Belt in list of SALs.	Amend NFL - Introduction: ... The following SALs have been identified in Wellington City: ... <u>8. Outer Green Belt.</u>
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.2	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	Considers that the Council has misinterpreted the NPS-UD and should not be creating housing areas in highly visual and steep land close to ridgelines such as the proposed development in Glenside West. Furthermore, the need for more housing should not justify the removal of the visual protection offered by DPC33 in Glenside West or any other part of Wellington. There is concern that this justification given by Council for this to occur misinterprets the NPS with the result that one particular ridgeline is left unprotected with further ridgelines perhaps under threat in the future by the precedent that this unjustifiably sets. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that Council not remove the ridgeline protection offered by District Plan Change 33 in Glenside West or any other part of Wellington.
Hilary Watson	FS75.1	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.22	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 374.2].	Allow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.80	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	Considers that are no triggers for active engagement with Taranaki Whānui in the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that there are amendments to include higher triggers for active engagement of Taranaki Whānui within the chapter. [Inferred decision requested]
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.81	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford. Submitter supports the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui. Concerns there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their ancestral lands.	Seeks that the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford is removed; specifically at Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.11	Part2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.81].</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.11	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that “Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.”</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.28	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.47	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lance Lones	FS81.13	Part2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Andy Foster	FS86.17	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whanui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whanui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whanui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.81]</p>	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.82	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	<p>Considers that overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p>	Seeks that any other relief to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.12	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.29	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.48	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.14	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.26	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	<p>Submitter is concerned that high rise development along this hilltop area will have a significant adverse impact to the Johnsonville Ridgeline and visual amenity of the whole suburb.</p>	Seeks that NFL (Natural Features and Landscapes) chapter is amended to add Woodland Road/Prospect Terrace (Area C on original submission page 25) to the list of Ridgelines
Johnsonville Community Association	429.27	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / General NFL	Amend	<p>Considers that the council is to remove the ridgeline protection in urban areas. These protections were established for good reason and the JCA objects to their removal.</p>	Seeks that the WCC reverse the decision to remove ridgeline protections in urban areas and re-establish them as they are in the current District Plan plus adding Woodland Road, Johnsonville.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.227	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / New NFL	Amend	Seeks new policy to give effect to policy 11 outside of SNAs. Recognises that policy 11 is given effect to in the coastal environment by way of the ECO chapter policies, however, those policies only apply to identified SNAs. There may be other areas in the coastal environment, particularly within SALs and ONFLs, that have biodiversity that is required to be protected under policy 11. As such, a separate policy to ensure that policy 11 is given effect to in these areas is required.	Add new policy NFL-PX to give effect to Policy 11 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement outside of Significant Natural Areas.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.142	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / New NFL	Oppose	NZCPS Policy 11 addresses significant indigenous biodiversity in the coastal environment. Considers it is not directly relevant for chapter NFL.	Disallow / In the absence of specific wording, disallow the submission point.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.228	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O1	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain NFL-O1 (Outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.166	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O1	Support	Considers it gives effect to section 6(b) of the RMA and NZCPS Policy 15(a).	Retain NFL-O1 (Outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.145	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O1	Support	It is important that the District Plan provides legal and policy support to be able to protect outstanding natural features and landscapes. Research shows that access to natural areas and environments is key to human health and well-being and a critical part of providing refuge for formerly at risk native birds.	Retain NFL-O1 (Outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.44	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O1	Support	Supports proposed Objective NFL-O1 (Outstanding natural features and landscapes).	Retain objective NFL-O1 (Outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.29	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O2	Support in part	Supports the policy directive within NFL-O2 to enhance the values 'where practicable'. Notwithstanding the support, the submitter notes that while the values for particular sites are outlined in Schedule 11, the characteristics are not. Clarification on the characteristics would assist with plan interpretation and application.	Retain NFL-O2 (Special amenity landscapes) as notified, with clarification.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.38	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O2	Oppose in part	Considers that it is appropriate subdivision, use and development in areas identified as SAL should be managed to maintain and enhance amenity values. Also agrees that Mount Kaukau and the Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape are Special Amenity Landscapes. However, the submitter believes that the MDRZ area of the land should not be included in this SAL mapping. By including the MDRZ land within the SAL overlay, it restricts the land from being efficiently utilized for medium density residential development. Furthermore, the zoning layout has principal support from GWRC both in terms of policy direction (i.e. Policy 27) and the consented layout. The landscape identified to be 'distinctive and widely recognised by the community for the contribution to the amenity and quality of the environment' is predominantly located within the balance land which includes Crows Nest and the Skyline Walkway Trailhead.	Retain NFL-O2 (Special amenity landscapes) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.15	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O2	Oppose	Supports Kilmarnston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However opposes the removal for the land in question. However oppose the removal for the land in question. The history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given it high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which are development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to remove the SAL from the Kilmarnston Development's land.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.15	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes /NFL-O2	Oppose	Support Kilmarnston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However Jo McKenzie opposes the removal for the land in question. Considers that the history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given it high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which are development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that proposes removing the SAL from the Kilmarnston Development's land
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.229	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O2	Oppose	Considers the objective does not give effect to s7(c) of the RMA.	Amend NFL-O2 (Special amenity landscapes): The characteristics and values of special amenity landscapes are maintained and, where practicable, enhanced.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.146	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O2	Support	It is important that the District Plan provides legal and policy support to be able to protect outstanding natural features and landscapes. Research shows that access to natural areas and environments is key to human health and well-being and a critical part of providing refuge for formerly at risk native birds.	Retain NFL-O2 (Special Amenity Landscapes) as notified.
John Tiley	142.9	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Amend	Considers that NFL-O3 should be clarified to state the amenity value of associated open space, and the opportunities to create continuity of open space.	Amend NFL-O3 (Ridgelines and hilltops) to include reference to the protection of 'the amenity value of associated open space, and the opportunities to create continuity of open space'.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.78	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Support	The submissions identify the need for greater clarity and better protection in the Plan for the city's identified ridgelines and hilltops. Wellington Civic Trust supports these points	Allow
Churton Park Community Association	189.9	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Amend	Considers that NFL-O3 should be clarified to state the amenity value of associated open space, and the opportunities to create continuity of open space.	Amend NFL-O3 (Ridgelines and hilltops) to include reference to the protection of 'the amenity value of associated open space, and the opportunities to create continuity of open space'.
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.6	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Support	Supports submission 189 in seeking to change the Proposed District Plan to more fully protect and enhance the City's natural landscapes including Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes and Ridgelines and Hilltops, and request that all the CPCA proposals are adopted. It is the view of the submitter that the only new activities to be allowed in these areas should be those essential pieces of infrastructure that cannot be located anywhere else. Housing development should not be allowed. [Inferred reference to submission point 189.9]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	F550.5	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Support	Supports submission 189 in seeking to change the Proposed District Plan to more fully protect and enhance the City's natural landscapes including Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes and Ridgelines and Hilltops, and request that all the CPCA proposals are adopted. It is the submitters view that the only new activities to be allowed in these areas should be those essential pieces of infrastructure that cannot be located anywhere else. Housing development should not be allowed. [Inferred reference to submission point 189.9]	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.82	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Oppose	Considers the objective inaccurately characterises the actual character of large areas of ridgelines and hilltops overlays in which wind turbines are located and fails to acknowledge the reality of the existing environment.	Retain NFL-O3 (Ridgelines and hilltops) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.83	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Amend	Considers the objective inaccurately characterises the actual character of large areas of ridgelines and hilltops overlays in which wind turbines are located and fails to acknowledge the reality of the existing environment.	Amend NFL-O3 (Ridgelines and hilltops) as follows: The natural green landscape backdrop provided by identified ridgelines and hilltops is maintained and enhanced , where practicable, enhanced recognising the existence of and the functional and operational needs of regionally significant infrastructure.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.30	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Oppose	Considers that the wording of objective NFL-O3 could be clarified as to the appropriateness of ensuring a natural green backdrop to the city on private land.	Clarify the appropriateness of ensuring a natural green backdrop to the city on private land and review the appropriateness of Hilltops and Ridgelines within the PDP.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.230	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain NFL-O3 (Ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.147	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-O3	Support	The green ridge tops of Wellington are a core part of its character and a major contributor to maintaining a 'biophilic' environment, which is key to human health, well being, and a critical part of protecting biodiversity.	Retain NFL-O3 (Ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
John Tiley	142.10	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Amend	Considers that NFL-P1 should be amended to include reference to ridgelines and hilltops.	Amend NFL-P1 (Identification of outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes) to include reference to ridgelines and hilltops.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.79	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Support	The submissions identify the need for greater clarity and better protection in the Plan for the city's identified ridgelines and hilltops. Wellington Civic Trust supports these points	Allow
Churton Park Community Association	189.10	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Amend	Considers that NFL-P1 should be amended to include reference to ridgelines and hilltops.	Amend NFL-P1 (Identification of outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes) to include reference to ridgelines and hilltops.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS49.7	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Support	Supports submission 189 in seeking to change the Proposed District Plan to more fully protect and enhance the City's natural landscapes including Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes and Ridgelines and Hilltops, and request that all the CPCA proposals are adopted. It is the submitters view that the only new activities to be allowed in these areas should be those essential pieces of infrastructure that cannot be located anywhere else. Housing development should not be allowed. [Inferred reference to submission point 189.10]	Allow
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Support	Supports submission 189 in seeking to change the Proposed District Plan to more fully protect and enhance the City's natural landscapes including Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes and Ridgelines and Hilltops, and request that all the CPCA proposals are adopted. It is the submitters view that the only new activities to be allowed in these areas should be those essential pieces of infrastructure that cannot be located anywhere else. Housing development should not be allowed. [Inferred reference to submission point 189.10]	Allow
Andy Foster	FS86.40	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 189.10].	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.231	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain NFL-P1 (Identification of outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.167	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Support	Considers it gives effect to section 6(b) of the RMA and NZCPS Policy 15(a).	Retain NFL-P1 (Identification of outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.148	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P1	Support	NFL-P1 is supported as it is helpful in that having a specific list provides certainty for owners and potential owners whose land falls within these areas.	Retain NFL-P1 (Identification of outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.84	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P2	Oppose	Considers that functional and operational needs will not be able to be accommodated (as intended by the Policy) if all adverse effects on visual amenity and landscape values must be avoided (for example, in upgrading existing wind turbines that occupy hilltops because they have a functional need to locate on high points). Considers the policy, as worded, does not reconcile the outcomes intended by clauses 2 and 3.	Retain NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.85	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P2	Amend	Considers that functional and operational needs will not be able to be accommodated (as intended by the Policy) if all adverse effects on visual amenity and landscape values must be avoided (for example, in upgrading existing wind turbines that occupy hilltops because they have a functional need to locate on high points). Considers the policy, as worded, does not reconcile the outcomes intended by clauses 2 and 3.	Amend Policy NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) as follows (or similar): Enable use and development within identified ridgelines and hilltops where: 1. The activity is compliant with the underlying zone provisions; and or <u>2. Adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape values of the identified Ridgelines and Hilltops are avoided, remedied or mitigated, recognising the existence of and the functional and operational needs of regionally significant infrastructure. There is a functional or operational need to locate within the ridgeline and hilltop area; and</u> 3. Any adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape values can be mitigated.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.31	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P2	Amend	The submitter has concerns with the policy directive within NFP-P2 clause 3. to mitigate 'any' adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape values, given the directive relates to all adverse effects regardless of scale or significance and that the values are not identified within the PDP. The requirement within clause 1. To "be compliant with the underlying zone provisions" is also not clear in its application. Considers the policy is subjective and open to interpretation and requests amendment to remove reference to the underlying zone provisions.	Amend NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) as follows: Enable use and development within identified ridgelines and hilltops where: 1. The activity is compliant with the underlying zone provisions; and <u>2.1. There is a functional or operational need to locate within the ridgeline and hilltop area; and</u> 3.2. Any Significant adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape values can be mitigated.
Parkvale Road Limited	298.6	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P2	Amend	Considers that if the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay is not removed, in order to support residential development of the areas of the site proposed for rezoning, an amendment to the policy is proposed.	Amend NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) as follows: Enable use and development within identified ridgelines and hilltops where: <u>1. Any adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape values can be mitigated; and</u> <u>2. The activity is compliant with the underlying zone provisions; or</u> <u>3. There is a functional or operational need to locate within the ridgeline and hilltop area.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.43	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P2	Oppose	Oppose removal of the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay within 200 Parkvale Road. This overlay is part of wider landscape protection and is appropriate for the property in question.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.72	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P2	Oppose	Supports placing the farm within the Special Amenity Landscape (in addition to retaining Ridgeline and Hilltop status) as was instructed by Council when notifying the Plan. Opposes the request from Parkvale Road Limited to reorder the Ridgeline and Hilltops Policies and Rules. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 29.6].	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.232	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P2	Amend	Considers activities on ridgelines and hilltops should be provisional on meeting these policy requirements, to ensure their landscape values are maintained to give effect to NFL-O3.	Amend NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops): <u>Only</u> Enable use and development within identified ridgelines and hilltops where: 1. The activity is compliant with the underlying zone provisions; and 2. There is a functional or operational need to locate within the ridgeline and hilltop area; and 3. Any adverse effects on the visual amenity and landscape values can be mitigated.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.143	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P2	Oppose	Considers that the insertion of 'only' enable adds no meaningful value to the policy, which is to provide for (enable) activities in the specified circumstances.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.149	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P2	Support	NFL-P12 is supported as it provides for necessary uses, e.g. masts, whilst seeking to mitigate adverse effects.	Retain NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.86	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P3	Oppose	Considers Policy NFL-P3 fails to recognise and provide for the existing turbine on Brooklyn Hill.	Retain Policy NFL-P3 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environment) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.87	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P3	Amend	Considers Policy NFL-P3 fails to recognise and provide for the existing turbine on Brooklyn Hill. P3.1 and P3.2 should be merged as P3.2.	Amend Policy NFL-P3 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environment) as follows (or similar): Provide for use and development within special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environment where: <u>1. Necessary to support the functional and operational needs of the Brooklyn Turbine; or</u> 2. Any adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and the the scale of the activity maintains the identified landscape values and characteristics.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.32	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P3	Support in part	Considers that while NFL-P3 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environment) is not in itself opposed, the submitter does note that while the values for particular sites are outlined in Schedule 11 of the PDP, the characteristics are not. It is therefore not clear what are the characteristics referred to in the policy. Clarification would assist with plan interpretation.	Clarify what are the characteristics referred to in NFL-P3.2 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environment).
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.39	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P3	Oppose in part	Considers that it is appropriate subdivision, use and development in areas identified as SAL should be managed to maintain and enhance amenity values. Also agrees that Mount Kaukau and the Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape are Special Amenity Landscapes. However, the submitter believes that the MDRZ area of the land should not be included in this SAL mapping. By including the MDRZ land within the SAL overlay, it restricts the land from being efficiently utilized for medium density residential development. Furthermore, the zoning layout has principal support from GWRC both in terms of policy direction (i.e. Policy 27) and the consented layout. The landscape identified to be 'distinctive and widely recognised by the community for the contribution to the amenity and quality of the environment' is predominantly located within the balance land which includes Crows Nest and the Skyline Walkway Trailhead.	Retain NFL-P3 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environments) as notified.
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.16	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P3	Oppose	Supports Kilmarston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However opposes the removal for the land in question. However oppose the removal for the land in question. The history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given it high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which are development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to remove the SAL from the Kilmarston Development's land.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.16	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes /NFL-P3	Oppose	Support Kilmarston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However Jo McKenzie opposes the removal for the land in question. Considers that the history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given it high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which are development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that proposes removing the SAL from the Kilmarston Development's land

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.233	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P3	Oppose in part	Raises concern that SAL Outer Green Belt has been left off SCHED11, and therefore there are no identified values to reference regarding this policy. Te Ahumairangi SAL for example, is home to the snail species, Potamopyrgus oppidanus. This policy should give effect to s7(f) of the RMA to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment to protect the biodiversity that live in these SALs. Considers activities in SALs should not be provided for solely on the basis of these policies (including NFL-P4) but agree that these policy requirements must be met.	Amend NFL-P3 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environment): <u>Only consider providing</u> for use and development within special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environment where: 1. Any adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 2. The scale of the activity maintains the identified landscape values and characteristics; <u>and</u> 3. <u>Any activity ensures the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.144	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P3	Oppose	Considers that the insertion of 'only' enable adds no meaningful value to the policy, which is to provide for (enable) activities in the specified circumstances.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.150	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P3	Support	NFL-P3 is supported as it provides for activities that can work within these areas in a manner that does not compromise their value.	Retain NFL-P3 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environment) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.33	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P4	Support in part	Considers that while NFL-P4 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment) is not in itself opposed, the submitter does note that while the values for particular sites are outlined in Schedule 11 of the PDP, the characteristics are not. It is therefore not clear what are the characteristics referred to in the policy.	Clarify what are the characteristics referred to in NFL-P4.2 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment). [Inferred decision requested]
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.34	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P4	Amend	Considers that while NFL-P4 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment) is not in itself opposed, the submitter does note that while the values for particular sites are outlined in Schedule 11 of the PDP, the characteristics are not. It is therefore not clear what are the characteristics referred to in the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P4 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment) as follows: Provide for use and development within special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment where: 1. ... 2. The activity maintains the identified landscape values and characteristics
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.234	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P4	Support in part	Considers the policy fails to give effect to Policies 13 and 15 of the NZCPS as well as s7(f) of the RMA. Further, the "identified" values are not enough to ensure the Plan gives effect to the NZCPS. Consideration of "providing for" activities in SALs in the coastal environment should not be solely on the basis of this one policy.	Amend NFL-P4 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment): <u>Only consider providing</u> for use and development within special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment where: 1. Any significant adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and , 2. The activity maintains the identified landscape values and characteristics; <u>and</u> ; 3. <u>Any activity ensures the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.145	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P4	Oppose	Considers that the insertion of 'only' enable adds no meaningful value to the policy, which is to provide for (enable) activities in the specified circumstances.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.151	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P4	Support	NFL-P4 is supported as it provides for activities that can work within these areas in a manner that does not compromise their value.	Retain NFL-P4 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.45	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P4	Support	Supports proposed Policy NFL-P4 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment).	Retain policy NFL-P4 (Use and development in special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.88	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P5	Oppose	Considers the word 'only' is not necessary because the following text explains where use and development will be allowed. Clause 2 of the policy does not add any value because Clause 1 addresses the same issue (protecting the identified values).	Retain Policy NFL-P5 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes outside the coastal environment) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.89	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P5	Amend	Considers the word 'only' is not necessary because the following text explains where use and development will be allowed. Clause 2 of the policy does not add any value because Clause 1 addresses the same issue (protecting the identified values).	Delete clause 2 of Policy NFL-P5 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes outside the coastal environment) as follows, or otherwise eliminate the duplication between clauses 1 and 2: Only allow for use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes outside the coastal environment where: 1. Any significant adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 2. The activity is designed to protect the identified landscape values and characteristics.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.235	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P5	Amend	Supports the intent of this policy but have concerns regarding "Only allow" wording in ONFLs. We oppose the use of "identified" given the shortcomings of SCHED10 (see submission point on that matter). Allowing activities in ONFLs outside the coastal environment should not be solely on the basis of this policy. Other considerations should also apply, such as policies from ECO chapter. This policy needs to be worded to ensure other considerations, such as significant biodiversity values, are also taken into account.	Amend NFL-P5 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes outside the coastal environment): Only <u>consider</u> allowing for use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes outside the coastal environment where: 1. Any significant adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 2. The activity is designed to protect the identified landscape values and characteristics.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.146	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P5	Oppose	Considers that the insertion of 'only' enable adds no meaningful value to the policy, which is to provide for (enable) activities in the specified circumstances.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.152	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P5	Support	NFL-P5 is supported as it provides for activities that can work within these areas in a manner that does not compromise their value.	Retain NFL-P5 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes outside the coastal environment) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.90	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P6	Oppose	Considers the NZCPS does not require avoidance of all adverse effects on outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment. Rather, avoidance of significant adverse effects is required.	Retain Policy NFL-P6 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.91	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P6	Amend	Considers the NZCPS does not require avoidance of all adverse effects on outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment. Rather, avoidance of significant adverse effects is required.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment) as follows (or similar): Avoid use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment unless any all significant adverse effects on the identified values can be avoided <u>and</u> other effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.236	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P6	Amend	Considers the policy needs to give better effect to the NZCPS. The "identified values" do not go far enough to ensuring Policy 15(a) is given effect to. SCHED10 is uncertain (see our submission points on the schedules).	Amend NFL-P6 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment): Only consider allowing for Avoid use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment <u>where</u> : 1. Any unless any adverse effects on the <u>outstanding natural features and landscapes identified values are</u> can be avoided; <u>and</u> 2. The activity is designed to protect the outstanding natural landscape values and characteristics.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.147	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P6	Oppose	Meridian considers the amended wording proposed in its submission point 228.91 better gives effect to s. 6 of the RMA and the relevant higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.168	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P6	Support	Considers it gives effect to section 6(b) of the RMA and NZCPS Policy 15(a).	Retain NFL-P6 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.153	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P6	Support	NFL-P6 is supported as it provides for activities that can work within these areas in a manner that does not compromise their value.	Retain NFL-P6 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.46	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P6	Support	Supports proposed policy NFL-P6 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment).	Retain policy NFL-P6 (Use and development within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.35	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P7	Support in part	Supports that NFL-P7 recognises existing quarry activities, and their expansion. NFL-P7 is specific to mining and quarrying, and specific to the Horokiwi site. The policy recognises the importance and role of existing quarry activities and provides a policy pathway for their expansion (outside ONFLs).	Retain NFL-P7 (Mining and quarrying activities in outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes), with amendments.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.36	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P7	Amend	Considers that reference to Hilltops and Ridgelines within the policy is appropriate given the Horokiwi Quarry site has a Hilltops and Ridgelines overlay.	Amend NFL-P7 (Mining and quarrying activities in outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes) as follows: Mining and quarrying activities in outstanding natural features and landscapes, and special amenity landscapes, <u>and hilltops and ridgelines</u> Manage mining and quarrying activities within outstanding natural features and landscapes, and special amenity landscapes, <u>and hilltops and ridgelines</u> as follows: 1 Allow for the ongoing operation of established mining and quarrying activities within out standing natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes <u>and hilltops and ridgelines</u> ; 2. Only allow for the extension of established mining and quarrying activities within special amenity landscape where potential adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated;

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.237	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P7	Support in part	Opposes the blanket provision for existing activities in 1, as this suggests their effects would not need to be considered if they require consenting. We support the rest of the provisions.	Amend NFL-P7 (Mining and quarrying activities in outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes): Manage mining and quarrying activities within outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes as follows: 1. Allow for the ongoing operation of established mining and quarrying activities within outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes <u>where their effects can be managed in accordance with the objectives and policies of this Plan</u> ; 2. Only allow for the extension of established mining and quarrying activities within special amenity landscape where potential adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 3. Avoid the establishment of new mining and quarrying within special amenity landscapes; and 4. Avoid the extension of established mining and quarrying activities and the establishment of new mining and quarrying activities within outstanding natural features and landscapes.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.238	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P8	Amend	Seeks amendment to give effect to s6(b) of the RMA and Policy 15 of the NZCPS	Amend NFL-P8 (Plantation forestry): Manage plantation forestry within outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes as follows: 1. Provide for established plantation forestry and ongoing management of existing plantation forestry within outstanding natural features and landscapes and special amenity landscapes; and 2. Avoid the <u>extension of existing and</u> establishment of new plantation forestry in outstanding natural features and landscapes.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.169	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P8	Support	Considers that avoiding new plantation forestry activities in outstanding natural features and landscapes gives effect to section 6(b) of the RMA and, in the coastal environment, NZCPS Policy 15.	Retain NFL-P8 (Plantation forestry) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.154	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P8	Support	NFL-P8 is supported as it sends an important signal that plantation forestry should not be located within these important landscapes.	Retain NFL-P8 (Plantation forestry) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.239	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P9	Amend	Seeks amendment to ensure values are protected in accordance with the objectives of this chapter.	Amend NFL-P9 (Restoration and enhancement): Provide for restoration or rehabilitation of the identified landscape character values in SCHED11 and SCHED12 by: 1. Recognising the landscape character values present; 2. Encouraging natural regeneration of indigenous species, including where practical the removal of pest species <u>and fencing off from stock</u> ; and 3. Providing for mana whenua to exercise their responsibilities as kaitiaki to protect, restore and maintain areas of indigenous biodiversity.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.155	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P9	Support	NFL-P9 is supported as it recognises the positive value of restoration and enhancement of these areas.	Retain NFL-P9 (Restoration and enhancement) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.53	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-P9	Support	Supports that the policy provides for mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga for indigenous biodiversity. [Inferred reason]	Retain NFL-P9 (Restoration and enhancement) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Nga Kaimanaaki o te Waimapihi	215.3	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R1	Amend	Considers that we need to preserve and restore indigenous native fauna. As well as preying on our native birds, cats also eat a large number of our native lizards and wētā (which are still in decline).	Seeks amendment to NFL-R1 (Restoration and enhancement activities within outstanding natural features and landscapes, special amenity landscapes and ridgelines and hilltops (including in the coastal environment)) to add guidelines that restrict pets from roaming in Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, Special Amenity Landscapes, and Ridgelines and Hilltops. [Inferred decision requested]
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.240	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R1	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain NFL-R1 (Restoration and enhancement activities within outstanding natural features and landscapes, special amenity landscapes and ridgelines and hilltops (including in the coastal environment)) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.156	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R1	Support	NFL-R1 is supported as it recognises the positive value of restoration and enhancement of these areas.	Retain NFL-R1 (Restoration and enhancement activities within outstanding natural features and landscapes...) as notified.
Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	486.4	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R1	Amend	Considers that NFL-R1 should be amended with an additional clause that enables Zealandia operations to continue as per other areas in the plan. Considers that NFL-R1 does not allow for the conservation and restoration work of Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne as the area is not subject to the Reserves Act.	Amend NFL-R1 (Restoration and enhancement activities within outstanding natural features and landscapes, special amenity landscapes and ridgelines and hilltops (including in the coastal environment)) by adding a clause that enables the ongoing restoration work within the Zealandia sanctuary where undertaken by the Karori Sanctuary Trust.
John Tiley	142.11	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R2	Amend	Considers that the Permitted Activity status in NFL-R2 appears to give carte blanche for any activity within ridgelines and hilltops.	Not specified.
Churton Park Community Association	189.11	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R2	Amend	Considers that the Permitted Activity status in NFL-R2 appears to give carte blanche for any activity within ridgelines and hilltops.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.241	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R2	Oppose	Opposes the wording of rule as it lacks clarity about the activities that are actually being referred to. This is uncertain and does not give any clarity to assess effects on this basis. Seek that the permitted activity be deleted.	Delete NFL-R2 (Any activity within the ridgelines and hilltops not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, or non-complying).
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.242	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R2	Oppose	Given comment on NFL-P2, would support RD in the instance that NFL-P2 was amended.	Amend NFL-R2 (Any activity within the ridgelines and hilltops not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, or non-complying) subject to relief sought for NFL-P2: 1. Activity status: Permitted <u>Restricted Discretionary</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.243	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R3	Support in part	Opposes the wording of the rule as it lacks clarity about the activities that are actually being referred to. Supports RD in SALs but seek that the matters of discretion cross reference new ECO and NFL policies sought above which are aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity outside of SNAs as well as ensuring policy 11 of the NZCPS is given effect to, outside of SNAs.	Amend NFL-R3 (Any activity within special amenity landscapes not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, or non-complying) to clarify scope of activities covered, and: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in NFL-P3 and NFL-P4 <u>[add cross references to relevant ECO and NFL policies that are aimed at maintenance of biodiversity outside Significant Natural Areas and give effect to policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement]</u> .
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.244	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R4	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain NFL-R4 (Any activity within outstanding natural features and landscapes not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, or non-complying) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.37	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R5	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity rule NFL-R5. Notwithstanding the proposed Special Purpose Quarry Zone which would apply to the Horokiwi site, and the existing use certificate.	Retain NFL-R5 (Operation of existing quarrying and mining activities within special amenity landscapes), with amendments.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.38	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R5	Amend	Considers that in order to provide consistency in how existing quarries are managed within NFL features, an amendment is sought to include Hilltops and Ridgelines in the permitted rule, noting that rule NFL-R2 provides a qualifier to the permitted activity rule that is not provided in NFL-R5.	Amend NFL-R5 (Operation of existing quarrying and mining activities within special amenity landscapes) as follows: Operation of existing quarrying and mining activities within special amenity landscapes <u>and Hilltops and Ridgelines</u> . All Zones Activity status: Permitted
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.245	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R5	Oppose	Opposes the blanket provision for existing quarrying and mining activities, as this suggests their effects would not need to be considered if they require consenting.	Amend NFL-R5 (Operation of existing quarrying and mining activities within special amenity landscapes): 1. Activity status: Permitted Restricted Discretionary <u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>1. [add cross references to relevant ECO and NFL policies that are aimed at maintenance of biodiversity outside Significant Natural Areas and give effect to policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement]</u> .
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.6	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R5	Oppose	Horokiwi Quarries Ltd opposes the sought change in activity status for existing quarries. The rule as proposed recognises existing quarries and the PDP provides an appropriate consenting framework for any expansion or activities that require a new consent.	Disallow
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.39	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R6	Support	Supports the discretionary activity rule NFL-R5 in so far as it applies to an expansion of the existing quarry operation. Notwithstanding the proposed Special Purpose Quarry Zone which would apply to the Horokiwi site, and the existing use certificate.	Retain NFL-R6 (Extension of existing quarrying and mining activities within special amenity landscapes) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.246	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R6	Oppose	Seeks the rule is given restricted discretionary status and that matters of discretion cross reference relevant policies in the plan including new ECO and NFL policies sought above.	Amend NFL-R6 (Extension of existing quarrying and mining activities within special amenity landscapes): 1. Activity status: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary <u>Matters of discretion:</u> 1. <u>add cross references to relevant ECO and NFL policies that are aimed at maintenance of biodiversity outside Significant Natural Areas and give effect to policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement.</u>
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.7	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R6	Oppose	Horokiwi Quarries Ltd opposes the sought change in activity status for expansions. As a discretionary activity, other policies in the PDP would be applied where relevant and applicable.	Disallow
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.40	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R7	Not specified	Considers that on the basis NFL-R6 relates to the expansion of existing quarries, Rule NFL-R7 has limited relevance to the submitter.	Retain NFL-R7 (New quarrying and mining activities within special amenity landscapes) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.247	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R7	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain NFL-R7 (New quarrying and mining activities within special amenity landscapes) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.41	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R8	Not specified	Considers that given there are no ONFLs within proximity of the existing Horokiwi site, the rule has limited relevance to the submitter.	Retain NFL-R8 (Extension of existing quarrying and mining activities, new quarrying and mining activities and new plantation forestry within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.248	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R8	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain NFL-R8 (Extension of existing quarrying and mining activities, new quarrying and mining activities and new plantation forestry within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.249	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R9	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain NFL-R9 (The maintenance, repair or demolition of existing buildings and structures within outstanding natural features and landscapes, special amenity landscapes and ridgelines and hilltops) as notified.
Barry Ellis	47.1	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R10	Amend	Considers that the Council should provide the relevant data that justifies filling in gullies and building over natural streams and springs. Natural disasters of Nelson and Abbots Ford should not be forgotten.	Seeks that data be provided in NFL-R10 (The construction of, alteration of and addition to, buildings and structures within the ridgelines and hilltops) to justify filling in gullies. [Inferred decision requested]
Parkvale Road Limited	298.7	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R10	Oppose in part	Considers that the operational and functional need to locate within a ridgeline and hilltop is already reflected in the policy which is listed as a matter of discretion, and therefore does not need to be listed again separately.	Seeks amendment, opposes in part NFL-R10.2 (The construction of, alteration of and addition to, buildings and structures within the ridgelines and hilltops) within current form.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.73	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R10	Oppose	Supports placing the farm within the Special Amenity Landscape (in addition to retaining Ridgeline and Hilltop status) as was instructed by Council when notifying the Plan. Opposes the request from Parkvale Road Limited to reorder the Ridgeline and Hilltops Policies and Rules. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 29.7].	Disallow
Parkvale Road Limited	298.8	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R10	Amend	Considers that the operational and functional need to locate within a ridgeline and hilltop is already reflected in the policy which is listed as a matter of discretion, and therefore does not need to be listed again separately.	Amend NFL-R10 (The construction of, alteration of and addition to, buildings and structures within the ridgelines and hilltops) as follows: Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in NFL-P2, and 2. The operational and function need to locate within the ridgeline and hilltop area.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.44	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R10	Support	Agree that the operational and functional need to locate within a ridgeline and hilltop is already reflected in the policy which is listed as a matter of discretion, and therefore does not need to be listed again separately.	Allow
Andy Foster	FS86.74	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R10	Oppose	Supports placing the farm within the Special Amenity Landscape (in addition to retaining Ridgeline and Hilltop status) as was instructed by Council when notifying the Plan. Opposes the request from Parkvale Road Limited to reorder the Ridgeline and Hilltops Policies and Rules. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 29.8].	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.250	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R10	Support in part	Considers permitted activity status in 1. and restricted discretionary in 2. is appropriate, but seeks subsequent amendments to NFL-P2 to ensure adequate protection of ridgelines and hilltops through matters of discretion.	Not specified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.40	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R11	Oppose in part	Considers that there is a conflict between these provisions and the SAL overlay provisions which make residential development on this land restrictive and adds uncertainty. Notes that NFL-R11 requires buildings and structures within the SAL overlay to be no more than 8m in height. The MRZ height restriction is 11m. The proposed MRZ over the Submitters land is appropriate to support the strategic direction of the PDP.	Not specified.
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.17	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R11	Oppose	Supports Kilmarston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However opposes the removal for the land in question. However oppose the removal for the land in question. The history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given it high landscape and amenity values, particularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which are development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to remove the SAL from the Kilmarston Development's land.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jo McKenzie	FS64.17	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R11	Oppose	Support Kilmарston Development's support of the SAL overlay in the District Plan. However Jo McKenzie opposes the removal for the land in question. Considers that the history of proposed development on this land (environment court decisions) and the community concerns about it strongly suggest that overlays such as SAL are appropriate to retain. An 8m height restriction is entirely appropriate for this location given it high landscape and amenity values, apricularly for sightlines from Ngaio but also Crofton Downs from which are development will be visible.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that proposes removing the SAL from the Kilmарston Development's land
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.251	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R11	Oppose	Opposes the permitted activity in SALs as neither it, nor NFL-S1, take into account effects on biodiversity as well as landscape values as well as policy 15 of the NZCPS, particularly regarding construction of new buildings and structures in the coastal environment	Delete NFL-R11.1 (The construction of, alteration of and addition to, buildings and structures within special amenity landscapes).
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.252	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R11	Amend	Supports RD status for this activity but seek that matters of discretion are widened to include relevant policies in the plan including new ECO and NFL policies sought above.	Amend NFL-R11.2 (The construction of, alteration of and addition to, buildings and structures within special amenity landscapes): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NFL-R11.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in NFL-P3 and NFL-P4 <u>add cross references to relevant ECO and NFL policies that are aimed at maintenance of biodiversity outside Significant Natural Areas and give effect to policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement</u> .
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.253	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R12	Support in part	Considers the hierarchy is appropriate as it gives effect to Policy 15 of the NZCPS. Seeks that matters of discretion are widened to include relevant policies in the plan including new ECO and NFL policies sought above.	Amend NFL-R12 (): 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance can be achieved with NFL-S2; and b. The building or structure is located outside the coastal environment. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in NFL-P5 <u>add cross references to relevant ECO and NFL policies that are aimed at maintenance of biodiversity outside Significant Natural Areas and give effect to policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement</u> .
Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	486.5	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-R12	Support in part	Supports the new delineation of the Outstanding Natural Landscape which now excludes operations and office environments.	Retain NFL-R12 (The construction of, alteration of and addition to, buildings and structures within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
John Tiley	142.12	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Oppose	Considers that NFL-S1 (Buildings and structures in special amenity landscapes) appears intended to permit residential housing construction in special amenity areas. These areas should be free of buildings.	Seeks that special amenity areas are free of buildings.
Churton Park Community Association	189.12	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Oppose	Considers that NFL-S1 (Buildings and structures in special amenity landscapes) appears intended to permit residential housing construction in special amenity areas. These areas should be free of buildings.	Seeks that special amenity areas are free of buildings.
Kilmарston Developments Limited and Kilmарston Properties Limited	290.41	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Support in part	Considers that the proposed standard will be better aligned to manage activities over the proposed NOSZ that the balance land is subject to.	Seeks that NFL-S1 (Buildings and structures in special amenity landscapes) apply to land identified within the Natural Open Space Zone. [inferred decision]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.22	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Oppose	Opposes the suggestion that SAL criteria would be appropriate to apply to NOSZ zoned land. That would be contrary to the purpose of that zone to enable a more lax approach to buildings and structures.	Disallow
Jo McKenzie	FS64.22	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Oppose	Opposes the suggestion that SAL criteria would be appropriate to apply to NOSZ zoned land. Considers that would be contrary to the purpose of that zone to enable a more lax approach to buildings and structures.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.53	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Oppose	Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.41]	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.42	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Amend	Considers that the proposed standard will be better aligned to manage activities over the proposed NOSZ that the balance land is subject to.	Seeks that NFL-S1 (Buildings and structures in special amenity landscapes) apply to land identified within the Natural Open Space Zone. [inferred decision]
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.23	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Oppose	Opposes the suggestion that SAL criteria would be appropriate to apply to NOSZ zoned land. That would be contrary to the purpose of that zone to enable a more lax approach to buildings and structures.	Disallow
Jo McKenzie	FS64.23	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Oppose	Opposes the suggestion that SAL criteria would be appropriate to apply to NOSZ zoned land. Considers that would be contrary to the purpose of that zone to enable a more lax approach to buildings and structures.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.254	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S1	Oppose in part	Considers construction of 8m buildings and structures in SALs will have significant visual and landscape effects, we question whether this is compatible with s7(c) of the RMA.	Amend NFL-S1 (Buildings and structures in special amenity landscapes) to reduce the maximum height of buildings and structures within special amenity landscapes.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.255	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S2	Support	Supports the standard.	Retain NFL-S2 (Buildings and structures in outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	486.6	Natural and Environmental Values / Natural Features and Landscapes / NFL-S2	Not specified	Considers that it is unclear whether NFL-S2 could cause challenges for Zealandia operations in relation to replacement of the fence perimeter fence over time (which may need to be done rapidly as issues arise, with an aging fence and the biosecurity threat it presents).	Seeks clarity whether NFL-S2 (Buildings and structures in outstanding natural features and landscapes) would cause challenges for Zealandia operations in relation to replacement of the fence perimeter fence over time.

Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity - Public Access

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.44	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O1	Support	Supports that public access is maintained along the coast, lakes, and rivers.	Retain PA-O1 (Public access) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Tyers Stream Group	221.61	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain PA-O1 (Public access) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.170	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O1	Support	Considers it gives effect to section 6(d) of the RMA.	Retain PA-O1 (Public Access) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.157	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O1	Support	Objective PA-O1 is supported as it safeguards public access, whilst protecting environmental values is important to Wellington and a city that has a strong relationship to its natural environment.	Retain PA-O1 (Public access) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.47	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O1	Support	Supports proposed Objective PA-O1 (Public access).	Retain objective PA-O1 (Public access) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.62	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.92	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Oppose in part	Considers the objective needs to be moderated to ensure that public access does not compromise the security of existing regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain Objective PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.93	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Amend	Considers the objective needs to be moderated to ensure that public access does not compromise the security of existing regionally significant infrastructure.	Amend Objective PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) to protect the security of regionally significant infrastructure as follows (or similar): Adverse effects of public access Public access does not have a negative impact on existing values such as natural character, indigenous biodiversity, landscape values, historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, <u>the security of regionally significant infrastructure</u> or the coastal environment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.80	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Support	WIAL supports this policy and agrees that it is important that public access is not provided to the detriment of the safety and security of regionally significant infrastructure. Similarly, public access should not give rise to adverse effects on public health and safety as a result of its proximity to regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.171	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Support in part	The objective is generally supported, but amendments are sought to ensure that the objective is achieved.	Retain PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.172	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Amend	Considers an assessment of natural character in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment has not yet been undertaken, and is necessary to protect existing natural character values. It is sought that the natural character ratings of riparian margins are assessed, which has been sought through a new policy in the natural character chapter.	Seeks that the Objective PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) is ensured by undertaking natural character ratings of riparian margins.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.158	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Support	Objective PA-O2 is supported as it safeguards public access, whilst protecting environmental values is important to Wellington and a city that has a strong relationship to its natural environment.	Retain PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.48	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Support	Supports proposed Objective PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access).	Retain objective PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.252	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Oppose in part	Considers that there are further changes are required to the objective to ensure there is a clear policy rationale for limbs 5 and 11 of Policy PA-P3.	Opposes PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.253	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Amend	Considers that there are further changes are required to the objective to ensure there is a clear policy rationale for limbs 5 and 11 of Policy PA-P3.	Amend PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) as follows: ... Public access does not have a negative impact on: <u>a. existing values such as natural character, indigenous biodiversity, landscape values, historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori or the coastal environment; or</u> <u>b. Public health and safety, particularly with respect to the safe operation and functioning of the Port and Airport.</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.54	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Support	Supports that the objective seeks to ensure that public access does not negatively impacts Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori.	Retain Objective PA-O2 (Adverse effects of public access) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.115	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-O2	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
Tyers Stream Group	221.63	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to PA-P1 (Appropriate activities) to clearly deliver the enhancement required by Objective PA-O1.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.173	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P1	Support	Considers it gives effect to section 6(d) of the RMA.	Retain PA-P1 (Appropriate activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.159	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P1	Support	PA-P1 is supported as it safeguards public access, whilst protecting environmental values is important to Wellington and a city that has a strong relationship to its natural environment.	Retain PA-P1 (Appropriate activities) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.64	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to PA-P2.3 to include setbacks from both existing and potential public access corridors to ensure linkages are made or enabled.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.174	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P2	Amend	Considers that an assessment of natural character in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment has not yet been undertaken.	Seeks to ensure that the natural character ratings of riparian margins are undertaken.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.160	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P2	Support	PA-P2 is supported as it sends an important signal about the need to take steps to at least maintain, and wherever possible enhance public access to the coast and water ways.	Retain PA-P2 (Maintenance and enhancement of public access) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.49	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P2	Support	Supports proposed Policy PA-P2 (Maintenance and enhancement of public access).	Retain policy PA-P2 (Maintenance and enhancement of public access) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.65	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain PA-P3 (Restriction of public access) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.94	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P3	Support in part	Considers the protection of existing regionally significant infrastructure other than the Port and Airport is another legitimate reason for restricting public access that should be added to the list of exceptions.	Retain Policy PA-P3 (Restriction of public access) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.95	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P3	Amend	Considers the protection of existing regionally significant infrastructure other than the Port and Airport is another legitimate reason for restricting public access that should be added to the list of exceptions.	Amend Policy PA-P3 (Restriction of public access) by adding an additional circumstance for restriction to the list as follows: Restriction of public access Only allow for the restriction of public access to, along or adjacent to the coast and waterbodies where the restriction is necessary to: 1. 11. Provide for the safe and efficient operation of <u>regionally significant infrastructure, including the Port and Airport Zone.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.175	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P3	Oppose in part	Considers it unclear as to whether PA-P3(10) gives effect to a relevant higher order planning documents and therefore should not be included in PA-P3.	Opposes PA-P3 (Restriction of public access) and seeks amendments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.176	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P3	Amend	Considers that sub-clause 10 in PA-P3 should be deleted. (Option A)	Amend PA-P3 (Restriction of public access) as follows: Only allow for the restriction of public access to, along or adjacent to the coast and waterbodies where the restriction is necessary to: ... 10. Address other exceptional circumstances sufficient to justify the restriction, or 11. Provide for the safe and efficient operation of the Port and Airport Zone.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.81	Part 2 / Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P3	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of subparagraph 11, however notes that Airport infrastructure can also be located outside of the Airport Zone (and possibly the same could be said for Port infrastructure).	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.177	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P3	Amend	Considers that PA-P3 should be amended to ensure the policy gives effect to higher planning documents. (Option B)	Amend PA-P3 (Restriction of public access) to ensure the policy gives effect to higher planning documents.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.161	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P3	Support	PA-P3 is supported as it recognises that in some situations the natural environment needs protecting from access.	Retain PA-P3 (Restriction of public access) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.254	Natural and Environmental Values / Public Access / PA-P3	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to limit the provision of public access when necessary to provide for the safe and efficient operation of activities at Wellington International Airport.	Retain PA-P3 (Restriction of Public Access) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.66	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	Considers that the RMA definition of river applies to streams. There are also waterways in Wellington with an annual flow bed width that is more than 3m wide, including Tyers Stream downstream from approximately the junction of Delhi and Karachi Crescents. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that appropriate esplanade provision be made along the margins of Tyers Stream, and other waterways, whenever subdivision occurs (as is required by the RMA) to create better linkages and facilitate more liveable spaces and lower energy/runoff intensity use of areas,
Waka Kotahi	370.189	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	Subdivision close to the state highway corridor should be at least restricted discretionary, and (as noted elsewhere), if there is a blanket distance from the state highway, it should be 100m. At subdivision stage there can be better options available to manage noise exposure rather than leaving it to treating individual houses, which does not protect outdoor amenity and can constrain residents to having to use mechanical ventilation.	Seeks to amend to require consent (at least restricted discretionary) for subdivision within 100m of a state highway.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.55	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	<p>Supports the relief sought and seeks further amendment to include the rail corridor within this provision. If subdivision within 100m of the rail corridor had a RDIS activity status, noise and vibration management options could be considered for a whole development as opposed to on individual properties.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include rail corridor within provision
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.27	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Stride considers that it would be unnecessary and inappropriate to apply a Restricted Discretionary activity status for all subdivision with 100m of a state highway. This blanket rule lacks nuance and may impose an unreasonable burden on subdivision, and other controls are more appropriate to manage any effects of the subdivision on the state highway.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.27	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Investore considers that it would be unnecessary and inappropriate to apply a Restricted Discretionary activity status for all subdivision with 100m of a state highway. This blanket rule lacks nuance and may impose an unreasonable burden on subdivision, and other controls are more appropriate to manage any effects of the subdivision on the state highway.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.83	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.</p> <p>Submitter supports the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p> <p>Concerns there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their ancestral lands.</p>	Seeks that the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford is removed; specifically at Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.12	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.83].</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.13	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that “Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.”</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiara Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.30	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.49	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lance Lones	FS81.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Andy Foster	FS86.18	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whānui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.83]</p>	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.84	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	<p>Considers that overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p>	Seeks that any other relief to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.23	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.23	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.14	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.31	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.50	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lance Lones	FS81.16	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.85	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.</p> <p>Submitter supports the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui.</p> <p>Concerns there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their ancestral lands.</p>	Seeks that the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford is removed; specifically at Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST.
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.85].</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.32	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.51	Part 2 /Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.17	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.19	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whānui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.85]</p>	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.86	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	Considers that overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.	Seeks that any other relief to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.24	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.24	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.16	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.33	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.52	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lance Lones	FS81.18	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.255	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	<p>Seeks that the subdivision chapter is amended to align with the decisions requested in submission points found in paragraph 4.68.1 to 4.68.3 of the original submission.</p> <p>[Refer to paragraphs 4.68.1 to 4.68.3 of the original submission]</p>
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.68	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.256	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the subdivision chapter is amended to discourage intensification of noise-sensitive activities through subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary or Outer Air Noise Overlay.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.69	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.257	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	A number of the objectives and policies restrict or limit subdivision activities in certain overlays. None of these provisions however reflect the ANB or 60dB Ldn Boundary for the Airport.	Seeks that objectives and policies in the subdivision are amended to ensure that Air Noise Boundary and the Outer Air Noise Overlay is sufficient to manage aircraft noise and reverse sensitivity effects.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.70	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.258	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	A number of the objectives and policies restrict or limit subdivision activities in certain overlays. None of these provisions however reflect the ANB or 60dB Ldn Boundary for the Airport.	Seeks that subdivision activities are restricted within the 60dB Ldn Boundary.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.71	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.259	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the subdivision chapter is amended to simplify rules and remove repetition.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.72	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.260	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that further guidance is added with regards to where it is necessary for building platforms to be identified as a part of subdivision activity.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.73	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.261	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that there is no requirement for building platforms to be identified within the Airport Zone.
Wellington City Council	266.95	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose in part	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Seeks to delete matter of control / discretion below from the rules listed: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary. Relevant rules: SUB-R1.1.7 SUB-R2.2.4 SUB-R3.2.5 SUB-R3.3.8 SUB-R4.1.3 SUB-R4.2.4 SUB-R5.1.3 SUB-R5.2.7 SUB-R5.3.4 SUB-R17.1.3 SUB-R17.2.3 SUB-R18.1.1c SUB-R19.1.3 SUB-R22.1.3 SUB-R23.1.3 SUB-R26.1.3
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	FS116.4	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support	SSNZ Wellington agree that the consideration of "an consent noices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' provides a wide discretion and so is not appropriate for rules with controlled and discretionary restricted activity status.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.96	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Seeks to delete matter of control / discretion below from the rules listed: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary. Relevant rules: SUB-R1.1.7 SUB-R2.2.4 SUB-R3.2.5 SUB-R3.3.8 SUB-R4.1.3 SUB-R4.2.4 SUB-R5.1.3 SUB-R5.2.7 SUB-R5.3.4 SUB-R17.1.3 SUB-R17.2.3 SUB-R18.1.1c SUB-R19.1.3 SUB-R22.1.3 SUB-R23.1.3 SUB-R26.1.3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.166	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that in order to assist with plan interpretation and application, reference to the National Grid as a qualifying matter within the introductory/plan relationship text of the subdivision chapter of the PDP should be included.	Amend the introduction to the Subdivision Chapter as follows: Other relevant District Plan provisions It is important to note that in addition to the provisions in this chapter, subdivision must comply with all applicable rules and standards for qualifying matter areas and a number of other Part 2: District-Wide chapters also contain provisions that may be relevant, including: ... - Infrastructure - the subdivision chapter includes rules to implement objectives and policies in the Infrastructure Chapter where certain types of subdivision are in close proximity to some network utilities. <u>The National Grid is a qualifying matter with its rules to be applied.</u> ... Resource consent may therefore be required under rules in this chapter as well as other chapters. Unless specifically stated in a rule or in this chapter, resource consent is required under each relevant rule. The steps to determine the status of an activity are set out in the General Approach chapter.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.167	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support	Considers the introductory text to the Subdivision Chapter provides guidance as to the applicability of the rule and policy provisions. Supports this guidance, in particular the reference that the area specific and topic specific provisions apply. A minor amendment is sought to amend the reference 'topic specific' to 'district wide' as it is considered the term 'topic specific' is not otherwise used in the plan and therefore it may be unclear to plan users to which provisions the term applies.	Retain the Introductory text to the Subdivision Chapter, subject to a minor amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.168	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers the introductory text to the Subdivision Chapter provides guidance as to the applicability of the rule and policy provisions. Supports this guidance, in particular the reference that the area specific and topic specific provisions apply. A minor amendment is sought to amend the reference 'topic specific' to 'district wide' as it is considered the term 'topic specific' is not otherwise used in the plan and therefore it may be unclear to plan users to which provisions the term applies.	Amend the introductory text to the Subdivision Chapter as follows: ... Rule SUB-R1 relates specifically to subdivision of land for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Residential Zone. Subdivisions under Rule SUB-R1 are not subject to Rules SUB-R2 – SUB-R5, but are subject to the area specific and topic-specific district wide rules where the land also contains a corresponding planning notation or overlay.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.169	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support	Supports guidance provided within the introduction to the PDP that clarifies for plan users that the objectives and policies relating to subdivision within the National Grid Yard are provided within the INF Chapter. Considers such direction is necessary given the PDP chapters separates the rules from the supporting policy framework.	Seeks to retain the text within the 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' section of the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.178	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment, the first step to assessing the potential effects of an activity (such as subdivision) on natural character requires determining the natural character rating, both at the site and area scales. Therefore, including a new policy to direct natural character ratings to be identified in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment will ensure that potential effects can be managed as part of the assessment of environmental effects in accordance with the natural character rating.	Seeks to include a new process policy as requested in the Natural Character chapter, for WCC to identify natural character ratings in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment and, in the interim, for WCC officers to work with applicants for resource consent to determine as to whether a natural character assessment is required as part of a resource consent process.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.187	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support in part	The Introduction to the Subdivision chapter is generally supported, but amendments are sought to clarify the effects of poorly designed subdivisions are related to vacant lot subdivisions where the land use activities have not been designed.	Retain the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.188	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter should be amended to clarify how the effects of poorly designed subdivisions are related to vacant lot subdivisions where the land use activities have not been designed. Further amendments are sought to clarify that the District Plan seeks to provide a more enabling framework for combined land use and subdivision resource consents. Further amendments are sought for clarity as it is considered that the explanation of the application of the objectives, policies and rules is confusing and does not provide further clarity, and that the objectives, policies and rules themselves should clearly describe how they apply.	Amend the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter as follows: ... In addition to facilitating increased housing supply and choice, subdivision is related to the Council's aims for a more sustainable and resilient future for Wellington. For example, poorly designed <u>vacant lot</u> subdivisions can limit neighbourhood connectivity and cohesion, entailing also longer travel times, greater reliance on private vehicle transport and associated increases in greenhouse gas emissions. ... Poorly-designed <u>vacant lot</u> subdivisions can also lead to greater energy consumption an associated costs for home heating, relative to designs that make better use of solar aspect another renewable energy opportunities. <u>Objectives, policies, rules and standards included in the subdivision chapter seek to manage the effects of vacant lot subdivision.</u> When subdivision and related land use activities are assessed concurrently, it enables a comprehensive understanding of the resulting pattern, scale and density of development. For this reason, the Council prefers combined subdivision and land use resource consent applications to be made wherever possible <u>and therefore the District Plan provides a more enabling framework for combined subdivision and land use application. However, it is understood that such an integrated approach is not always practicable or preferable for applicants, for a variety of reasons.</u> ... Subdivisions commonly lead to in an increase in intensity of land use activity, and <u>additional</u> steps <u>may</u> need to be taken <u>for vacant lot at</u> subdivisions <u>stage</u> to ensure existing and future activities can be serviced for access, water supply, wastewater disposal, stormwater management, telecommunications and power supply.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.189	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter should be amended to clarify the effects of poorly designed subdivisions are related to vacant lot subdivisions where the land use activities have not been designed. Further amendments are sought to clarify that the District Plan seeks to provide a more enabling framework for combined land use and subdivision resource consents. Further amendments are sought for clarity as it is considered that the explanation of the application of the objectives, policies and rules is confusing and does not provide further clarity, and that the objectives, policies and rules themselves should clearly describe how they apply.	Amend the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter as follows: ... Subdivision is only permitted in limited circumstances. <u>Under</u> Section 223 of the RMA, <u>a</u> requires that a survey plan for such subdivisions may be submitted to Council for approval provided that a certificate of compliance has been obtained for the subdivision and that certificate has not lapsed. ... Rule SUB R1 relates specifically to subdivision of land for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Residential Zone. Subdivisions under Rule SUB R1 are not subject to Rules SUB R2 – SUB R5, but are subject to the area specific and topic specific rules where the land also contains a corresponding planning notation or overlay. With the exception of Rule SUB R1, the general subdivision objectives, policies and rules apply to all subdivision proposals, including those that affect land subject to other planning map notations, areas, or overlays. To the extent relevant, this includes Objectives SUB O1 and SUB O2, Policies SUB P1 – SUB P8, and Rules SUB R2 – SUB R5. In addition to those general provisions, the area specific and topic specific policies and rules apply to subdivisions affecting land subject to the applicable planning notation or overlay. This includes Policies SUB P9 – SUB P26, and Rules SUB R6 – SUB R31.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.190	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support in part	Headings in the Subdivision chapter are partially supported and some additional heading are proposed.	Retain the Subdivision chapter with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.191	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that the Subdivision chapter should be amended to have additional headings added to the chapter to categorise the policies to help with plan legibility and usability.	Amend the Subdivision chapter to add new policy headings as follows: <u>Historic Heritage and Cultural Values:</u> SUB-P8 – SUB-P13 <u>Natural Environment:</u> SUB-P14 – SUB-P19 <u>Coastal Environment:</u> SUB-P20 – SUB-P24 <u>Natural Hazards:</u> SUB-P25 – SUB-P26
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.192	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support in part	The introduction of notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities is supported. It is sought that this is applied to all restricted discretionary activities.	Retain the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter as notified, with chapter subject to amendments.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.57	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Considers it necessary to be notified of infrastructure activities adjacent to the rail corridor to ensure KiwiRail has the opportunity to be included in the planning assessment process. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.193	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that all rules in the Subdivision chapter should have a notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities. The technical nature of these breaches requires technical and/or engineering assessments, and public participation by way of limited or public notification will unlikely add anything to the consideration of the effects of these breaches. Particularly, the notification statuses for SUB-R1 generally relate to the land use activity and associated standards, and the subdivision itself is not generating additional effects that should trigger notification.	Amend all Rules in the Subdivision chapter to include a notification preclusion statement for activities under Restricted Discretionary as follows: <u>Notification:</u> <u>Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A or section 95B of the RMA.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.58	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Considers it necessary to be notified of infrastructure activities adjacent to the rail corridor to ensure KiwiRail has the opportunity to be included in the planning assessment process. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.136	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose	Blanket approach to non-notification of subdivision is too blunt an approach and inconsistent with the policy of the RMA. There is insufficient justification to depart from the usual notification tests.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.194	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose in part	Opposes the matter of control and matter of discretion to 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instructed necessary' with all controlled and restricted discretion activities are opposed. An amendment is sought for all Rules in the Subdivision chapter.	Opposes the matter of control and matter of discretion to 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instructed necessary' with all controlled and restricted discretion activities and requests amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.195	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that all Rules in the Subdivision chapter should be amended to remove matters of discretion for activities with controlled and restricted discretionary status referring to 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instructed necessary'. This should not be a determining matter for discretion when granting consent. Anticipated development is provided for within the framework of the underlying zone and relevant district plan provisions, and covenants and consent notices are tools that are currently provided for when necessary and appropriate under current legislation. Deletion is sought in all rules.	Amend all Rules in the Subdivision chapter to remove reference of "Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary".
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.196	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose in part	The inclusion of design guides as a statutory document and matter of discretion with the Subdivision chapter Rules is opposed. Design guides should act as a tool to give effect to the outcomes in the objectives and policies of the chapter. Deletion is sought in all rules.	Opposes all references to design guides throughout all rules in the plan.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.3	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose	The Design guides provide a useful and informative guide to design of subdivision and development and should be retained.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.24	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks that the improved design guides in the Proposed District Plan as notified are retained.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.197	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that all Rules in the Subdivision chapter should be amended to remove Design Guides. Design guides should act as a tool to give effect to the outcomes in the objectives and policies of the chapter and should not be considered as statutory documents in matters of discretion. Deletion is sought in all rules.	Amend all Rules in the Subdivision chapter to remove references of Design Guides.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.4	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose	The Design guides provide a useful and informative guide to design of subdivision and development and should be retained.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.262	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to other provisions within the subdivision chapter to remove the complex and duplicating consenting requirements for activities within the Airport Zone. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the subdivision chapter is amended to delete subdivision methods other than SUB-R4 insofar as they relate to infrastructure and/or provide clarification that the other provisions are not applicable to infrastructure.
Trelissick Park Group	168.17	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Amend	Considers that subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas.	Add a new provision to the Subdivision chapter to prevent subdivision in significant natural areas. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.190	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Amend	<p>The Submitter seeks an additional standard which subdivision activities shall be assessed against when located within specified distances of the state highway network. Notes that it is widely accepted nationally and internationally that noise from transport networks have the potential to cause adverse health and amenity effects on people living nearby. That potential has been documented by authoritative bodies such as the World Health Organisation (WHO), including the Publication Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European region in October 2018 (WHO Europe Guidelines).</p> <p>State highways pass through both urban and rural areas throughout the Wellington City District and most have sufficient traffic volumes to generate sound above WHO Europe Guideline levels, indicating there will be impacts on human health and amenity where noise sensitive activities locate nearby.</p> <p>Applying the metric setback approach is a moderately efficient and effective method of managing noise effects on human health when compared to alternatives such as do nothing, modelling a setback, or creating a 'no build' yard zone. In the future, the submitter may seek a change to this standard to reflect modelling data which is a highly efficient and effective method of management.</p> <p>[See original submission for further details]</p>	<p>Add a new Standard to the Subdivision chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>SUB-SX</u> <u>Subdivision resulting in the creation of new sites 100m of a State Highway (measured from the nearest painted edge of the carriageway).</u></p> <p><u>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. The potential adverse effects of noise generated from the road network.</u> <u>2. The potential adverse effects of site development on the efficient use and operation of the state highway network and the suitability of any mitigation measures relating to noise and vibration to enable the continued operation of the network.</u> <u>3. Whether any consultation with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency has occurred and the outcome of that consultation.</u> <u>4. Whether a consent notice with regard to reverse sensitivity effects on the State Highway network is proposed.</u> <u>5. Whether any proposed building platform or development should be restricted to parts of the site.</u> <u>6. Whether there are any special topographical features or ground conditions which may mitigate effects on the operation of the State Highway network.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.56	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	<p>Supports the relief sought and seeks further amendment to include the rail corridor within this provision. If subdivision within 100m of the rail corridor had a RDIS activity status, noise and vibration management options could be considered for a whole development as opposed to on individual properties.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include rail corridor within provision
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.28	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Oppose	Stride is opposed to applying additional restrictions within 100m of a state highway and considers that this amendment seeks to unfairly impose the costs of mitigating state highway noise on private landowners. As noted above, this blanket rule lacks nuance and may impose an unreasonable burden on subdivision, and other controls are more appropriate to manage any effects of the subdivision on the state highway.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.28	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Oppose	Investore is opposed to applying additional restrictions within 100m of a state highway and considers that this amendment seeks to unfairly impose the costs of mitigating state highway noise on private landowners. As noted above, this blanket rule lacks nuance and may impose an unreasonable burden on subdivision, and other controls are more appropriate to manage any effects of the subdivision on the state highway.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.198	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Amend	Considers that the Subdivision chapter should have an additional objective added to the subdivision chapter which speaks directly to the outcomes sought for subdivision within or on land identified as having historical values, natural environmental values and coastal values. This addition is sought to set a clear overarching objective to the policies concerned with these environments which are more sensitive to change.	<p>Add a new Objective to the Subdivision chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>SUB-O[number]</u></p> <p><u>Subdivision is managed in areas with identified historical values, natural environmental and coastal values, where subdivision can have adverse effects on the values that the District Plan seeks to manage or protect.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.5	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Support	The new objective suggested by the submitter has merit, and serves to support the subsequent policies and rules.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.263	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Amend	Considers that a new policy is required to address subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary.	Add a new policy to SUB chapter as follows: <u>SUB-P27 Subdivision of land affected by the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary</u> <u>Avoid subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary where the potential future permitted density of noise sensitive activities will give rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects on Wellington International Airport.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.122	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed policy which would unnecessarily constrain urban development within areas that would be suitable for high density development and where adverse effects can be managed through acoustic insulation and ventilation requirements.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.74	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.57	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Support	Considers that the policy from the operative district plan should be added [see original submission for full reasons]	Add a new policy as follows: <i>"Protect the heritage values of listed buildings, objects, areas and scheduled archaeological sites by ensuring that the effects of subdivision and development on the same site as any listed building or object are avoided, remedied and mitigated"</i>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.6	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Support	New policy addressing the avoidance of adverse effects of subdivision on heritage places. While policies SUB-P10, SUB-P11, and SUB-P12 address subdivision of land containing historic heritage features, these policies provide for subdivision, having regard to certain relevant matters. The addition of a policy for avoiding or mitigating adverse effects has merit.	Allow
John Tiley	142.13	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that the focus of SUB-O1 is on efficient development but is silent on preservation of landscape amenity values. The objective is unbalanced should be rewritten.	Seeks that SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) is rewritten to provide greater balance between efficient development and the preservation of landscape amenity values. [Inferred decision requested].
Churton Park Community Association	189.13	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that the focus of SUB-O1 is on efficient development but is silent on preservation of landscape amenity values. The objective is unbalanced should be rewritten.	Seeks that SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) is rewritten to provide greater balance between efficient development and the preservation of landscape amenity values. [Inferred decision requested].
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.105	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support	Supports the objective as it promotes adequate servicing of new subdivisions, including for water supply.	Retain SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as notified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.20	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that Marshall's Ridge should be given protection through the strengthening of the objective.	Amend SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) to give further protection to Marshall's Ridge and other ridgelines within the area.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.50	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. SUB-O1 is supported in that the electricity distribution network is clearly identified as being associated with efficient development. However, the need for a separate definition for development infrastructure is still reflected in SUB-O1. It is because of this concern that position remains neutral to the objective as currently worded.	Not specified.
Waka Kotahi	370.191	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support in part	Supports with amendment.	Supports SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.192	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers an additional outcome sought for subdivision activities to ensure that development considers land use and transport in an integrated manner throughout both the urban and rural areas as all development should consider the connections to the movement of people.	Amend Objective SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as follows: ... 6. The provision of electricity connections to the legal boundary or each allotment; and 7. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.; <u>and</u> 8. <u>Any potential adverse effects of site development on the efficient use and operation of the roading and state highway network.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.59	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support	Supports the additional clause 8 but seeks that this matter is broadened to also consider potential adverse effects on the efficient use and operation of the rail network as sought in our primary submission. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include rail corridor within provision
LIVE WELLington	FS96.91	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	More enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.29	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Stride is opposed to this requested amendment as it is inappropriately broad and may be interpreted to require all subdivision to consider potential effects on the state highway network.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.29	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Investore is opposed to this requested amendment as it is inappropriately broad and may be interpreted to require all subdivision to consider potential effects on the state highway network.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.162	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support	This objective is in line with the overall strategic objectives of the plan, spatial plan and proposed Regional Policy Statement.	Retain SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.199	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support in part	Objective SUB-O1 is generally supported, but minor amendments are sought to recognise that the zone purpose, form and function along with amenity values will change overtime.	Retain Objective SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.200	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that Objective SUB-O1 should be amended to recognise that the zone purpose, form and function along with amenity values will change overtime. This objective should align with Policy-5 that recognises the scale and intensity anticipated for the underlying zone.	Amend Objective SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as follows: Subdivision achieves an efficient development pattern that: 1. Maintains or enhances Wellington's compact urban form; 2. Is compatible with the nature, scale and intensity anticipated for the underlying zone and local context ; 3. Enables <u>flexibility, innovation and choice for appropriate</u> future development and use of resulting land or buildings; and 4. Is supported by development infrastructure and additional infrastructure for existing and anticipated future activities.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.137	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Consider local context is an important consideration for a consent authority. Local context ties in with the RMA's purpose of sustainable development.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.264	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose in part	Opposes SUB-O1. [see paragraph 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.265	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Opposes SUB-O1. [see paragraph 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as follows: ... <u>5. Avoids development that is incompatible with regionally significant infrastructure.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.60	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support	Supports amendment to this policy to ensure regionally significant infrastructure is protected. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.123	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment which would constrain urban development. Furthermore, the amendment results in a lack of clarity for Plan users to understand what development may be incompatible.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.97	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that subdivision, and associated land use development that subdivision enables, can compromise public safety and the safe operation of the rail network if inappropriately designed. KiwiRail seek amendment to SUB-O1 to recognise the value of the transport network, and the need to maintain the safety and efficiency of this network.	Amend SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as follows: Subdivision achieves an efficient development pattern that: 1 Maintains or enhances Wellington’s compact urban form; 2. Is compatible with the zone purpose, local context and associated amenity values; 3 Enables appropriate future development and use of resulting land or buildings; and 4 Is supported by development infrastructure and additional infrastructure for existing and anticipated future activities. <u>5. Maintains the safety and efficiency of the transport network.</u>
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.19	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Stride is opposed to the insertion of reference to ‘maintains the safety and efficiency of the transport network’.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.19	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Investore is opposed to the insertion of reference to ‘maintains the safety and efficiency of the transport network’.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.163	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O2	Support	This objective recognises the importance of residents being able to access coastal and freshwater margins, and that in many areas such access doesn’t exist, or is difficult.	Retain SUB-O2 (Esplanades) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.256	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P1	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P1 (Recognising and providing for subdivision) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.164	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P1	Support	SUB-S1 is supported as it helps give effect to the Subdivision objectives.	Retain SUB-P1 (Recognising and providing for subdivision) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.201	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P1	Support	SUB-P1 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P1 (Recognising and providing for subdivision) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.257	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P2 (Boundary adjustments and amalgamation) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.165	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Support	SUB-P2 is important as it will help reduce barriers in situations where such re-adjustments can provide cost-effective ways of achieving better development patterns in the city.	Retain SUB-P2 (Boundary adjustments and amalgamation) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.202	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Support in part	SUB-P2 is generally supported with a minor amendment.	Retain SUB-P2 (Boundary adjustments and amalgamation) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.203	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Amend	Considers SUB-P2 should be amended to recognise what is anticipated by the underlying zone.	Amend SUB-P2 (Boundary adjustments and amalgamation) as follows: Enable boundary adjustments and site amalgamation to enhance the efficient use of land, provided that the nature and scale of resulting development potential is compatible with the <u>underlying zone local context</u> .
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.138	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Oppose	Consider local context is an important consideration for a consent authority. Local context ties in with the RMA's purpose of sustainable development.	Disallow
Trelissick Park Group	168.18	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support	Supports that SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.258	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.179	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support in part	Supports the direction in this policy, and its role as a matter of discretion throughout the subdivision chapter.	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design), subject to amendments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.180	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Amend	Considers that proposed RPS Change 1 (policy FW.2) seeks for District Plans to address water demand and include provisions to improve water efficiency. An additional subclause to SUB-P3 regarding encouraging efficient water use would have regard to this policy. The Wellington Regional Public Transport Plan 2021 states Greater Wellington will work with its regional partners to ensure new subdivisions can accommodate public transport. The policy wording can be strengthened for public transport to signal that subdivisions should be designed to ensure public transport routes can be provided for, and vehicles can access those routes. Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies CC.3 and CC.9 in particular) seeks for District Plans to contribute to reduction in transport-related greenhouse gas emissions. Subdivision design can aid in reducing greenhouse gas emission through actions such as the use of renewable energy, providing infrastructure to enable the use of non-fossil fuel transport and reducing urban sprawl. Policy SUB-P3 should include the need for subdivision design to support greenhouse gas emission reductions	Amend wording in SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) to include 'provide for' public transport, encourage efficient water use and support greenhouse gas emission reductions as follows: ... <u>2a. Encourage the efficient use of water:</u> ... 5. Support walking and cycling <u>opportunities</u> , and <u>provide for</u> public transport opportunities, and enhance neighbourhood and network connectivity and safety; and 6. Are adaptive to the effects of climate change. And <u>7. Support greenhouse gas emission reductions</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.193	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Amend	The submitter requests that an additional clause be added, providing for local and other centres in proposed subdivisions to support reduced reliance on private vehicle travel & reduced emissions. Most large-scale subdivisions, whether it be brownfield or greenfield development, will still contribute to the vitality of the nearest commercial centre. As such, the proximity of the nearest centre should be considered across the board not just in new development areas.	Amend SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as follows: ... <u>7. Considers the ability of future residents to meet their day-to-day needs within the immediate area.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.166	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support	SUB-P3 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.204	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support in part	SUB-P3 is generally supported	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) with amendment.
Hilary Watson	FS74.5	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.205	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Amend	Considers that SUB-P3 should be amended to provide the flexibility where practicable to achieve such outcomes as not all developments can achieve and attain all aspects in design and layout. Amendments also sought to remove reference to renewable energy as it is already captured under 'natural and physical resources.'	Amend SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as follows: Provide Encourage and promote for subdivision design and layout that makes efficient use of renewable energy and other natural and physical resources, and delivers well-connected, resilient communities including development patterns that: 1. Maximise solar gain; 2. Incorporate effective water sensitive design <u>where practicable</u> ; 3. Achieve <u>Provide for</u> hydraulic neutrality; 4. Provide for safe vehicle access; 5. Support walking, cycling and public transport opportunities and enhance neighbourhood and network connectivity and safety; and 6. Are adaptive to the effects of climate change.
Hilary Watson	FS74.6	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.80	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's suggested amendments as it weakens the policy direction. The policy as notified has better regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-P3 is retained as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.11	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Oppose weakening of SUB-P3. Hydraulic neutrality is critical to reducing stormwater runoff and subsequent pollution into Wellington Harbour. Also needs to give effect to NPS-FM 2020.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-P3 is retained as notified to ensure hydraulic neutrality is achieved.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.98	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Amend	Considers that effective subdivision design can enable development that provides for the health and well-being of people and communities by managing reverse sensitivity effects on established uses. KiwiRail seek amendment to SUB-P3 to address the potential for adverse effects on the infrastructure, including the rail corridor. The addition of clause 7 ensures adverse effects of activities are rightfully considered at subdivision design stage. This also provides for consistency with Policy INF-P7 in the Infrastructure Chapter and ensures this policy is given effect to as intended. KiwiRail support policy for subdivision design to incorporate water sensitive design and to achieve hydraulic neutrality as provided in clause 2 and 3. KiwiRail seek to ensure neighbouring development does not result in stormwater discharge onto the rail corridor which can compromise the safe and efficient operation of the rail network. KiwiRail further support clause 4 that provides for subdivision with safe vehicle access. KiwiRail seek to ensure safety at rail level crossings is maintained.	Amend SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as follows: Provide for subdivision design and layout that makes efficient use of renewable energy and other natural and physical resources, and delivers well-connected, resilient communities including development patterns that: 1. Maximise solar gain; 2. Incorporate effective water sensitive design; 3. Achieve hydraulic neutrality; 4. Provide for safe vehicle access; 5. Support walking, cycling and public transport opportunities and enhance neighbourhood and network connectivity and safety; and 6. Are adaptive to the effects of climate change; <u>and</u> 7. <u>Manage adverse effects of activities through setbacks and design controls to achieve appropriate protection of infrastructure.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.30	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.20	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Stride considers this is unnecessary in light of the existing measures to enable the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including designations, and it would be inappropriate to require development on adjoining land to do this.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.20	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	This is unnecessary in light of the existing measures to enable the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including designations, and it would be inappropriate to require development on adjoining land to do this.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.259	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P4	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P4 (Integration and layout of subdivision and development) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.167	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P4	Support	SUB-P4 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P4 (Integration and layout of subdivision and development) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.206	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P4	Support	SUB-P4 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P4 (Integration and layout of subdivision and development) as notified.
Peter Kelly	16.5	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P5	Amend	<p>Councillors have a democratic mandate to balance the interests of WCC residents against the important natural environment values represented by significant natural areas (SNAs). The Proposed Rules are essentially the Officer Draft Rules, but with the SNA designation removed from all residential zoned land.</p> <p>Requests that if SNAs are returned to residentially zoned land, the provisions in the draft District Plan are reinstated and fine-tuned.</p>	<p>If the Proposed District Plan is amended to allow Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land:</p> <p>Seeks that changes are made to SUB (Subdivision) to give effect to the following provision:</p> <p>Amend Draft District Plan SUB-P5 as follows: Provide for... "<u>and minimises vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas until 1 July 2027.</u>"</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.260	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P5	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P5 (Subdivision for residential activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.168	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P5	Support	SUB-P5 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P5 (Subdivision for residential activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.207	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P5	Support	SUB-P5 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P5 (Subdivision for residential activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.261	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.51	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	<p>Supports SUB-P6 to the extent that recognition and protection of lawfully established activities is provided for.</p> <p>Regionally Significant Infrastructure (RSI) located within the Rural and future urban zones provides a critical service and is required to operate safely and efficiently. To ensure the efficient operation of RSI the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity need to be suitably recognised and provided for in the PDP, which this provision does.</p>	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.194	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	Supports matter 3. "Do not increase the risk of reverse sensitivity effects arising on existing lawfully established activities".	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.169	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	SUB-P6 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.208	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	SUB-P6 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.106	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support	<p>Supports the policy as it promotes suitable access and connections to the reticulated water supply. Where this is not possible, SUB-P7 expects allotments to accommodate on-site water supply for firefighting purposes. However, in order to ensure that the on-site location, capacity and access to such supply is adequate for FENZ to respond to a fire, it is necessary for the supply to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. It is acknowledged however that existing standard SUB-S2 requires all new allotments, created through subdivision, to comply with the Code so this policy, and associated standards, are fully supported</p>	Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.262	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.181	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support in part	Supports this requirement to connect to reticulated networks where available.	Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing), subject to amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.182	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Amend	<p>Considers the PDP should provide for approved alternative wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Septic tanks are excluded from this recommendation due to their known issues with leakage of untreated wastewater and nitrates, particularly when poorly maintained.</p> <p>Providing for alternative wastewater treatment options aligns with recommendation 35 of Te Mahere Wai and gives effect to Te Mana o Te Wai. Alternative wastewater treatment options often reduce potable water use significantly. Reducing pressure of new development on the wastewater network may also make intensification in some areas with existing network capacity constraints more feasible.</p> <p>Relevant direction from the operative RPS includes policies 16 and 45. Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(r), FW.5 and 58. Regional plan rules would apply to discharges from all wastewater systems to manage potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality, aquatic ecosystems and soil health. These requirements could feasibly be met by approved alternative wastewater systems in both brownfield development and greenfield development.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-P7 (Servicing) to include direction in the Subdivision chapter to provide for decentralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using alternative wastewater systems (but not septic tanks due to their existing issues with contamination and leaching) anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available.</p> <p>Where connections are available and there is network capacity, a connection to the wastewater network would still be required.</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.183	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Amend	<p>Considers the PDP should provide for approved alternative wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Septic tanks are excluded from this recommendation due to their known issues with leakage of untreated wastewater and nitrates, particularly when poorly maintained.</p> <p>Providing for alternative wastewater treatment options aligns with recommendation 35 of Te Mahere Wai and gives effect to Te Mana o Te Wai. Alternative wastewater treatment options often reduce potable water use significantly. Reducing pressure of new development on the wastewater network may also make intensification in some areas with existing network capacity constraints more feasible.</p> <p>Relevant direction from the operative RPS includes policies 16 and 45. Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(r), FW.5 and 58. Regional plan rules would apply to discharges from all wastewater systems to manage potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality, aquatic ecosystems and soil health. These requirements could feasibly be met by approved alternative wastewater systems in both brownfield development and greenfield development.</p>	<p>Seeks to include any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.</p>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.52	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support in part	<p>Supports SUB-P7 to the extent that it is clear in that 'all allotments' (urban and rural) are to be adequately serviced by an electricity supply.</p> <p>Considers that the policy should be amended as infrastructure connectivity for 'Additional Infrastructure' should be recognised to the same extent of defined 'Development Infrastructure' at the policy level of the PDP.</p>	<p>Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) with amendment.</p>
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.53	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Amend	<p>Considers that SUB-P7 should be amended so that infrastructure connectivity for 'Additional Infrastructure' is recognised to the same extent of defined 'Development Infrastructure' at the policy level of the PDP.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-P7 (Servicing) as follows:</p> <p>Require all allotments created by any subdivision to be adequately serviced such that:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. <u>Suitable connections to telecommunications and electricity are supplied.</u></p>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.170	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support	<p>SUB-P7 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.</p>	<p>Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) as notified.</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.209	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support	<p>SUB-P7 is generally supported.</p>	<p>Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) as notified.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.263	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P8	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P8 (Esplanade requirements) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.171	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P8	Support	SUB-P8 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P8 (Esplanade requirements) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.210	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P8	Support	SUB-P8 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P8 (Esplanade requirements) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.264	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.172	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	SUB-P9 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.211	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	SUB-P9 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.55	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support in part	Supports the policy managing subdivision within Category A and B Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori. [Inferred reason]	Retain SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) with amendments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.116	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.56	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Amend	Considers that the policy could go further than presently drafted. [Inferred reason]	Amend SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) by requiring partnership and engagement with mana whenua rather than just having regard to the extent of consultation with mana whenua.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.117	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.
Wellington City Council	266.97	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers an additional matter should be included in SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) for consistency with SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas).	Amend SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land on which heritage buildings and heritage structures are located, having regard to: <u>a. The extent to which the subdivision and any anticipated development would detract from the identified heritage values;</u> 1-b. The identified relationship and contribution of the setting and surroundings of the site to the values of the heritage building or heritage structure; 2-c. The extent to which the subdivision would retain an appropriate setting for the heritage building or heritage structure; and 3-d. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.7	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Support	The additional matter appropriately addresses the potential for adverse effects on heritage values.	Allow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.265	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.173	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Support	SUB-P10 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.212	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Support in part	SUB-P10 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development.	Retain SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.213	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers that SUB-P10 should be amended to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development. Anticipated development is provided for within the framework of the underlying zone and relevant district plan provisions, and covenants and consent notices are tools that are currently provided for when necessary and appropriate under current legislation.	Amend SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land on which heritage buildings and heritage structures are located, having regard to: 1. The identified relationship and contribution of the setting and surroundings of the site to the values of the heritage building or heritage structure; 2. The extent to which the subdivision would retain an appropriate setting for the heritage building or heritage structure; and 3. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.8	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUBP10	Oppose	Reference to covenants or consent notices are appropriate methods for ongoing protection of heritage values. It is useful for applicants and decision makers are reminded of these methods when assessing applications for subdivision. [Inferred reference to submission 391.213]	Disallow / Retain as notified.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUBP10	Oppose	We oppose removal of regard for convenants and consent notices. It is appropriate to allow for convenants to control development for heritage buildings.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.14	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposes removal of regard for convenants and consent notices. It is appropriate to allow for convenants to control development for heritage buildings.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.58	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers that advice from a qualified heritage professional, included in SUB-P12 (subdivision in archaeological sites), is also important to include as a point under the policies for sub-divisions involving heritage buildings and areas to ensure adverse effects are avoided or mitigated.	Amend policy SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land on which heritage buildings and heritage structures are located, having regard to: 1. The identified relationship and contribution of the setting and surroundings of the site to the values of the heritage building or heritage structure; 2. The extent to which the subdivision would retain an appropriate setting for the heritage building or heritage structure; and 3. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development and ; 4. <u>The findings of any advice by a suitably qualified heritage professional;</u>
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.59	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers that consideration of any buildings and structures associated with the heritage values of the heritage building or structure should be considered.	Amend policy SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land on which heritage buildings and heritage structures are located, having regard to: 1. The identified relationship and contribution <u>of associated buildings and structures, of and</u> the setting and surroundings of the site to the values of the heritage building or heritage structure; 2. The extent to which the subdivision would retain an appropriate setting for the heritage building or heritage structure; and 3. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.60	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers that there are no rules or standards to achieve the outcomes in SUB-P10 to 12. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) be added as a restricted discretionary rule.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.266	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.174	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Support	SUB-P11 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.214	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Support in part	SUB-P11 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Retain SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.215	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Amend	Considers that SUB-P11 should be amended to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Amend SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land within heritage areas, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the subdivision and any anticipated development would detract from the identified heritage values; and 2. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.9	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUBP11	Oppose	Reference to covenants or consent notices are appropriate methods for ongoing protection of heritage values. It is useful for applicants and decision makers are reminded of these methods when assessing applications for subdivision.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.16	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUBP11	Oppose	Removal of regard for covenants and consent notices is opposed. It is appropriate to allow for covenants to control development for heritage areas.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Oppose	Removal of regard for covenants and consent notices is opposed. It is appropriate to allow for covenants to control development for heritage areas.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.61	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Amend	Considers that advice from a qualified heritage professional, included in SUB-P12 (subdivision in archaeological sites), is also important to include as a point under the policies for sub-divisions involving heritage buildings and areas to ensure adverse effects are avoided or mitigated.	Amend HH-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land within heritage areas, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the subdivision and any anticipated development would detract from the identified heritage values; and 2. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development; <u>and</u> 3. <u>The findings of any advice by a suitably qualified heritage professional.</u>
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.62	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Amend	Considers that there are no rules or standards to achieve the outcomes in SUB-P10 to 12. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) be added as a restricted discretionary rule.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.267	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.175	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Support	SUB-P12 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.216	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Support in part	SUB-P12 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Retain SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.217	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Amend	Considers that SUB-P12 should be amended to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Amend SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site, having regard to: ... 4. The outcomes of any consultation with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga; and 5. Whether controls such as covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage anticipated development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.10	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Oppose	Reference to covenants or consent notices are appropriate methods for ongoing protection of heritage values. It is useful for applicants and decision makers are reminded of these methods when assessing applications for subdivision.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.63	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Support	Supports the inclusion of the outcomes of consultation with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga to ensure that any archaeological authority provisions are recognised.	Retain SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.64	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Amend	Considers that there are no rules or standards to achieve the outcomes in SUB-P10 to 12. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) be added as a restricted discretionary rule.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.268	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P13	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P13 (Subdivision of land containing a notable tree) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.176	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P13	Support	SUB-P13 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P13 (Subdivision of land containing a notable tree) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.218	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P13	Support in part	SUB-P13 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Retain SUB-P13 (Subdivision of land containing a notable tree) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.219	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P13	Amend	Considers that SUB-P13 should be amended to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Amend SUB-P13 (Subdivision of land containing a notable tree) as follows: Require subdivision of land containing notable trees to support the maintenance of tree health and minimise the potential for interference, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the location of new boundaries relative to the notable tree and any anticipated development will increase the risk of the interference with property; 2. Whether controls such as consent notices or covenants can be imposed on any new allotment; and 3. Whether site access and new utilities can be located outside of the root protection area of the notable tree.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.269	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P14 (Subdivision within riparian margins) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.184	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Oppose in part	Opposes the use of 'provide for' relating to subdivision in riparian margins. The proposed policy does not contribute to NATC-O1 to preserve and protect natural character within riparian margins from inappropriate subdivision.	Opposes SUB-P14 (Subdivision within riparian margins) and seeks amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.185	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Amend	Opposes the use of 'provide for' relating to subdivision in riparian margins. The proposed policy does not contribute to NATC-O1 to preserve and protect natural character within riparian margins from inappropriate subdivision.	Amend SUB-P14 (Subdivision within riparian margins) as follows: Provide for subdivision within riparian margins where- 1. The natural character is protected; and The subdivisions is designed to minimise the adverse effects of future use and development enabled by the subdivision on the natural character. Only allow for subdivision in riparian margins where adverse effect on natural character are avoided, and other adverse effects on natural character are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.32	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.177	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Support	SUB-P14 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P14 (Subdivision within riparian margins) as notified.
Trelissick Park Group	168.19	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Oppose	Considers that subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas.	Delete SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified (as subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas).
Tyers Stream Group	221.67	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Not specified	Considers that the main issue with the provision is that this has no effect in the absence of any SNAs on private residential land.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tyers Stream Group	221.68	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Not specified	Considers that avoid is a high bar for subdivision to cross, except for the 'where practicable'. The effects management hierarchy is very similar to that proposed in the NPSIB.	Seeks that accounting mechanism be developed if offsetting and compensation is contemplated and suggests this could be a fund to deliver more or better biodiversity elsewhere, on a 'net gain' basis.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.270	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Support in part	e introduction to this chapter states that it contains policies and rules that implement the objectives in the ECO chapter, where subdivision affects an SNA. We note that this chapter has taken the approach of replicating (although not exactly) some of the policies from the ECO chapter. An alternative approach would be to cross reference the EC policies in this chapter. Either can work, however, care needs to be taken to be clear which policies apply to subdivision, and to ensure that all relevant policies are included in the subdivision chapter. Because the ECO policies already apply to subdivision (e.g. ECO P1, P3) it may be simpler to cross reference the ECO policies in this subdivision chapter.	Amend SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) to refer to ECO policies to avoid repetition. <u>Protect significant natural areas by applying ECO-P1, ECO-P3, ECO XX (re maintenance of biodiversity) and ECO P5.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.271	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Support in part	If the replication approach is retained, there will also need to be replication of ECO P5, to ensure that the NZCPS is given effect to.	Amend SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) to align with relief sought on ECO policies: Protect the biodiversity values of the identified significant natural areas with SCHEDULE by requiring subdivision, use and development to: 1. <u>Avoid adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity in the coastal environment to the extent stated in ECO P5 (or reference the replicated SUB policy);</u> 2. <u>Avoid the following adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values:</u> <u>a. Loss of ecosystem representation and extent;</u> <u>b. Disruption to sequences, mosaics or ecosystem function;</u> <u>c. Fragmentation or loss of buffering or connectivity within the SNA and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems; and</u> <u>d. A reduction in population size or occupancy of threatened species using the SNA for any part of their life cycle.</u> 3. Avoid other adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values where practicable; 4. Minimise <u>Mitigate</u> adverse effects on the biodiversity values where avoidance is not practicable; 5. Remedy adverse effects on the biodiversity values where they cannot be avoided or <u>mitigated</u> minimised ; 6. Only consider biodiversity offsetting for any residual adverse effects that cannot otherwise be avoided, mitigated minimised or remedied and where the principles of APP2 – Biodiversity Offsetting are met; and 7. Only consider biodiversity compensation after first considering biodiversity offsetting and where the principles of APP2 – Biodiversity Compensation are met.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.178	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Support	SUB-P15 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.50	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas).	Retain policy SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified.
Trelissick Park Group	168.20	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Oppose	Considers that subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas.	Delete SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas) as notified (as subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas).
Tyers Stream Group	221.69	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Not specified	Considers that the main issue with the provision is that this has no effect in the absence of any SNAs on private residential land.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.272	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Support in part	Seeks to delete this policy, and include the following policy as a replacement for SUB P15 and P16: SUB P-15 Protection of, and subdivision in significant natural areas Protect significant natural areas by applying ECO-P1, ECO-P3, ECO XX (re maintenance of biodiversity) and ECO P5.	Delete SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas) if cross reference policy relief is accepted for SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas): <u>Protect significant natural areas by applying ECO-P1, ECO-P3, ECO XX (re maintenance of biodiversity) and ECO P5.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.273	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Support in part	If the replication approach is retained, we seek amendments as per our submission points on ECO P3. We also note that this policy is slightly different from ECO-P3. It is not clear why this is. While this policy includes considerations absent from ECO-P3 (which are supported), arguably this policy applies a lesser standard, in that all that is required is that certain things are taken into account – typically the extent to which something is provided. ECO- P3 in contrast requires e.g. ‘ensures that the ecological processes’ (ECO-P3.4). As such, we prefer the formulation from ECO-P3, and have added the relevant additional requirements parts from SUB P16 below. We would also accept different wording, as long as the wording is clear that certain things must be achieved, not simply taken into account, or required to an extent.	Amend SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas): Only a Allow for subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas listed in SCHED10 where it: 1. Applies the effects management hierarchy approach in SUB P15; and 2. Demonstrates that it is appropriate, <u>including</u> by taking into account the findings of an ecological assessment for the activity in accordance with APP15; and 3. Provides protective covenants of the significant natural area; 4. Minimises fragmentation of the significant natural area; 5. Locates building platforms and vehicle accessways within the new lots outside the significant natural area; and 6. Ensures the activities effects on biodiversity values are appropriately managed in accordance with the effects management hierarchy, <u>and where residual effects remain after avoiding, remedying or mitigating,</u> to achieve no net loss of biodiversity values of the identified significant natural area; and 7. Ensures that the ecological processes, functions and integrity of the significant natural area are maintained.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.179	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Support	SUB-P16 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.51	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas).	Retain policy SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas) as notified.
John Tiley	142.14	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Oppose	Oppose SUB-P17 (Subdivision of land within ridgeline and hilltops) as the concept of subdividing on ridgelines does a disservice to the city’s landscape values, expressed in other plans and policies over the last twenty years.	Not specified.
Churton Park Community Association	189.14	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Oppose	Oppose SUB-17 as the concept of subdividing on ridgelines does a disservice to the city’s landscape values, expressed in other plans and policies over the last twenty years.	Not specified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.21	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Amend	Considers that Marshall's Ridge should be given protection through the strengthening of the policy.	Amend SUB-P17 (Subdivision of land within ridgeline and hilltops) to give further protection to Marshall's Ridge and other ridgelines within the area.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.274	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates NFL P2. We seek the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P17 (Subdivision of land within ridgeline and hilltops) to align with relief sought on NFL-P2.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.180	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Support	SUB-P17 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P17 (Subdivision of land within ridgeline and hilltops) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.275	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P18	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates NFL P3 and P4. We seek the same amendments sought for those policies here.	Amend SUB-P18 (Subdivision of land within special amenity landscapes) to align with relief sought on NFL-P3 and NFL-P4.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.181	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P18	Support	SUB-P18 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P18 (Subdivision of land within special amenity landscapes) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.276	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P19	Support in part	Supports the intent of this policy but have concerns regarding “Only allow” wording in ONFLs. As per the submission points on SCHED10 and NFL-P5, opposes the use of “identified” given the shortcomings of SCHED10. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P19 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located outside of the coastal environment) to align with relief sought on NFL-P5.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.182	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P19	Support	SUB-P19 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P19 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located outside of the coastal environment) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.277	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P20	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates NFL P5. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P20 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located within the coastal environment) to align with relief sought on NFL-P5.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.183	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P20	Support	SUB-P20 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P20 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located within the coastal environment) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.52	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P20	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P20 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located within the coastal environment).	Retain policy SUB-P20 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located within the coastal environment) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.278	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P21	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates NFL P6. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P21 (Subdivision of land within the landward extent of the coastal environment) to align with relief sought on NFL-P6.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.184	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P21	Support	SUB-P21 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P21 (Subdivision of land within the landward extent of the coastal environment) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.53	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P21	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P21 (Subdivision of land within the landward extent of the coastal environment).	Retain policy SUB-P21 (Subdivision of land within the landward extent of the coastal environment) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.279	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P22	Support in part	Considers the policy appears to replicate policy CE P5. Seeks the same amendments sought in relation to CE P5 to this policy.	Amend SUB-P22 (Subdivision of land within high coastal natural character areas) to align with relief sought on CE-P5.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.185	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P22	Support	SUB-P22 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P22 (Subdivision of land within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.54	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P22	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P22 (Subdivision of land within high coastal natural character areas).	Retain policy SUB-P22 (Subdivision of land within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.280	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P23	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates CE P6. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P23 (Subdivision of land within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City Centre Zone) to align with relief sought on CE-P6.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.186	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P23	Support	SUB-P23 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P23 (Subdivision of land within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City Centre Zone) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.281	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P24	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates CE P7. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P24 (Subdivision of land within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone and City Centre Zone) to align with relief sought on CE-P7.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.187	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P24	Support	SUB-P24 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P24 (Subdivision of land within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone and City Centre Zone) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.107	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	Supports the policy as it seeks to take a risk-based approach to the management of subdivision of land in locations where there is significant risk from natural hazards. This objective achieves the purpose of the RMA by providing for the safety and wellbeing of people and communities and addresses the risk to property across the city.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as notified.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.13	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	Supports this policy and the risk based approach to reducing natural hazard risk.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.282	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates CE P11. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) to align with relief sought on CE-P11.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.186	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.188	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	SUB-P25 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.220	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	SUB-P25 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.14	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Support	Supports this policy and the risk reduction measures being planned for in and around the port and railway areas of the Wellington Fault Overlay.	Retain SUB-26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.283	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.187	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Amend	Considers it appropriate to make amendments to bring the policy in line with the Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend SUB-P26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) as follows: Require subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay to incorporate mitigation measures that <u>minimise the reduce or avoid an increase in</u> risk to people, property and infrastructure from the ground shaking and fault rupture on the Wellington Fault.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.33	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.189	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Support	SUB-P26 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.110	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Oppose	Opposes SUB-P26 because the policy doesn't equate the process of subdivision per se which is not the land use or any structure which may be at increased risk from the Wellington Fault. This is included in the Natural Hazards chapter.	Delete SUB-P26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) in its entirety.
Peter Kelly	16.6	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Councillors have a democratic mandate to balance the interests of WCC residents against the important natural environment values represented by significant natural areas (SNAs). The Proposed Rules are essentially the Officer Draft Rules, but with the SNA designation removed from all residential zoned land. Requests that if SNAs are returned to residentially zoned land, the provisions in the draft District Plan are reinstated and fine-tuned.	If the Proposed District Plan is amended to allow Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land: Seeks that changes are made to SUB (Subdivision) to give effect to the following provision: Amend Draft District Plan SUB-R1 as follows: ... <u>8. Minimising vegetation loss within a Significant Natural Area.</u>
Chorus New Zealand Limited	88.1	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	The SUB-R1 is supported as it ensures populations in the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone have provision for fibre optic cables and continue to have access to world-class connectivity. If not provided at the time of subdivision, retroactively providing fibre optic cable connections can result in unnecessary and disruptive works and increased costs to the end user.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as notified.
Rachel Marr	89.1	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Opposes the non-notification clauses under SUB-R1 on the basis that subdivision can cause problems and judicial review is often too late to rectify the issue. Considers that an open policy that allows for the public to voice any concerns before the subdevelopment begins, would make it a smoother process during the subdevelopment and manage expectations. [See original submission for further detail]	Seeks an amendment to SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) for a more open process for consents with notification when neighbours will obviously be adversely affected by the work.
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.1	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	This rule has a notification preclusion relating to certain situations where there are 4 or more units complying with certain standards. For example, MRZ-S7 is a standard which specifically states it does not apply to multi-unit housing listed as a provision to be complied with for the notification preclusion for 4 or more units in SUB-R1, despite MRZ-S7 saying that it doesn't apply to multi-unit housing. This wording needs to be made clearer.	Seeks that SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) is amended so that where a standard does not apply to multi-unit housing, it is not highlighted as being necessary to consider under a notification preclusion.
Wellington City Council	266.98	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose in part	Considers the rule does not have legal effect.	Remove the gavel for SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone)
Wellington City Council	266.99	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control from rule SUB-R1.1.7 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.108	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	Supports the rule as it controls the provision of water supply for subdivision for the purpose of establishing residential units in the Medium and High Density Residential zones. The matters of control include the provision of a water supply connection for each allotment that meets the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, this is strongly supported by FENZ.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.65	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	Supports SUB-R1 to the extent it reflects MDRS clause 3.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	350.66	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support in part	Supports permitted activity status for signs P-1's provisions for appropriate signs, but opposes signs being required to meet all of the matters contained in the list. For example, an entrance sign for a retirement village is required but it is not to meet a regulatory or statutory requirement.	Amend Sign-P1 so signs are not required to comply with all of the listed matters, particularly (4) and (7).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.54	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support in part	Supports SUB-R1 as the subdivision of land associated with medium and high density land use development is required to be a controlled activity. Consideration of the NPSUD requirements is supported, with new records of title being certified under 223 and 224 of the RMA in conjunction with permitted development being controlled to the extent that a suitable connection to an electricity supply is provided.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) with amendment.
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.55	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Considers that SUB-R1 should be amended to be more robust regarding the degree of connection. As currently worded the Rule the "provision of electricity" does not instil an expectation that a safe and secure supply to an electricity supply network; but rather, merely that any given development has provision to the network. It is also noted that equipment is likely to also be required, which should be considered to facilitate the connection, not the development to an electricity supply.	Amend SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as follows: ... 6. The provision of <u>That connections to a safe and secure electricity supply network are provided</u> connections to the legal boundary or of each allotment; and ...
Waka Kotahi	370.195	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Seeks an additional matter of control relating to the management of adverse effects on noise.	Amend SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as follows: ... 6. The provision of electricity connections to the legal boundary or each allotment; and 7. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary; <u>and</u> 8. <u>Any potential adverse effects of site development on the efficient use and operation of the roading and state highway network.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.61	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	Supports the additional clause 8 but seeks that this matter is broadened to also consider potential adverse effects on the efficient use and operation of the rail network. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include rail corridor within provision
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.18	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed new matter of control.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.190	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	SUB-R1 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.221	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support in part	SUB-R1 is generally supported, but amendments are sought in matters of control.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) with amendment.
Hilary Watson	FS74.7	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.222	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Considers that SUB-R1 should be amended so that its matters of control are more consistent with other rules and standards in the Subdivision chapter. This would also be more appropriate with standards that are required to be complied with.	Amend SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Matters of control are: 1. The provision of practical, physical and legal access from each allotment directly to a formed legal road or by registered right of way; <u>2. Whether the subdivision necessitates a joint land use application.</u> <u>3. Compliance with SUB-S1, SUB-S2, SUB-S3, SUBS4, and SUB-S5</u> 2. The provision of a water supply connection to the Council's reticulated water supply system for each allotment sufficient to meet the levels of service in the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services 2022 and the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008; 2. The provision of a wastewater disposal connection to Council's reticulated wastewater system for each allotment sufficient to meet the level of service in the Wellington Regional Standard for Water Services 2022; 4. The provision of a stormwater connection to Council's reticulated stormwater system for each allotment sufficient to meet the level of service in the Wellington Regional Standard for Water Services 2022; 5. The provision of fibre optic cable connections to the legal boundary of each allotment; 6. The provision of electricity connections to the legal boundary of each allotment; and 7. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary. ...
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	FS14.1	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Fire and Emergency opposes the deletion of #2 matter of control relating to the provision of a water supply and firefighting water supply. Fire and Emergency consider it vital that the plan contains provisions which ensure all new land use development and subdivisions are supplied with an adequate firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, to provide for operational firefighting requirements. In order for Fire and Emergency to achieve its principal objective which includes protecting and preserving life and preventing or limiting damage to property, land and the environment, it is critical that water supply infrastructure of adequate capacity, pressures and accessibility is in place prior to development commencing. The Code of Practice sets out the minimum requirements for firefighting water and access in order for Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently in an emergency.	Disallow / Retain "The provision of a water supply connection to the Council's reticulated water supply system for each allotment sufficient to meet the levels of service in the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services 2022 and the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008." as a matter of control for SUB-R1.
Hilary Watson	FS74.8	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.27	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Considers that the notification status statement erroneously includes compliance with MRZ-S1 for subdivision for 4+ units when the standard only applies to subdivisions with 1-3 units.	Amend SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) to: Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly notified or limited notified if the subdivision is only associated with residential units that fully comply with density standards MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2 , MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7 and MRZ-S8 in the Medium Density Residential Zone; or HRZ-S1, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S4, HRZ-S5, HRZ-S6, HRZ-S7, HRZ-S8 and HRZ-S9 in the High Density Residential Zone. Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly or limited notified if the subdivision is associated with an application for the construction and use of 4 or more residential units that comply with density standards MRZ-S1 , MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7 and MRZ-S8 in the Medium Density Residential Zone; or HRZ-S1, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S4, HRZ-S5, HRZ-S6, HRZ-S7, HRZ-S8 and HRZ-S9 in the High Density Residential Zone.
Wellington City Council	266.100	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of discretion from rule SUB-R2.2.4 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment) as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.109	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Support	Supports the rule subject to the relief sought regarding SUB-S1 and SUB-S2, which will ensure water supply and access matters are sufficiently addressed for all new allotments. FENZ considers this will help ensure the safety and wellbeing of life, property, and the environment in relation to fire risk. FENZ considers the matters of discretion for Restricted Discretionary activities for SUB-R2, provide Council with the necessary scope to consider firefighting water supply and access matters, through consideration of SUB-P7 and the extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard.	Retain SUB-R2 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment) as notified. Support of this rule is subject to requested amendments to SUB-S1 and SUB-S2.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.191	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Support	SUB-R2 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R2 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.223	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Support in part	SUB-R2 is partially supported, with the expectation that it may be amended to fit with other proposed requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain SUB-R2 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment), with conditional amendment. [Refer to original submission]
Hilary Watson	FS74.9	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.28	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Amend	Consider that all subdivision rules should include the ability to assess and claim existing use rights for standards that are not met for existing buildings or situations.	Amend SUB-R2 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment) to: c. The subdivision will not lead to, or increase the degree of, non-compliance with land use standards of the applicable Zone.
Rod Halliday	25.23	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Amend	Considers that the 100m setback distance in SUB-R3.2 is arbitrary and may incur risks to the applicant.	Delete SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments) 3.2.e in its entirety.
Wellington City Council	266.101	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control/discretion from rule SUB-R3.2.5 (Boundary adjustments) and 3.3.8 as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.110	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Support	Supports the rule subject to the relief sought regarding SUB-S1 and SUB-S2, which will ensure water supply and access matters are sufficiently addressed for all new allotments as both a permitted and controlled activity. Further, matters of control consider SUB-P7. FENZ considers this will help ensure the safety and wellbeing of life, property, and the environment in relation to fire risk. FENZ considers the matters of discretion for Restricted Discretionary activities for SUB-R3, provide Council with the necessary scope to consider firefighting water supply and access matters, through consideration of SUB-P7 and the extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard.	Retain SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.192	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Support	SUB-R3 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.224	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Support in part	SUB-R3 is partially supported, with the expectation that it may be amended to fit with other proposed requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments), with conditional amendment. [Refer to original submission]
Hilary Watson	FS74.10	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.29	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Amend	Considers that all subdivision rules should include the ability to assess and claim existing use rights for standards that are not met for existing buildings or situations.	Amend SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments) to: c. The subdivision will not lead to, or increase the degree of, non-compliance with land use standards of the applicable Zone.
Tyers Stream Group	221.70	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support in part	Supports in part the provision of a connection to the water reticulation network except that it does not fund the upgrade needed for that network to cope with extra capacity required for the series of new subdivision.	Retain SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) with amendment.
Wellington City Council	266.102	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control/discretion from rule SUB-R4.1.3 and 4.2.4 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure) as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.
Waka Kotahi	370.196	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support in part	Supports with amendments, noted below.	Supports with amendment, noted below.
Waka Kotahi	370.197	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Amend	The submitter concurs that subdivision for the sole purpose of providing infrastructure should be a controlled activity however, considers that this rule should reference that it must be sought by a Network Utility Operator and this rule should not be subject to SUB-S6 (minimum dimension size) as this would result in an unnecessary burden on acquiring sites to deliver necessary infrastructure outcomes. Non-compliance with SUB-R4 should be retained as a Restricted Discretionary activity	Amend SUB-R4 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure) as follows: Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure 1. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. Subdivision is sought by a Network Utility Operator and b. Compliance is achieved with the following standards for any balance allotment: i. SUB-S1; and ii. SUB-S6; and SUB-S7.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.62	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support	Supports provision for a network utility operator to undertake subdivision as a controlled activity, subject to standards. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.193	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support	SUB-R4 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R4 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.225	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support in part	SUB-R4 is partially supported, with the expectation that it may be amended to fit with other proposed requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain SUB-R2 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure), with conditional amendment. [Refer to original submission]
Hilary Watson	FS74.11	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.266	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support	Supports SUB-R4.	Retain SUB-R4 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.103	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of discretion from rule SUB-R5.2.7 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment) and 5.3.4 as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.111	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Support	Supports the rule subject to the relief sought regarding SUB-S1 and SUB-S2, which will ensure water supply and access matters are sufficiently addressed for all new allotments as both a permitted and controlled activity. Further, matters of control consider SUB-P7. FENZ considers this will help ensure the safety and wellbeing of life, property, and the environment in relation to fire risk.	Retain SUB-R5 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.194	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Support	SUB-R5 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R5 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.226	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Support in part	SUB-R5 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to require a minimum shape standard for vacant lot subdivision to manage the creation of lot sizes that do not support the outcomes of the underlying zone.	Retain SUB-R5 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment), with amendment.
Hilary Watson	FS74.12	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.227	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Amend	Considers that SUB-R5 should be amended so that the Discretionary Activity status is given when minimum lot size and shape standards are not met. This activity status is considered appropriate as vacant lot subdivision that does not meet proposed minimum lot size and shape should not be anticipated within the zone. A minimum shape standard should be provided for vacant lot subdivision to manage the creation of lot sizes that do not support the outcomes of the underlying zone. Proposed minimum lot size and shape are sought through amendments to SUB-S6.	Amend SUB-R5.4 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment) as follows: 4. Activity Status: Discretionary where: a. The subdivision is not a controlled activity under SUB-R5.1 or a restricted discretionary activity under SUB-R5.2 or SUB-R5.3. ; b. Compliance with SUB-S6 is not achieved.
Hilary Watson	FS74.13	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.30	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Support	Supports SUB-R5.	Retain as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.112	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R6	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land. However, FENZ considers SUB-R6 does not provide appropriate consideration for the provision of services, particularly firefighting water supply and access to that supply. As such, FENZ seeks an amendment to SUB-R6 to provide Council with the discretion to consider these matters.	Support SUB-R6 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A and B), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.113	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R6	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land. However, FENZ considers SUB-R6 does not provide appropriate consideration for the provision of services, particularly firefighting water supply and access to that supply. As such, FENZ seeks an amendment to SUB-R6 to provide Council with the discretion to consider these matters.	Amend SUB-R6 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A and B) as follows: Matters of discretion: ... 1. The matters in SUB-P9-; and 2. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.195	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R6	Support	SUB-R6 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R6 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A and B) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.196	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R7	Support	SUB-R7 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R7 (Subdivision of a site on which a scheduled heritage building or object is located) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.197	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R8	Support	SUB-R8 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R8 (Subdivision of a site within a heritage area) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.198	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R9	Support	SUB-R9 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R9 (Subdivision of a site on which a scheduled archaeological site is located) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.199	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R10	Support	SUB-R10 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R10 (Subdivision of a site on which a notable tree is located) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.114	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Support in part	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.115	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area) as follows: Matters of discretion: 1. The matters in SUB-P15 and 16624, SUB-P16; <u>and</u> 2. <u>The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.284	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Support in part	Supports the requirement that the building platform be located outside the SNA for the RDA rule to apply. The RDA rule should also only apply where access to the building platform is also outside the SNA. The matters of discretion should be expanded to include ECO XX (re maintenance of biodiversity) and ECO P5, or their replicas in the SUB chapter (as sought above). Where the RDA requirements are not met, the activity should become non-complying	Amend SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. A future building platform to contain a residential unit is identified for each new undeveloped allotment that: i. Complies with the underlying zone provisions for buildings; and ii. Is located outside of the significant natural area. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in SUB-P15 and 16624, SUB-P16. 2. <u>The matters in ECO-P5 and ECO-PX (re: maintenance of biodiversity).</u> ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Non-complying</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.200	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Support	SUB-R11 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.55	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Support	Supports proposed Rule SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area).	Retain rule SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.116	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R12	Support in part	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Support SUB-R12 (Subdivision of land within significant amenity landscapes), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.117	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R12	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R12 (Subdivision of land within significant amenity landscapes) as follows: Matters of discretion: 1. The effects on the identified values of the special amenity landscape; and 2. The matters in SUB-P18; <u>and</u> 3. <u>The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.285	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R12	Support in part	Supports RD in SALs but seek that the matters of discretion be expanded to include NFL-P3 and NFL-P4 and cross reference new ECO and NFL policies sought above which are aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity outside of SNAs as well as ensuring policy 11 of the NZCPS is given effect to, outside of SNAs. Oppose the use of "identified" values as per our submission on SCHED11. Support discretionary status in 2.	Amend SUB-R12 (Subdivision of land within special amenity landscapes): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. A future building platform to contain a residential unit is identified for each new undeveloped allotment that: i. complies with the underlying zone provisions for buildings. Matters of discretion are: 1. The effects on the identified values of the special amenity landscape; and 2. The matters in SUB-P18 <u>3. The matters in NFL-P3, NFL-P4 [and ECO and NFL policies for maintenance of biodiversity outside SNAs and giving effect to Policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement]</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.201	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R12	Support	SUB-R12 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R12 (Subdivision of land within special amenity landscapes) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.118	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R13	Support in part	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Retain SUB-R13 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.119	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R13	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R13 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as follows: Matters of discretion: 1. The matters in SUB-P19 and SUB-P20; and 2. The effects on the identified values of the outstanding natural features or landscapes; and <u>3. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.286	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R13	Support in part	Supports the requirement that the future building platform is located outside of the outstanding natural feature or landscape. Considers this should be extended to also require that the access to the building platform is outside of the ONFL as well. Seeks that the matters of discretion for RDA refer to policies aimed at protecting ONFLs and the indigenous biodiversity located within them, including new ECO and NFL policies sought by F&B which are aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity outside of SNAs. Support Discretionary and Non-Complying status.	Amend SUB-R13 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. A future building platform to contain a residential unit <u>and access</u> is identified for each new undeveloped allotment that: i. complies with the underlying zone provisions for buildings; and ii. is located outside of the outstanding natural feature or landscape. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in SUB-P19 and SUB-P20; and 2. The effects on the identified values of the outstanding natural features or landscapes. <u>3. [Insert ECO and NFL policies for maintenance of biodiversity outside SNAs]</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.202	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R13	Support	SUB-R13 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R13 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.120	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R14	Support in part	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R14 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal margins and riparian margins), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.121	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R14	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R14 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal margins and riparian margins) as follows: Matters of discretion: 1. The matters in PA-P1, SUB-P8 and SUB-P21; <u>and</u> <u>2. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.287	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R14	Oppose in part	Considers that provisions which only protect areas of high natural character do not give effect to NZCPS policy 13. As such, we oppose the controlled rule, which would not allow the Council the ability to decline consent where there were significant adverse effects. In that context, RD is more appropriate. Ensure that the matters of discretion refer to policies aimed at protecting natural character, not only those concerning esplanade strips (SUB P8) and urban sprawl (SUB P21)	Amend SUB-R14 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal margins and riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Controlled <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: a. The subdivision is not located in any Open Space and Recreation Zone or the General Rural Zone; and b. Compliance is achieved with the following standards: i. SUB-S6; and ii. SUB-S7. Matters of control <u>discretion</u> are: The matters in PA-P1, SUB-P8 and SUB-P21, and <u>[insert references to policies that protect natural character]</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.203	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R14	Support	SUB-R14 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R14 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal margins and riparian margins) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.122	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Support in part	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.123	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins) as follows: Matters of discretion: 2. Any measures proposed to protect the natural character values of the area, including the location and size of future building platforms; and , 3. The matters in SUB-P14, SUB-P21, SUB-P24, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3; <u>and</u> <u>4. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.288	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Oppose in part	Opposes controlled status for this activity. As submitted in the Coastal Environment chapter, the requirement to protect natural character applies regardless of zoning. Ensure that the matters of discretion for the RDA refer to policies aimed at protecting natural character.	Amend SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Controlled <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: The subdivision is located in the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City-Centre Zone Matters of control <u>discretion</u> are: 1. The effect on coastal margins and riparian margins; 2. Any measures proposed to protect the natural character values of the area, including the location and size of future building platforms; and 3. The matters in SUB-P14, SUB-P21, SUB-P23, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3, <u>and [insert references to policies that protect natural character]</u> .
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.204	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Support	SUB-R15 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.56	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Support	Supports proposed Rule SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins).	Retain rule SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.124	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Support in part	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.125	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas) as follows: Matters of discretion: 2. Any measures proposed to protect the natural character values of the area, including the location and size of future building platforms; and 3. The matters in SUB-P14, SUB-P21, SUB-P22, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3; <u>and</u> 4. <u>The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.289	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Support in part	Supports the requirement that the building platform is outside the high natural character area. Considers this should be extended to also require that the access to the building platform is outside the high natural character area. Also seeks that this rule is extended to apply to all areas of natural character in the coastal environment. Considers matters of discretion must refer to policies aimed at the protection of natural character. Supports non-complying status.	Amend SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas): Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: A future building platform to contain a residential unit <u>and an access</u> is identified for each new undeveloped allotment that: complies with the underlying zone provisions for buildings; and is located outside of the high coastal natural character area. Matters of discretion are: 1. The effects on the identified coastal natural character values; 2. Any measures proposed to protect the natural character values of the area, including the location and size of future building platforms; and 3. The matters in SUB-P14, SUB-P21, SUB-P22, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3 <u>and [insert references to policies that protect natural character]</u> .
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.205	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Support	SUB-R16 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.57	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Support	Supports proposed Rule SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas).	Retain rule SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.104	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control/discretion from rule SUB-R17.2.3 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) and 17.1.3 as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.126	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium, or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault, or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.127	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium, or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault, or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: Matters of discretion: 2. Site access and the design of any vehicle parking and associated maneuvering areas proposed; and 3. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary; <u>and</u> 4. <u>The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.188	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Considers where the activity does not comply with Rule SUB-R17.1.b, i.e. the building platform is within a stream corridor, a non-complying activity status is more appropriate instead of discretionary as proposed in the notified rule. Non-complying activity status allows full scrutiny of the application as part of the consent process and sends a message to applicants that consents generally will not be granted.	Amend SUB-R17.1 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled <u>Non-Complying</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.206	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Support	SUB-R17 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.228	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Hilary Watson	FS74.14	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.59	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.229	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Amend SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled where: a. The building platform is not located within an identified overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay; and/or b. The building platform is not located within a stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay. Matters of control are: ... 3. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary. 2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary ... 3. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary; and
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.57	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.
Hilary Watson	FS74.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.60	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.267	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.268	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
Wellington City Council	266.105	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control from rule SUB-R18.1.1c (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, or within the Liquefaction, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.
Poneke Architects	292.3	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Opposes the Coastal Environment provisions in relation to subdivision as these are too broad and will effectively stop development in Wellington.	Delete references to the Coastal Environment in SUB-R18 (Subdivision of land in special amenity landscapes). [Inferred decision requested]
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.189	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Amend	Considers it is appropriate to require resource consent for subdivisions that create building platforms associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay. However, the activity status should be restricted discretionary, not controlled. Restricted discretionary activity status gives Council the ability to decline an application if it is considered inappropriate or the mitigation measures are inadequate. The matter listed under SUB-R18 (2) is considered appropriate for restricted activity status.	Amend SUB-R18. (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, or within the Liquefaction, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ... Retain SUB-R18 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low...) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.207	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Support	SUB-R18 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R18 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.230	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R18 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, or within the Liquefaction, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) and seeks amendments.
Hilary Watson	FS74.16	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.61	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.231	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Seeks amendments to SUB-R18 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, or within the Liquefaction, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) to remove the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.58	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.
Hilary Watson	FS74.17	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.62	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Wellington City Council	266.106	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control from rule SUB-R19.1.3 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.208	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Support	SUB-R19 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.232	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment. to remove the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.
Hilary Watson	FS74.18	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.63	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.233	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Seeks amendment to SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to remove the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.59	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Hilary Watson	FS74.19	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.64	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.269	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.270	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.209	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R20	Support	SUB-R20 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R20 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within overland flow...) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.271	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R20	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R20 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay or the Ohariu Fault Overlay) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.272	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R20	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R20 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay or the Ohariu Fault Overlay) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.210	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Support	SUB-R21 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.234	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose in part	SUB-R21 is opposed as it would prevent subdivision for residential activities in existing urban areas subject to coastal hazards such as Kilbirnie. An amendment is sought to change the activity status to Discretionary to allow for the potential for managing the hazard risk for residential activities. The reference to the 'Flood Hazard Overlays' is also opposed.	Opposes in part SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Hilary Watson	FS74.20	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.81	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-R21 and SUB-R25 are retained as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.235	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Amend	Considers that SUB-R21 should be amended, as it would prevent subdivision for residential activities in existing urban areas subject to coastal hazards such as Kilbirnie. Amendments to change the activity status to Discretionary to allow for the potential for managing the hazard risk for residential activities. Amendments are also sought to remove the reference to flood hazard overlays in the District Plan and to remove the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary'	Amend SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays 1. Activity Status: Non-Complying Discretionary
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.60	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the stream corridor of the flood hazard overlay and high coastal hazard overlay should remain non-compliant. Unimpeded stream corridors are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Additionally, coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area, and expose more people to increasing coastal hazard risk.	Disallow / Seeks that the parts of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay and coastal hazard overlay be disallowed.
Hilary Watson	FS74.21	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.273	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.274	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
Wellington City Council	266.107	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control from rule SUB-R22.1.3 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive areas within the Sheppards Fault, Terawhiti Fault or Liquefaction Overlays) as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.211	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Support	SUB-R22 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R22 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive areas within the Sheppards Fault, Terawhiti Fault or Liquefaction Overlays) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.236	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R22 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive areas within the Sheppards Fault, Terawhiti Fault or Liquefaction Overlays) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Hilary Watson	FS74.22	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.65	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.76	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.237	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Amend SUB-R22 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive areas within the Sheppards Fault, Terawhiti Fault or Liquefaction Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled ... 2. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary. [Inferred decision requested]
Hilary Watson	FS74.23	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.66	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.77	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow
Wellington City Council	266.108	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of discretion from rule SUB-R23.1.3 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.190	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Amend	Considers the policies listed in matter of discretion 1 should include Policy SUB-P25	Amend SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to include SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as a matter of discretion.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.212	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Support	SUB-R23 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.238	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Hilary Watson	FS74.24	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hilary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.67	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.78	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.239	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Amend SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays 1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary ... 2. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary. 4. The matters in NH-P6 for building platforms that are located in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay; and ... [Inferred decision requested]
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.61	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow / Toka Tū Ake EQC seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.68	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.79	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.275	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.276	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.213	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Support	SUB-R24 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.240	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.69	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.80	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.241	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Amend SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays [Inferred decision requested]
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.70	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.81	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.277	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.278	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.214	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Support	SUB-R25 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.242	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Oppose in part	SUB-R25 is opposed as it would prevent subdivision for residential activities in existing urban areas subject to coastal hazards such as Kilbirnie. Amendments to change the activity status to Discretionary to allow for the potential for managing the hazard risk for residential activities are sought. Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.82	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-R21 and SUB-R25 are retained as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.243	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Amend	Considers that SUB-R25 should be amended, as it would prevent subdivision for residential activities in existing urban areas subject to coastal hazards such as Kilbirnie. Amendments to change the activity status to Discretionary to allow for the potential for managing the hazard risk for residential activities. Amendments are also sought to remove the reference to flood hazard overlays in the District Plan and District Plan.	Amend SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays 1. Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u> [Inferred decision requested]
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.62	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the stream corridor of the flood hazard overlay, high coastal hazard overlay, and the Wellington and Ohariu Fault overlays should remain non-compliant for the following reasons: - Unimpeded stream corridors are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. - coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and - Rupture of the Wellington or Ohariu fault is the natural hazard which will create the most devastating impact on Wellington City. While ground shaking can't be 'planned' for (but built for), the amount of damage can be reduced by not locating buildings on the faults. Therefore the fault overlays need to be retained to avoid building on the faults. Amending hazard sensitive activities in these overlays to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area, exposes more people and properties to increasing coastal hazard risk, and exposes more people and properties to fault rupture. This is unacceptable even within already developed suburbs.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.279	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.280	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.
Wellington City Council	266.109	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R26	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control/discretion from rule SUB-R26.1.3 (Subdivision within the Wellington Fault Overlay or medium or high coastal hazard areas on land occupied by City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.215	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R26	Support	SUB-R26 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R26 (Subdivision within the Wellington Fault Overlay or medium or high coastal hazard areas on land...) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.281	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R26	Support in part	Supports this rule subject to the amendments sought to Policy CE-P20 of the Proposed Plan.	If amendments to CE-P20 in original submission are adopted: Retain SUB-R26 (Subdivision within the Wellington Fault Overlay or medium or high coastal hazard areas on land occupied by City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.110	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R27	Oppose	Considers the 'National Grid substation buffer' has been removed and as such this rule is no longer relevant.	Seeks to delete SUB-R27 in its entirety. AND: consequential renumbering of SUB-R28 to SUB-R31.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.39	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R27	Support	The deletion of the rule is consistent with the relief sought in the Transpower submission and is therefore supported.	Allow
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.170	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R27	Oppose	Submitter is not supportive of the rule and will not be pursuing it through the PDP process, noting there is no supporting definition of the substation buffer area to direct where the rule applies.	Delete Rule SUB-R27 (Subdivision in the National Grid substation buffer) in its entirety.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.216	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R27	Support	SUB-R27 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R27 (Subdivision in the National Grid substation buffer) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.171	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R28	Amend	Considers that on the basis the National Grid is a qualifying matter, the subdivision rule SUB-R28 should be addressed as part of the ISPP process.	Seeks that, subject to other amendments sought by the submitter to SUB-R28 (Subdivision in the National Grid Subdivision corridor) the rule be included within the IPI and made subject to the ISPP process.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.172	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R28	Support in part	Supports SUB-R28 on the basis the rule gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPS-ET and provides for the outcomes sought in INF-P7 (noting Transpower is seeking amendment to the policy). In particular the activity status is supported and reflects the approach in other district plans across New Zealand. Considers a restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision provides an appropriate incentive and opportunity to design subdivision layouts that avoid building sites within the National Grid Yard. Considers that Subdivision is the most effective point at which to ensure future reverse sensitivity effects, maintenance access issues, and adverse effects of transmission lines (including amenity issues) are avoided. This can be achieved by designing subdivision layouts to properly accommodate transmission corridors (including, for example, through the creation of reserves and/or open space where buffer corridors are located). The default non-complying status is supported where the standards cannot be met and reflects the strong policy directive of the NPS-ET. Seeks the following amendments: - Amend clause 2. to provide clarity and certainty the consideration also applies to the support structures, noting that transmission lines are not defined in the PDP. - Amend clause 5. to provide further direction as to the matters to consider when considering vegetation planting. - Provide as a matter of discretion, the risk of electrical hazards (new clause 8.).	Retain SUB-R28 (Subdivision in the National Grid subdivision corridor), subject to amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.173	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R28	Amend	<p>Supports SUB-R28 on the basis the rule gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPSET and provides for the outcomes sought in INF-P7 (noting Transpower is seeking amendment to the policy). In particular the activity status is supported and reflects the approach in other district plans across New Zealand. Considers a restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision provides an appropriate incentive and opportunity to design subdivision layouts that avoid building sites within the National Grid Yard. Considers that Subdivision is the most effective point at which to ensure future reverse sensitivity effects, maintenance access issues, and adverse effects of transmission lines (including amenity issues) are avoided. This can be achieved by designing subdivision layouts to properly accommodate transmission corridors (including, for example, through the creation of reserves and/or open space where buffer corridors are located). The default non-complying status is supported where the standards cannot be met and reflects the strong policy directive of the NPSET. Seeks the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend clause 2. to provide clarity and certainty the consideration also applies to the support structures, noting that transmission lines are not defined in the PDP. - Amend clause 5. to provide further direction as to the matters to consider when considering vegetation planting. - Provide as a matter of discretion, the risk of electrical hazards (new clause 8.). 	<p>Amend SUB-R28 (Subdivision in the National Grid subdivision corridor) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. The provision for the on-going efficient operation, maintenance, development and upgrade of the National Grid, including the ability for continued reasonable access to existing transmission lines <u>and support structures</u> for maintenance, inspections and upgrading;</p> <p>...</p> <p>5. The nature and location of any proposed vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of the National Grid, <u>and how such landscaping will impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development (including access) of the National Grid;</u></p> <p>6. The outcome of any consultation with Transpower; and</p> <p>7. The extent to which the design and layout of the subdivision demonstrates that a suitable building platform or platforms for a principal building or dwelling can be located outside of the National Grid Yard for each new allotment.</p> <p><u>8. The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage.</u></p> <p>...</p>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.217	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R28	Support	SUB-R28 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R28 (Subdivision in the National Grid subdivision corridor) as notified.
Firstgas Limited	304.39	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Amend	<p>Considers that SUB-R29 should not have a Permitted Activity status. New subdivision, and future land use development enabled by subdivision, can adversely affect the safe, efficient and effective functioning of the Gas Transmission Network including above-ground stations. The Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor, as well as above ground related infrastructure has the ability to affect how subdivision and development takes place. A Restricted Discretionary Activity is considered more appropriate to manage the consultation outcomes sought as part of a matter of discretion (not control) by Council.</p>	Delete SUB-R29.1 (Subdivision of land containing a Gas Transmission Pipeline corridor) in its entirety and replace with a new rule.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Firstgas Limited	304.40	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Amend	<p>Considers that SUB-R29 should be amended to ensure that it includes the subdivision of land containing and/or within 10m the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor or subdivision of land within 30m of above ground related infrastructure. The rule should be amended so that the subdivision of land containing and/or within 10m of a Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor or within 30m of above ground related infrastructure can be appropriately managed</p> <p>New subdivision, and future land use development enabled by subdivision, can adversely affect the safe, efficient and effective functioning of the Gas Transmission Network including above-ground stations. The Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor, as well as above ground related infrastructure has the ability to affect how subdivision and development takes place.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-R29.1 (Subdivision of land containing a Gas Transmission Pipeline corridor) as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision of land containing <u>and/or within 10m of a Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor or; Subdivision of land within 30m of above ground related infrastructure.</u></p> <p>Activity status: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The subdivision will not result in any building(s) (or any part of any building) or <u>sensitive residential</u> activities being located within <u>10m of the gas transmission pipeline corridor and/or within 30m of above ground related infrastructure;</u></p> <p>b. New allotment boundaries are outside of, and do not cross, the gas transmission pipeline corridor <u>and/or within 30m of above ground related infrastructure;</u></p> <p>c. The layout of allotments, including the balance area, and any associated earthworks, maintains physical and practical access to the Gas Transmission Pipeline; and</p> <p>d. The subdivision is not located in any Residential Zone.</p> <p>Matters of control are:</p> <p>....</p> <p>4. The extent to which the subdivision design allows for activities to be setback from the Gas Transmission Network pipeline; Gas Transmission Network pipeline;</p> <p>5. The nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of the Gas Transmission Network pipeline; and Gas Transmission Network pipeline; and</p> <p>6. The outcome of any consultation with the owner and operator of the gas transmission pipeline.</p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.64	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the changes sought. It is unclear where the spatial application of this rule will apply and as such a cost benefit analysis cannot be undertaken. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendments and introduction of the rule.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.218	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Support	SUB-R29 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R29 (Subdivision of land containing a Gas Transmission Pipeline corridor) as notified.
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.12	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Oppose	<p>Firstgas opposes this submission which seeks to retain Rule SUB-R29 as notified in relation to the subdivision of land containing a Gas Transmission Pipeline to align with Firstgas' original submission seeking to amend this rule.</p> <p>Firstgas is seeking to amend this rule so that it includes the subdivision of land containing or within 10m of a Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor or subdivision of land within 30m of above ground infrastructure.</p>	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.219	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Support	SUB-R30 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R30 (Subdivision with the Air Noise Boundary) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.282	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Support in part	<p>Supports the discretionary activity status for subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary, however, submits that this rule should also apply to the 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 in original submission for further detail.]</p>	Retain SUB-R30 (Subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.283	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Amend	<p>Supports the discretionary activity status for subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary, however, submits that this rule should also apply to the 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 in original submission for further detail.]</p>	<p>Amend SUB-R30 (Subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary) as follows:</p> <p>SUB-R30 Subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary <u>or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary</u></p> <p>Activity Status: Discretionary</p> <p><u>Notification status: For a resource consent application made in respect of Rule SUB-R30, WIAL must be considered to be an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.124	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment which would constrain urban development in a wide area. An assessment of affected parties should be determined on a case-by-case development dependent on the effects of the activity. A blanket notification requirement would result in unnecessary delays and constraints to development where adverse effects may already have been appropriately mitigated.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.75	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.220	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R31	Support	SUB-R31 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R31 (Any other subdivision) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.128	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Support in part	Supports standard as it requires allotments to have access to a formed legal road. However, FENZ requires vehicle access standards to help ensure accesses can accommodate a fire appliances. As per the feedback provided within the Infrastructure and Transport chapters, FENZ seeks an amendment to SUB-S1 to ensure sufficient access for firefighting appliances is provided to sites in unreticulated areas, or areas where the driveway exceeds hose run distances	Retain SUB-S1 (Access), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.129	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Amend	Supports standard as it requires allotments to have access to a formed legal road. However, FENZ requires vehicle access standards to help ensure accesses can accommodate a fire appliances. As per the feedback provided within the Infrastructure and Transport chapters, FENZ seeks an amendment to SUB-S1 to ensure sufficient access for firefighting appliances is provided to sites in unreticulated areas, or areas where the driveway exceeds hose run distances	Amend SUB-S1 (Access) as follows: Every allotment must have practical, physical and legal access directly to a formed legal road or by way of a registered right-of-way. <u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u> <u>a. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>b. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>c. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>d. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>e. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles; and</u> <u>f. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions.</u>
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	FS116.5	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Oppose	The requested changes for driveways longer than 50m are not consistent with Acceptable Solution C/AS1 Part 6 nor SNZ PAS 4509:2008. The requirements of SNZ PAS 4509:2008 are included as a matter of control under SUB-R1. Therefore, changes to SUB-S1 are not required	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.198	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Support in part	Supports with amendments, noted below.	Supports with amendment, noted below.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.92	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	More enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.199	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Amend	The Submitter seeks the addition of a note pertinent to this standard.	Amend SUB-S1 (Access) as follows: Every allotment must have practical, physical and legal access directly to a formed legal road or by way of a registered right-of-way. <u>Note, please refer to the requirements of Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Part IV of the Government Roadway Powers Act 1989 with regard to vehicle entrances onto state highways.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.31	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Oppose	Considers that this standard requires discretion to be exercised by Council, which is not appropriate for a standard. Considers that this standard replicates S106(1)(c) of the RMA and is therefore an unnecessary duplication.	Delete SUB-S1 (Access).
AdamsonShaw	137.1	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Considers that SUB-S2 should be clarified to refer to new <i>vacant</i> allotments. An allotment created around an existing dwelling (i.e. not a vacant allotment) will not create an adverse effects on the existing water supply arrangement currently serving the existing house. Therefore, upgrades to the existing water supply arrangement (to meet current standards by Wellington Water Limited) cannot be required in the form of a condition of the subdivision consent as per Section 108AA(1)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. The existing water supply arrangement servicing the existing dwelling on the allotment (as long as the dwelling is to remain as part of the subdivision) can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply) to specifically refer to new <i>vacant</i> allotments.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	FS116.6	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Support	Agree that where an existing house is retained on a new lot, that the existing water supply does not need to be replaced.	Allow
AdamsonShaw	137.2	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Considers that SUB-S2 should be clarified to ensure that existing water supply arrangements continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply) to add a point to ensure that existing water supply arrangements continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.130	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Support in part	Strongly supports the standard as it requires all new lots to be serviced with reticulated water supply where available and, where this is not possible or sufficient, the provision of an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply must be provided. FENZ also supports reference to the firefighting Code of Practice specifically within the standards as it gives assurance that new lots as required will have ability to connect to an adequate firefighting water supply which is best considered before the development of any new buildings on the lot. It is also essential that FENZ personnel are able to access such supplies to utilise for firefighting purposes. The standards for the facilitation of such access are also contained within the Code of Practice. Specific reference to the necessity to provide access to water supply in accordance with the Code is therefore sought. FENZ supports the assessment criteria where the standard is infringed which includes the suitability of the proposed water supply for firefighting purposes, including effects on people's health and safety, and on property. Where this standard is infringed, it is considered necessary for FENZ to be consulted on any such applications.	Supports SUB-S2 (Water supply), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.131	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Strongly supports the standard as it requires all new lots to be serviced with reticulated water supply where available and, where this is not possible or sufficient, the provision of an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply must be provided. FENZ also supports reference to the firefighting Code of Practice specifically within the standards as it gives assurance that new lots as required will have ability to connect to an adequate firefighting water supply which is best considered before the development of any new buildings on the lot. It is also essential that FENZ personnel are able to access such supplies to utilise for firefighting purposes. The standards for the facilitation of such access are also contained within the Code of Practice. Specific reference to the necessity to provide access to water supply in accordance with the Code is therefore sought. FENZ supports the assessment criteria where the standard is infringed which includes the suitability of the proposed water supply for firefighting purposes, including effects on people's health and safety, and on property. Where this standard is infringed, it is considered necessary for FENZ to be consulted on any such applications.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply) as follows: 1. Where a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems is available, all new allotments must: a. Be provided with a water supply connection at the allotment boundary, that provides the level of service in Chapter 6, Tables 6.1 and 6.2 of the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services May 2019; b. Comply with water supply requirements, <u>including the requirements for access to such supply</u> , in of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008; and 2. Where a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems is not available, all allotments must: a. Be provided with access to a self-sufficient potable water supply with a minimum volume of 10,000L; and b. Comply with the water supply requirements, <u>including the requirements for access to such supply</u> , of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.191	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Considers that this would reduce the demand on reticulated water supplies, to have regard to Policies FW.2, FW.3, FW.5 and CC.14 42 (q) in Proposed RPS Change 1, and Policy 45 in the Operative RPS.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply) to require new lots connecting to the Council's water supply system to include alternate supplies for non-potable use, such as roofwater collection systems among other possible sources.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.32	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Considers that this rule makes the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021 a permitted activity standard. Therefore considers that the document (or specific relevant provisions) should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan to allow submissions on the provisions, rather than being incorporated as a reference document. Considers that the consultation requirements of Schedule 1, Clause 34 of the RMA have therefore not been met. Considers that incorporating material by reference creates uncertainty for developers, as these documents can be amended by other entities (specifically Wellington Water) with no particular process. Notes that while there was some consultation, few issues were resolved. Notes that a District Plan change would be required to incorporate any new variations to the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply): Remove reference to the Regional Standard for Water Services Add minimum requirements for new connections into the District Plan as required by the Regional Standard for Water Services.
AdamsonShaw	137.3	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that SUB-S3 should be clarified to refer to new <i>vacant</i> allotments. An allotment created around an existing dwelling (i.e.. not a vacant allotment) will not create an adverse effects on the existing wastewater system/connection currently serving the existing house. Therefore, upgrades to the existing wastewater system/connection (to meet current standards by Wellington Water Limited) cannot be required in the form of a condition of the subdivision consent as per Section 108AA(1)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. The existing wastewater system/connection servicing the existing dwelling on the allotment (as long as the dwelling is to remain as part of the subdivision) can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S3 (Wastewater disposal) to specifically refer to new <u>vacant</u> allotments.
AdamsonShaw	137.4	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that SUB-S3 should be clarified to ensure that existing wastewater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S3 (Wastewater disposal) to add a point to ensure that existing wastewater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.192	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that the specific reference to septic tanks or soakage fields should be updated to refer to on-site domestic wastewater treatment and disposal.	Amend wording of SUB-S3 (Wastewater disposal) clause 2 as follows: Where a connection to Council's reticulated wastewater systems is not available, all allotments must be provided with <u>on-site wastewater systems</u> a septic tank or soakage field or an approved alternative means to dispose of sewage in a sanitary manner'.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.193	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that the standard should provide for using approved alternative wastewater systems for decentralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections aren't available. Providing for alternative wastewater treatment options aligns with recommendation 35 of Te Mahere Wai and gives effect to Te Mana o Te Wai. Alternative wastewater treatment options often reduce potable water use significantly. Reducing pressure of new development on the wastewater network may also make intensification in some areas with existing network capacity constraints more feasible. Relevant direction from the operative RPS includes policies 16 and 45. Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(r), FW.5 and 58. Regional plan rules would apply to discharges from all wastewater systems to manage potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality, aquatic ecosystems and soil health. These requirements could feasibly be met by approved alternative wastewater systems in both brownfield development and greenfield development.	Seeks that WCC provide for the possibility of de-centralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using alternative approved wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Where connections are available and there is network capacity, a connection to the wastewater network would still be required.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.194	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that this standard should refer to additional requirements for on-site wastewater discharge under the Natural Resources Plan.	Seeks to amend to refer to additional requirements for on-site wastewater discharge under the Natural Resources Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.33	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that this rule makes the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021 a permitted activity standard. Therefore considers that the document (or specific relevant provisions) should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan to allow submissions on the provisions, rather than being incorporated as a reference document. Considers that the consultation requirements of Schedule 1, Clause 34 of the RMA have therefore not been met. Considers that many of the "level of service" items listed in the Standard are not appropriate to be standards for the District Plan. For example, the on-site disposal standards require Council to exercise discretion, which creates uncertainty.	Amend SUB-S3 (Wastewater disposal): Remove reference to the Regional Standard for Water Services Add minimum requirements for new connections into the District Plan as required by the Regional Standard for Water Services.
Rod Halliday	25.24	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) needs to have an exemption, or a permitted activity standard that does not require hydraulic neutrality for sites upstream of the Stebbings or Seton Nossiter detention structure that are designed to hold back the 1 in 100 year storm event.	Seeks that an exemption be added in SUB-S4 (Stormwater management), point 2, where allotments should not be required to achieve hydraulic neutrality if they are located within the Stebbings or Seton Nossiter stormwater catchments.
Heidi Snelson	FS24.8	Part 2 / Subdivision Chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Oppose	Submitter is seeking to reduce mitigation requirements and responsibilities around hydraulic neutrality and permeable surface requirements in the case of storm water management at a unprecedented time of storm water damage in Wellington. Developments should undertake more mitigation not less in all areas given climate change. Especially those posing more risk, such as steep hillsides, abutting/above key infrastructure (roading, power, water, railway), and significant streams, such as at the sites of the current and planned developments in Churton Park and Glenside West. The Glenside West development area is downstream of both detention structures, on extremely steep hillsides, above Porirua Stream, directly above Middleton Road (State Highway 1 motorway detour route) and the North Island railway line (which runs alongside and over the Porirua Stream). This development area must be specifically required to achieve Hydraulic Neutrality. Be that through specific technological infrastructure in build design and water catchment, significant permeable surface requirements/planting. Through Large Lot Residential Only in Glenside West.	Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed to ensure strict adherence to hydraulic neutrality in Glenside West Development Area, and Stebbings Valley / Reedy Block Development Area. Seeks minimum standard of hydraulic neutrality required and corresponding requirement of high level of permeable surface mitigations. Seeks that Glenside West be designated Large Lot Residential only.
AdamsonShaw	137.5	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 should be clarified to refer to new <i>vacant</i> allotments. An allotment created around an existing dwelling (i.e.. not a vacant allotment) will not create an adverse effects on the existing stormwater system/connection currently serving the existing house. Therefore, upgrades to the existing stormwater system/connection (to meet current standards by Wellington Water Limited) cannot be required in the form of a condition of the subdivision consent as per Section 108AA(1)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. The existing stormwater system/connection servicing the existing dwelling on the allotment (as long as the dwelling is to remain as part of the subdivision) can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) to specifically refer to new <i>vacant</i> allotments.
AdamsonShaw	137.6	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 should be clarified to ensure that existing stormwater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) to add a point to ensure that existing stormwater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.
AdamsonShaw	137.7	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 should be clarified to reflect that subdivisions can involve creating allotments around existing dwellings. Allotments that contain existing dwellings do not need to be provided with hydraulic neutrality. This is because the dwelling existed prior to the subdivision and so the subdivision is not increasing the stormwater runoff on this allotment.	Amend SUB-S4.2 (Stormwater management) as follows: 2. All subdivisions <u>creating vacant allotments</u> must achieve hydraulic neutrality; and ...
AdamsonShaw	137.8	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 should be clarified to reflect that allotments that contain existing dwellings do not need to be provided with hydraulic neutrality.	Amend SUB-S4.2 (Stormwater management) to include a note pointing out that existing dwellings do not require hydraulic neutrality.
Trelissick Park Group	168.21	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Support	Supports that SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) as notified, with amendments below.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Trelissick Park Group	168.22	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that it is essential that all building developments, including infill housing, require at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development, and so infringement provisions for stormwater should be deleted.	Amend SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) as follows: ... Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:- 1. The extent to which the proposed stormwater management solution is sufficient for the development or activity it serves; 2. The extent to which the proposed stormwater management solution results in adverse effects on peoples' health and safety; 3. Whether the proposed stormwater management solution results in adverse flooding effects on other property, including on the effective function of Council's reticulated network; 4. Where Council's reticulated system is not immediately available but is likely to be in the near future, the appropriateness of temporary systems; and 5. Whether any site constraints make compliance impracticable.
Tyers Stream Group	221.71	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 is OK except that provision of a connection to the water reticulation network does not fund the upgrade needed for that network to cope with extra capacity required for the series of new subdivision.	Seeks amendment to SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) to require contributions from the subdivider to any upgrades, in proportion to the extent of upgrade required from the subdivision. [Inferred decision requested]
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.195	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers these standards should refer to additional requirements for stormwater discharge under the Natural Resources Plan.	Seeks to amend to refer to additional requirements for stormwater discharge under the Natural Resources Plan.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.34	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that this rule makes the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021 a permitted activity standard. Therefore considers that the document (or specific relevant provisions) should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan to allow submissions on the provisions, rather than being incorporated as a reference document. Considers that the consultation requirements of Schedule 1, Clause 34 of the RMA have therefore not been met. In the Standard, Tables 4.1 of the Standard provides a design level of service for a 10% AEP. However, Tables 4.2 and 4.3 evaluate floor levels and flood depths/flows in public areas, which are not relevant to the provision of stormwater connection for a lot.	Amend SUB-S4 (Stormwater management): Remove reference to the Regional Standard for Water Services Add minimum requirements for new connections into the District Plan as required by the Regional Standard for Water Services.
Chorus New Zealand Limited	88.2	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S5	Support	The SUB-S5 is supported as it ensures that appropriate subdivision activities within the relevant zones have provision for fibre optic cables. This provision achieves an appropriate balance to ensure that all allotments created by any subdivision are adequately serviced by telecommunications in accordance with SUB-P7.	Retain SUB-S5 (Telecommunications and power supply) as notified.
Rod Halliday	25.25	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S6	Amend	Considers that the use of the phrase 'capable of providing a platform within the 'built' area' in SUB-S6.8 (Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area) is ambiguous and subject to misinterpretation. This development should be treated like 'All other Zones'.	Amend SUB-S6.8 (Number, size and shape of allotments - Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area) as follows: ... Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area 8. Minimum allotment size and shape: Capable of providing a platform within the 'built' area nil [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.11	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S6	Oppose	<p>Supports unbuilt areas marked in grey remaining as 'no build' areas. Oppose any of these areas including the area marked in mustard/yellow (Fig 1 FS04) being used for medium density housing. Medium density housing would intrude into the hilltops and ridgelines, and any building platforms would require extensive earthworks causing sedimentation downstream and would fill existing deep gullies that contain and carry stormwater.</p> <p>Filling gullies for building platforms and roading is not sustainable watershed management and does not follow UN Sustainable Development Goals for addressing Climate Change. Council should ensure any proposed development for Glenside West promotes smarter water management and climate change adaptation solutions. Additionally, Council should protect the landscape as supported by the Boffa Miskell report <i>ibid</i> (2018): p 63). Refer to p 7-9 of this submission.</p> <p>Believe Council should discourage medium density housing on steep terrain as proposed for Glenside West and protect this landscape as supported by the Boffa Miskell (2018) report.</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for full reason, including attachment]</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 25.25]</p>	<p>Amend / Seeks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The grey unbuilt area in Glenside West is unsuitable land for housing. - The whole area shown in mustard/yellow is limited to Large Lot Residential. - No housing is built above the current Glenside-Churton park suburb boundary in order that the ridgeline is offered at least some degree of visual protection.
Heidi Snelson	FS24.10	Part 2 / Subdivision Chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S6	Oppose	<p>Submitter looks to remove and reduce requirements to keep development activities within 'built areas'.</p> <p>Submitter looks to remove need to adhere to defined limits around 'built area', 'non build' areas and activities. Submitter looks to undertake activities via their own discretion rather than those defined by the WCC/GWRC.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks requirements for discrete built areas and not allowing for "all other zone" considerations without defined limits.</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.244	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S6	Support in part	<p>SUB-S6 is generally supported, but amendments are sought regarding the exclusion of minimum lot size requirements and limits as applied by this standard.</p> <p>[Submitter refers to SUB-R6 instead of SUB-S6]</p>	<p>Retain SUB-S6 (Number, size and shape of allotments) with amendment.</p>

General District-wide Matters

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested				
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.245	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S6	Amend	<p>Considers that SUB-S6 should be amended to exclude minimum lot size requirements and limits as applied by this standard. However, considers that the minimum lot size in the Metropolitan Centre, Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre, Mixed Use and General Industrial Zone should be nil as well. Applying a minimum lot size is considered inconsistent with SUB-O1, SUB-P1 and SUB-P5.</p> <p>It is also sought by the submitter that a minimum shape factor standard is added for vacant allotments, to match with SUB-R5. The matters of control that apply to the creation of a vacant allotment ensure appropriate consideration is given to the feasible development of all vacant allotments which is considered sufficient to ensure small, undevelopable lots do not result.</p> <p>The submitter also requests the deletion to any reference of legal instruments as a matter of assessment criteria for considering and determining consent applications.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S6 (Number, size and shape of allotments) as follows:</p> <p>Number, size and shape of <u>vacant</u> allotments</p> <p>The following maximum <u>vacant</u> allotment number and minimum size and shape limits must be complied with for any fee simple subdivision:</p> <p>...</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Standard</td> <td>Limit</td> </tr> <tr> <td>....</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Vacant Allotments</u></p> <p><u>Minimum allotment shape</u> <u>Accommodate a rectangle of 8m x 15m.</u></p> <p>Metropolitan Centre, Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre, Mixed Use & General Industrial Zones</p> <p>5. Maximum number of allotments nil</p> <p>6. Minimum allotment size 500m² <u>nil</u></p> <p>7. Minimum allotment shape nil</p> <p>Assessment Criteria where the standard is infringed:</p> <p>1. The extent to which a higher density of <u>higher density of</u> development is compatible with the <u>anticipated zone purpose, form and function local site context</u>;</p> <p>...</p> <p>5. The effectiveness of any legal or instruments necessary to limit future intensification.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for table]</p>	Standard	Limit	
Standard	Limit								
....									
Rod Halliday	25.26	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S7	Amend	<p>Considers that SUB-S7 (Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips) seems inappropriate to apply to large rural lots as this will see huge tracts of riparian areas lost. SUB-S7 should be reverted back to the way it was written in Rule 15.4.5 in the Operative District Plan, with only lots less than 4ha in the rural zone captured.</p>	<p>Seeks that SUB-S7 (Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips) only applies to lots smaller than 4ha in Rural Zones.</p>				
Rod Halliday	25.27	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S7	Amend	<p>Considers that SUB-S7 (Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips) seems inappropriate to apply to large rural lots as this will see huge tracts of riparian areas lost. SUB-S7 should only be applicable to the following identified streams and tributaries, as stated in the Operative District Plan, Rule 15.4.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Porirua Stream and tributaries - Makara Stream and tributaries, including Ohariu Stream - Oteranga Stream and tributaries - Karori Stream and tributaries 	<p>Seeks that SUB-S7 (Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips) applies solely to the following streams and tributaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Porirua Stream and tributaries - Makara Stream and tributaries, including Ohariu Stream - Oteranga Stream and tributaries - Karori Stream and tributaries 				
Alan Fairless	242.11	General District wide Matters / General point on District wide Matters / General point on District wide Matters	Oppose	<p>Considers that amendments are needed to enable more limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects, to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.</p>	<p>Seeks that the Proposed District Plan includes greater provisions for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects.</p>				
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.1	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / General point on District wide Matters / General point on District wide Matters	Oppose	<p>Relief sought in original submission is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>				

General District-wide Matters - Coastal Environment

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.1	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / General point on District wide Matters / General point on District wide Matters	Oppose	Relief sought in original submission is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow
Grant Birkinshaw	52.4	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Opposes the Coastal Hazard overlay based on Tsunami occurrences. The Tsunami baseline is for CD evacuation procedures and as such is not appropriate in a legal document.	Not specified.
Melissa Harward	65.3	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support	Supports green infrastructure and planning coastal hazard mitigation works.	Retain Coastal Environment chapter as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.96	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	Considers that the text in the introduction describing Wellington's coastline is only partially accurate. The description fails to acknowledge the presence of the turbines, roads and other built facilities in the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms. Considers in this respect the description inaccurately depicts the actual character of the visible backdrop to the Moana Raukawa coastal environment as 'largely undeveloped'.	Retain the Introduction to the Coastal Environment chapter, with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.97	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers that the text in the introduction describing Wellington's coastline is only partially accurate. The description fails to acknowledge the presence of the turbines, roads and other built facilities in the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms. Considers in this respect the description inaccurately depicts the actual character of the visible backdrop to the Moana Raukawa coastal environment as 'largely undeveloped'.	Amend the text description in the introduction to read as follows (or similar) to acknowledge the presence of the built structures in the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms: Wellington City's coastline extends for over 100 kilometers kilometres . The western and southern parts of this coastline are largely undeveloped. Narrow shore platforms and steep escarpment and cliff faces are typical along this part of the coastline, where exposure to rigorous environmental conditions has helped shape rugged landforms. <u>Many areas of Wellington's rural coastal environment are largely undeveloped (for example, the west-facing and south-facing escarpments adjacent to Raukawa Moana (Cook's Strait) west of Owhiro Bay). Parts of the rural environment above the coastal escarpments have been modified by development (for example, by the establishment of the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms which now form part of the existing environment).</u> At the same time <u>The urban areas of the coastal environment have been heavily modified, with public roads present nearly the entire length of the coastline around the harbour from Sinclair Head to Petone, with and residential and commercial development having modified the natural character throughout this area.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	228.98	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	Considers the intention of the Plan to be that the rules for renewable electricity generation activities, structures and buildings would be wholly contained in the REG chapter. Meridian supports this approach. Considers The note in the preamble is not entirely helpful in clarifying this. Considers the standards listed for activities in the coastal environment are entirely inappropriate for renewable electricity generation activities and structures and should not be construed as a 'permitted baseline' for renewable electricity generation activities there, and particularly not for existing wind farms.	Retain the Introduction to the Coastal Environment Rules chapter with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.99	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers the intention of the Plan to be that the rules for renewable electricity generation activities, structures and buildings would be wholly contained in the REG chapter. Meridian supports this approach. Considers The note in the preamble is not entirely helpful in clarifying this. Considers the standards listed for activities in the coastal environment are entirely inappropriate for renewable electricity generation activities and structures and should not be construed as a 'permitted baseline' for renewable electricity generation activities there, and particularly not for existing wind farms.	Amend the Introduction to Chapter CE Coastal Environment Rules, by inserting, under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions', the following (or similar) clarification note: <u>The rules applicable to renewable electricity generation activities in the coastal environment, including in areas of high and very high coastal natural character, are contained in Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation. The rules in Chapter CE Coastal Environment do not apply to renewable electricity generation activities in the coastal environment, including in areas of high and very high coastal natural character in the coastal environment.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	Opposes parts of the Coastal Overlay as it relates to part of the exiting Horokiwi quarry site. An amended boundary is sought given the nature of the existing quarrying activities undertaken and modified nature of the environment. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the coastal environment line as it relates to Horokiwi is amended. [Refer to original submission, including figure and attachments]
Poneke Architects	292.4	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Opposes the Coastal Environment provisions as these are too broad and will effectively stop development in Wellington.	Delete the Coastal Environment chapter in its entirety. [Inferred decision requested]
Yvonne Weeber	340.19	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain the 'Coastal Environment' chapter as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.20	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the Coastal Environment chapter should be amended to include coastal hazards of storm surges and storm events. It is not only sea level rise that is causing coastal inundation but storm surges and storm events that are increasing due to climate change.	Amend the Introduction to the Coastal Environment chapter as follows: Coastal Hazards Wellington City's coastal environment is susceptible to a range of coastal hazards, which are mapped as Coastal Hazard Overlays. These include: 1. Tsunami; 2. Coastal inundation including sea level rise, <u>storm surges and storm events.</u>
Yvonne Weeber	340.21	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Activities related to mining and quarrying within the coastal environment mentioned in CE-P9 are opposed.	Seeks that Mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment not be permitted. [Inferred decision requested]
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.12	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Policy CE-P9 provides a policy framework for quarrying and mining activities within the coastal environment as opposed to activity status. The reasoning for the relief sought by the submitter is not clear.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.22	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment mentioned in CE-R10 and CE-R11 are opposed.	Not specified
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.290	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support in part	General comment on all rules - Notes policy 13 NZCPS requires that significant adverse effects are avoided in all natural character areas in the coastal environment, not only high natural character. As such, for any rule that applies to areas of high natural character, Forest & Bird seeks that it applies in any area of natural character.	Amend all rules to refer to all areas of "natural character", not only areas of "high natural character".
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.82	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.148	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Considers that the original submission point refers to 'all rules'. Meridian notes that the structure of the Plan is that the rules that apply to renewable electricity generation activities are entirely contained in the REG chapter (and Meridian has requested the insertion of notes that clarify this intention throughout the Plan). The original submission point is opposed to the extent that it seeks to cut across the Plan's intention.	Disallow / Disallow the requested amendments as they relate to the REG chapter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.74	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support in part	Notes there is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD which is subject to the coastal hazards overlays and this is not recognised in the Introduction. Argosy supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to coastal hazards. Retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur, and therefore it would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to anticipate a protection or adaptation approach to climate change hazards. Amendment is required to help reconcile these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre zone provisions above. The Introduction also includes a proposed Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table. This table includes tsunami with a 1:100 year scenario inundation extent as High. The High risk Coastal Hazard Tsunami Overlay covers a large part of the CBD, and the Medium and Low risk areas extend marginally further than the High risk area. Due to the nature of a tsunami, with high impact but low probability, it is considered that the greatest risk rating should be Medium	Amend the Introduction to the Coastal Environment as follows: Amend the Introduction to recognise that there is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD and an adaptation and protection approach is needed to manage coastal hazards in this area. Argosy seeks for the Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table to be retained as notified subject to the following change: Tsunami – 1:100 year scenario inundation extent = High <u>Medium</u>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.3	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking to medium.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.111	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.
CentrePort Limited	402.112	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.
CentrePort Limited	402.113	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers that there are also objectives and policies relating to the Port Zone which are relevant to the Coastal Environment chapter.	Amend explanatory statement in the introduction of the Coastal Environment chapter as follows: Provisions relating to infrastructure within the coastal environment are located in the INF-CE sub-chapter <u>and in the Special Purpose Port Zone</u> . The provisions in the INF-CE chapter apply in addition to the general provisions of the infrastructure chapter.
CentrePort Limited	402.114	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support in part	Considers that there are also objectives and policies relating to the Port Zone which are relevant to the Coastal Environment chapter.	Retain the explanatory statement in the introduction of the Coastal Environment chapter, with amendment.
Oyster Management Limited	404.30	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan recognises the benefits of existing investment in the CBD in relation to natural hazards and coastal hazards.
Oyster Management Limited	404.31	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provides consistency in the approach to potentially hazardous activities in the Natural Hazards and Coastal Hazards Overlays.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.32	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support in part	Supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to coastal hazards. [Refer to original submission for full reason] .	Retain CE (Coastal Environment) introduction with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.33	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	Considers there is significant existing investment in Wellington CBD that is subject to coastal hazard overlays, which is not recognised in the Introduction. Supports the Introduction to the extent it takes an adaption approach to coastal hazards, as retreat from Wellington CBD is unlikely, it would therefore be more appropriate to anticipate protection or adaption approaches to climate change hazards. Considers that amendment is required to align these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre Zone provisions. Amendment is required to help reconcile these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre zone provisions. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend CE (Coastal Environment) - Introduction to recognise the significant existing investment in Wellington CBD and an adaption and protection approach is required to manage coastal hazards in the area.
Oyster Management Limited	404.34	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers there is significant existing investment in Wellington CBD that is subject to coastal hazard overlays, which is not recognised in the Introduction. Supports the Introduction to the extent it takes an adaption approach to coastal hazards, as retreat from Wellington CBD is unlikely, it would therefore be more appropriate to anticipate protection or adaption approaches to climate change hazards. Considers that amendment is required to align these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre Zone provisions. Amendment is required to help reconcile these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre zone provisions. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend CE (Coastal Environment) - Introduction to recognise the significant existing investment in Wellington CBD and an adaption and protection approach is required to manage coastal hazards in the area.
Oyster Management Limited	404.35	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers that the hazard ratings for the tsunami risk events in the Coastal Hazard Overlay table in CE - Introduction should be amended due to the high impact, low probability nature of tsunami hazards. Considers the greatest risk rating for a tsunami event should be Medium. Considers that the hazard overlays are wide ranging in terms of risk and feasible approaches to mitigate that risk. By including all the Inundation and Tsunami overlays together, the Proposed Plan applies the same risk and mitigation approach to Inundation and Tsunami. This is inappropriate because the risk of tsunami cannot be mitigated and the probability of tsunami is low compared to Coastal Inundation.	Amend Coastal Hazard Overlay table in CE - Introduction as follows: Tsunami - 1:100 year scenario inundation extent: High <u>Medium</u> ... Tsunami - 1:500 year scenario inundation extent: Medium <u>Low</u> ... Tsunami - 1:1000 year scenario inundation extent: Low
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.70	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking to medium. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking for all tsunamis given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.284	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support in part	<p>Supports the recognition afforded to Wellington International Airport within the introductory text.</p> <p>Considers that the introductory text should also reference the relevant enabling provisions within the NZCPS relating to the operational and functional needs of infrastructure.</p> <p>The area of Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is highly modified and includes an extensive seawall that is located within the coastal margin. This wall protects regionally significant infrastructure from coastal erosion, including the WCC wastewater network and Wellington International Airport. It also protects Moa Point Road. As per the approach used for the Port and City Centre Zone, the relevant coastal margin provisions should not apply to this area.</p>	Retain Coastal Environment chapter introduction as notified, and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.65	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.285	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	<p>Supports the recognition afforded to Wellington International Airport within the introductory text.</p> <p>Considers that the introductory text should also reference the relevant enabling provisions within the NZCPS relating to the operational and functional needs of infrastructure.</p> <p>The area of Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is highly modified and includes an extensive seawall that is located within the coastal margin. This wall protects regionally significant infrastructure from coastal erosion, including the WCC wastewater network and Wellington International Airport. It also protects Moa Point Road. As per the approach used for the Port and City Centre Zone, the relevant coastal margin provisions should not apply to this area.</p>	<p>Amend Coastal Environment chapter introduction as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>The coastal and riparian margin provisions do not apply in highly modified areas like the <u>Airport Zone, Port Zone, or the City Centre Zone, or the area of Natural Open Space Zone located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>Any activities within the City Centre Zone or are associated with the Wellington Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are assessed against their own specific objectives, policies and rules <u>contained in Part 3</u>. This is in recognition of the social and economic benefits these activities have and that their position in the City is largely fixed <u>as well as the policy directives of the NZCPS and RPS that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure.</u></p> <p>...</p>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.66	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.286	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	<p>Submitter acknowledges its siting within the coastal environment, as defined by the NZCPS and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Submitter expresses concern that the complex relationship between the Coastal Environment, Infrastructure and Airport Zone provisions creates an inefficient consenting pathway for airport and airport related activities.</p>	Opposes the Coastal Environment overlay at the Airport Zone.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.287	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	<p>Submitter acknowledges its siting within the coastal environment, as defined by the NZCPS and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Submitter expresses concern that the complex relationship between the Coastal Environment, Infrastructure and Airport Zone provisions creates an inefficient consenting pathway for airport and airport related activities.</p>	Seeks that the Coastal Environment overlay is removed from the Airport Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.288	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Submitter acknowledges its siting within the coastal environment, as defined by the NZCPS and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement. Submitter expresses concern that the complex relationship between the Coastal Environment, Infrastructure and Airport Zone provisions creates an inefficient consenting pathway for airport and airport related activities.	Seeks that the relationship and consenting pathway for activities within the coastal environment (insofar as they relate to activities undertaken within the Airport Zone) are enabled, streamlined and reflective of the existing environment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.289	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Environment chapter unnecessarily duplicates controls found elsewhere in the PDP. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the coastal environment chapter and the associated infrastructure within the coastal environment chapter should be reworked to focus on effects that specifically relate to the coastal environment and have not already been addressed, or cannot otherwise be addressed, by the underlying land use zone.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.290	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Environment chapter unnecessarily duplicates controls found elsewhere in the PDP. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the coastal environment chapter is amended to give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those provisions that recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities (such as infrastructure) to locate within these areas and the associated management of effects.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.291	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers that tsunami hazard response within existing urban areas requires a broader management response that is best managed collectively by emergency management groups such as Civil Defence. The PDP's approach to tsunami management is cumbersome, particularly for large lifeline utilities like WIAL who have extensive emergency management plans and procedures in place, as well as CDEM requirements to remain operational during a civil defence emergency. The relevant coastal hazard policies and methods that apply to the site therefore have limited utility and will generate unnecessary resource consent requirements for matters that are otherwise already considered by WIAL during the design and development phase of activities within the zone. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.93	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Land use planning and emergency management options need to be complimentary.	Disallow
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.94	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). Intensification and further development of brownfield sites as well as development of greenfield sites should be restricted within tsunami hazard overlays (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling).	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.292	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	<p>Considers that tsunami hazard response within existing urban areas requires a broader management response that is best managed collectively by emergency management groups such as Civil Defence.</p> <p>The PDP's approach to tsunami management is cumbersome, particularly for large lifeline utilities like WIAL who have extensive emergency management plans and procedures in place, as well as CDEM requirements to remain operational during a civil defence emergency. The relevant coastal hazard policies and methods that apply to the site therefore have limited utility and will generate unnecessary resource consent requirements for matters that are otherwise already considered by WIAL during the design and development phase of activities within the zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend the Coastal Environment Chapter to apply coastal tsunami hazard provisions only to new Greenfield developments.
Fabric Property Limited	425.32	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	<p>There is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD which is subject to the coastal hazards overlays, and it is important that the risks from coastal hazards are appropriately addressed.</p> <p>supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to coastal hazards. Retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur, and therefore it would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to anticipate a protection or adaptation approach to climate change hazards. Amendment is required to help reconcile these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre zone provisions above.</p> <p>The Introduction also includes a proposed Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table. This table includes tsunami with a 1:100 year scenario inundation extent as High. The High risk Coastal Hazard Tsunami Overlay covers a large part of the CBD, and the Medium and Low risk areas extend marginally further than the High risk area. Due to the nature of a Tsunami, with high impact but low probability, it is considered that the greatest risk rating should be Medium.</p>	<p>Seeks that the introduction to the Coastal Environment introduction is amended to recognise that there is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD and an adaptation and protection approach is needed to manage coastal hazards in this area.</p> <p>Amend the Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table as follows:</p> <p>Tsunami – 1:100 year scenario inundation extent = High <u>Medium</u></p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking to medium. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction).	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.18	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support	Supports the Coastal Environment Chapter.	Retain the Coastal Environment Chapter with amendment.
Guardians of the Bays	452.19	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers an amendment to the introduction to include coastal hazards of storm surges and storm events. It is not only sea level rise that is causing coastal inundation but storm surges and storm events that are increasing due to climate change.	<p>Amend Introduction to the Coastal Environment chapter as follows:</p> <p>Coastal Hazards- Wellington City's coastal environment is susceptible to a range of coastal hazards, which are mapped as Coastal Hazard Overlays. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tsunami; 2. Coastal inundation including sea level rise, <u>storm surges and storm events.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.291	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend	<p>Considers the plan does not appear to include provisions to give effect to policy 13(1)(b) NZCPS.</p> <p>Seeks new objective, policy, and rules to protect areas of outstanding natural character in the coastal environment, in accordance with policy 13 NZCPS.</p>	Add new objective CE-OX, policy CE-PX, and rule CE-RX to give effect to policy 13(1)(b) of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement to protect areas of outstanding natural character in the coastal environment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.83	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.149	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Oppose	Considers that the framework of this Plan is that ONFLs, including ONFLs in the coastal environment, are identified in the relevant Schedule and the objectives and policies are set out in the NFL chapter. The NFL chapter policies already provide the protection requested.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.292	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend	Seeks a new policy for outstanding natural character in the coastal environment to give effect to policy 13(1)(a) NZCPS. We also seek rules to give effect to that policy. Considers this section of the plan should also deal with areas of outstanding natural character in the landward coastal environment. It does not appear to be dealt with in the Natural Character chapter, which is only about rivers and riparian margins.	Add new policy CE-PX and rule CE-Rx to give effect to policy 13(1)(a) of the NZ Coastal Policy statement with regarding to outstanding natural character in the coastal environment and landward coastal environment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.84	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.150	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Oppose	Considers that the framework of this Plan is that ONFLs, including ONFLs in the coastal environment, are identified in the relevant Schedule and the objectives and policies are set out in the NFL chapter. The NFL chapter policies already provide the protection requested.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.293	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend	Seeks a new policy to give effect to policy 11 outside of SNAs. Notes that policy 11 is partially given effect to in the coastal environment by way of the ECO chapter policies, however, those policies only apply to identified SNAs. There may be other areas in the coastal environment, particularly within areas of natural character, that have biodiversity that is required to be protected under policy 11. Therefore considers a separate policy is required to ensure that policy 11 is given effect to in these areas.	Add new policy CE-PX to give effect to policy 11 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement outside Significant Natural Areas and within the coastal environment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.85	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.151	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Oppose	Considers that NZCPS Policy 11 addresses significant indigenous biological diversity in the coastal environment. The ECO chapter addresses NZCPS Policy 11 matters in relation to activities within SNAs in the coastal environment. Meridian accepts that the ECO chapter does not address NZCPS Policy 11 values outside SNAs. Considers that it is not possible to comment in any further detail in the absence of any explicit wording proposal. It may be that amendment to the ECO chapter is necessary to address this point.	Not specified / Seeks that any amendments be detailed for consideration.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.293	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend	Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. Considers that the rule should only be applicable to new hard engineering structures. The ongoing upgrade, maintenance and repair of existing hard engineering structures that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure should be permitted, as WIAL has provided for in the underlying Natural Open Space Zone. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Add new rule in Coastal Environment chapter as follows: <u>CE – R24A Hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area for regionally significant infrastructure</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.67	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.57	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Environment chapter could specifically recognise and protect significant cultural infrastructure, such as coastal marae, and the impacts that marae communities may face.	Add new objective in the Coastal Environment chapter as follows: <u>Reduce the susceptibility of significant cultural property, infrastructure and associated communities from damage by coastal hazards.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	228.100	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Oppose in part	Considers that together with the description of the natural character of the coastal environment along Raukawa Moana in Schedule SCHED10, Objective CE-O1 (Coastal environment) fails to acknowledge the presence of the existing modifications (including buildings and structures) made by the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms. Seeks amendments to more accurately describe the modified natural character of these parts of the coastal environment in SCHED10 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes), in the description of the coastal environment in Chapter CE Coastal Environment and in the objectives of Chapter CE Coastal Environment, including CE-O1.	Retain Objective CE-O1 (Coastal environment) with amendment to acknowledge the presence of the built structures in the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms:
Meridian Energy Limited	228.101	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Amend	Considers that together with the description of the natural character of the coastal environment along Raukawa Moana in Schedule SCHED10 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes), Objective CE-O1 (Coastal environment) fails to acknowledge the presence of the existing modifications (including buildings and structures) made by the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms. Seeks amendments to more accurately describe the modified natural character of these parts of the coastal environment in SCHED10, in the description of the coastal environment in Chapter CE Coastal Environment and in the objectives of Chapter CE Coastal Environment, including CE-O1.	Amend Objective CE-O1 (Coastal environment) to read as follows (or similar) to acknowledge the presence of the built structures in the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms: The natural character and qualities that contribute to the natural character within the landward extent of the coastal environment are maintained and, where appropriate, restored or enhanced, <u>recognising the presence of existing renewable electricity generation activities and the importance of the renewable electricity generation resource in the coastal environment.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	228.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Amend	Considers that together with the description of the natural character of the coastal environment along Raukawa Moana in Schedule SCHED10 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes), Objective CE-O1 (Coastal environment) fails to acknowledge the presence of the existing modifications (including buildings and structures) made by the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms. Seeks amendments to more accurately describe the modified natural character of these parts of the coastal environment in SCHED10, in the description of the coastal environment in Chapter CE Coastal Environment and in the objectives of Chapter CE Coastal Environment, including CE-O1.	Add into the Chapter CE Coastal Environment or Chapter REG Renewable Electricity Generation, as a second option to amending Objective CE-O1, a new separate objective that acknowledges the presence of and recognises the benefits of the existing wind farms within the coastal environment and within the backdrop to the mapped coastal environment as follows (or similar to achieve the same outcome): <u>Objective [XX-O1]:</u> <u>The benefits of the existing wind farms along Wellington's coastline are recognised and their generation capacity is optimised.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.43	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Support	Supports Objective CE-O1 .	Retain CE-O1 (Coastal environment) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.294	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Support	Supports this objective. However, the policies do not give effect to it, as they are limited to areas of high natural character only. Seeks that the policies give effect to this objective.	Retain CE-O1 (Coastal environment) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.86	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.196	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Support in part	Support the intent of Objective CE-O1 to preserve and protect natural character ratings across the landward extent of the coastal environment.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.197	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Amend	Considers that rather than just in high natural character areas/sites of high natural character; this approach gives effect to the intent of NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b). However, we request amendments to the wording of Objective CE-O1 to be more aligned with NZCPS Policies 13 and 14 consistently across the PDP, as provided in the requested amendments. This is important as 'preserved' and 'protected' are the terms used in NZCPS Policy 13 and section 6(a) of the RMA and are more directive than the term 'maintained' in terms of the outcome to be achieved. The submitter notes that the outcome of Objective CE-O1 cannot currently be achieved by the plan provisions, given natural character ratings have not been scheduled at the area scale across the full extent of the coastal environment. The relevant policies (such as CE-P5) also do not seek to manage the effects of development on natural character values across the full extent of the landward coastal environment. Mapping and scheduling area scale natural character ratings will ensure the appropriate plan provisions are included in the approach to ensure CE-O1 can be achieved and the provisions better give effect to NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b).	Seeks to amend to align with NZCPS Policies 13 and 15, specifically to reflect the requirement to "preserve" and "protect" natural character as follows. The natural character and qualities that contribute to the natural character within the landward extent of the coastal environment are maintained preserved and protected and, where appropriate, restored or enhanced rehabilitated.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.152	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Oppose	Considers that it is not accurate to say that the NZCPS requires preservation in an absolute sense. The NZCPS qualifies its use of the word 'preserve' in accordance with s. 6 (a) of the RMA. If the word 'protected' is to be used, it should give proper effect to s. 6 (a) of the RMA and also include the words 'protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development'. The word 'maintain' works in the context of Objective CE-O1.	Disallow / Disallow the requested amendments unless the word 'protected' is qualified as intended by the RMA and includes the words 'protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development'. In the absence of explicit wording of requested relief, disallow the submission point's request for 'any other consequential amendments required'. There is simply insufficient detail.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.198	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Amend	<p>Considers that rather than just in high natural character areas/sites of high natural character; this approach gives effect to the intent of NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b). However, we request amendments to the wording of Objective CE-O1 to be more aligned with NZCPS Policies 13 and 14 consistently across the PDP, as provided in the requested amendments. This is important as 'preserved' and 'protected' are the terms used in NZCPS Policy 13 and section 6(a) of the RMA and are more directive than the term 'maintained' in terms of the outcome to be achieved.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the outcome of Objective CE-O1 cannot currently be achieved by the plan provisions, given natural character ratings have not been scheduled at the area scale across the full extent of the coastal environment. The relevant policies (such as CE-P5) also do not seek to manage the effects of development on natural character values across the full extent of the landward coastal environment. Mapping and scheduling area scale natural character ratings will ensure the appropriate plan provisions are included in the approach to ensure CE-O1 can be achieved and the provisions better give effect to NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b).</p>	Seeks this includes any other consequential amendments required.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.153	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is not accurate to say that the NZCPS requires preservation in an absolute sense. The NZCPS qualifies its use of the word 'preserve' in accordance with s. 6 (a) of the RMA. If the word 'protected' is to be used, it should give proper effect to s. 6 (a) of the RMA and also include the words 'protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development'. The word 'maintain' works in the context of Objective CE-O1.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the requested amendments unless the word 'protected' is qualified as intended by the RMA and includes the words 'protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development'. In the absence of explicit wording of requested relief, disallow the submission point's request for 'any other consequential amendments required'. There is simply insufficient detail.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.221	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Amend	<p>Considers that it is important to ensure that, in the midst of an ecological emergency, the default attitude towards environmental protection is one of restoration.</p>	<p>Amend CE-O1 (Coastal environment) as follows:</p> <p>"The natural character and qualities that contribute to the natural character within the landward extent of the coastal environment are maintained and, <u>where possible</u>, restored or enhanced".</p>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.154	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Oppose	<p>Meridian considers that the expression 'where practicable' or 'where appropriate' better gives effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments than 'where possible' (which sets an unduly stringent requirement).</p>	Disallow
Director-General of Conservation	385.58	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Support in part	<p>Supports CE-O1, however would request the addition of the word 'rehabilitated' to ensure the objective is in line with Policy 14 of the NZCPS which promotes either restoration or rehabilitation of the natural character of the coastal environment.</p>	Supports objective CE-O1 (Coastal environment) in part, but seeks amendment.
Director-General of Conservation	385.59	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Amend	<p>Supports CE-O1, however would request the addition of the word 'rehabilitated' to ensure the objective is in line with Policy 14 of the NZCPS which promotes either restoration or rehabilitation of the natural character of the coastal environment.</p>	<p>Amend objective CE-O1 (Coastal environment) as follows:</p> <p>The natural character and qualities that contribute to the natural character within the landward extent of the coastal environment are maintained and, where appropriate, restored, <u>rehabilitated</u>, or enhanced.</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.294	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Support in part	<p>Supports this objective to the extent that the natural character is recognised and addressed in the underlying land use zone and thus do not require an additional level of control within this chapter and other plan provisions recognise the importance of regionally significant infrastructure and the need to adversely affect natural character for operational or functional reasons.</p>	Supports CE-O1 (Coastal Environment) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.295	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Amend	<p>Supports this objective to the extent that the natural character is recognised and addressed in the underlying land use zone and thus do not require an additional level of control within this chapter and other plan provisions recognise the importance of regionally significant infrastructure and the need to adversely affect natural character for operational or functional reasons.</p>	<p>Seeks that CE-O1 (Coastal Environment) is amended to be reworked to focus on effects that specifically relate to the coastal environment and have not already been addressed, or cannot otherwise be addressed, by the underlying land use zone.</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.296	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Amend	Supports this objective to the extent that the natural character is recognised and addressed in the underlying land use zone and thus do not require an additional level of control within this chapter and other plan provisions recognise the importance of regionally significant infrastructure and the need to adversely affect natural character for operational or functional reasons.	Seeks that CE-O1 (Coastal Environment) is amended to ensure the provisions give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those provisions that recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities (such as infrastructure) to locate within these areas and the associated management of effects. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.58	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O1	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-O1 (Coastal Environment) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points
Meridian Energy Limited	228.103	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Support in part	Considers that these [natural character areas] are identified in Schedule SCHED12 (High Coastal Natural Character Areas) as 'high' and 'very high'. There are no West Wind or Mill Creek wind farm turbines within the mapped overlays of 'high' or 'very high' coastal natural character but the wind farm structures are part of the visible backdrop to these 'high coastal natural character areas'. Considers the presence of these visible large structures needs to be acknowledged as existing and should not be considered inappropriate development. Considers the focus of Objective CE-O2 (High coastal natural character areas) should be on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development within the mapped 'high coastal natural character areas'.	Retain Objective CE-O2 (High coastal natural character areas) with amendment to acknowledge and recognise the existing West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms as legitimate, authorised and appropriate existing development established within the backdrop to areas of identified 'high coastal natural character':
Meridian Energy Limited	228.104	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Amend	Considers that these [natural character areas] are identified in Schedule SCHED12 (High Coastal Natural Character Areas) as 'high' and 'very high'. There are no West Wind or Mill Creek wind farm turbines within the mapped overlays of 'high' or 'very high' coastal natural character but the wind farm structures are part of the visible backdrop to these 'high coastal natural character areas'. Considers the presence of these visible large structures needs to be acknowledged as existing and should not be considered inappropriate development. Considers the focus of Objective CE-O2 (High coastal natural character areas) should be on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development within the mapped 'high coastal natural character areas'.	Amend Objective CE-O2 (High coastal natural character areas) in the following manner (or similar) or otherwise amend the Chapter CE Coastal Environment objectives to acknowledge and recognise the existing West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms as legitimate, authorised and appropriate existing development established within the backdrop to areas of identified 'high coastal natural character': The identified characteristics and values of areas of high coastal natural character areas in the landward extent of the coastal environment are preserved and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development <u>occurring within the mapped high coastal natural character areas.</u>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.295	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Support in part	Considers that in order to give effect to NZCPS policy 13, this policy cannot be limited to areas of high natural character only. Seeks amendment to apply to all natural character in the landward extent of the coastal environment. Considers it also should not be limited to identified values. SCHED 12 provides only a very small amount of information about the values, and cannot be the basis for assessing protection. We therefore seek that reference to 'identified' values is deleted from this objective and all other provisions in this chapter. Considers SCHED 12 could be expanded to include a lot more detail on the values present.	Amend CE-O2 (High coastal natural character areas): The identified characteristics and values of areas of high coastal natural character areas in the landward extent of the coastal environment are preserved and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.87	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.155	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Oppose	Considers that the focus of the objective is correctly on the identified characteristics and, consistent with the Objective's title, it should address the mapped areas of high coastal natural character.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.199	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Amend	Supports WCC's approach to protecting high natural character values in CE02	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.200	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Amend	Considers to give effect to NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b), natural character is also required to be preserved "in all other areas of the coastal environment", rather than just sites of high natural character in isolation.	Amend CE-O2 (High coastal natural character areas) to refer to sites of natural character, in addition to areas of high natural character as per requested drafting as follows: High Coastal natural character areas <u>Adverse effects on identified characteristics and values of sites and areas of high coastal natural character in the landward extent of the coastal environment are avoided.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.156	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Oppose	Considers that the original submission point misrepresents the wording of NZCPS Policy 13. The NZCPS does not require absolute preservation of natural character and avoidance in all circumstances. Taken together, the policies of the CE chapter do implement the management hierarchy set out in NZCPS Policy 13 (i.e. avoid adverse effects in areas of outstanding natural character, avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment). Meridian would support amendments that reflect the NZCPS management hierarchy.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.222	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-O2 (High coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.60	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Support	Supports proposed Objective CE-O2 (High coastal natural character areas).	Retain objective CE-O2 (High coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.59	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O2	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-O2 (High natural character areas) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.296	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O3	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain CE-O3 (Coastal margins and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.88	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O3	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.223	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O3	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-O3 (Coastal margins and riparian margins) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.61	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O3	Support	Supports proposed Objective CE-O3 (Coastal margins and riparian margins).	Retain objective CE-O3 (Coastal margins and riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.297	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O3	Support in part	Supports this objective to the extent that the protection of coastal margins are addressed in the underlying land use zone and thus do not require an additional level of control within this chapter and other plan provisions recognise the importance of regionally significant infrastructure and the need to adversely affect natural character for operational or functional reasons.	Supports CE-O3 (Coastal Margins and riparian margins) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.298	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O3	Amend	Supports this objective to the extent that the protection of coastal margins are addressed in the underlying land use zone and thus do not require an additional level of control within this chapter and other plan provisions recognise the importance of regionally significant infrastructure and the need to adversely affect natural character for operational or functional reasons.	Seeks that CE-O3 (Coastal Margins and riparian margins) is amended to be reworked to focus on effects that specifically relate to the coastal environment and have not already been addressed, or cannot otherwise be addressed, by the underlying land use zone. [Inferred decision requested] [See paragraphs 4.48 and 4.49 of the original submission].
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.299	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O3	Amend	Supports this objective to the extent that the protection of coastal margins are addressed in the underlying land use zone and thus do not require an additional level of control within this chapter and other plan provisions recognise the importance of regionally significant infrastructure and the need to adversely affect natural character for operational or functional reasons.	Seeks that CE-O3 (Coastal Margins and riparian margins) is amended to ensure the provisions give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those provisions that recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities (such as infrastructure) to locate within these areas and the associated management of effects. [Inferred decision requested] [See paragraphs 4.48 and 4.49 of the original submission].
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.60	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O3	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-O3 (Coastal margins and riparian margins) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.297	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O4	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain CE-O4 (Customary Harvesting) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.89	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O4	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.224	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O4	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment. Particularly supports giving effect to Wellington City Council's Te Tiriti obligations.	Retain CE-O4 (Customary Harvesting) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.61	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O4	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-O4 (Customary harvesting) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.132	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O5	Support	Supports this objective to reduce risk to people, property, and infrastructure. FENZ acknowledges there are existing fire stations located within the Coastal Hazard Areas and that any development of these would be subject to provisions within this chapter.	Retain CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.298	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O5	Support in part	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected.	Amend CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards): Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.90	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O5	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.201	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Amend	Considers amendments appropriate to bring the policy in line with the Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to amend wording of CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards): Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays minimises reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.34	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.225	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.75	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports the objective in that it enables subdivision, use and development in Coastal Hazard overlays that does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.246	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support in part	Objective CE-05 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Supports Objective CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.247	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Amend	Considers that CE-05 should be amended to better identify the effects of new subdivision, use and development may have on the existing environment. It is sought the word "new" is added to this objective to recognise the additional impact that only new subdivision, use and development has on the existing environment.	Amend Objective CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as follows: New S -subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.
Oyster Management Limited	404.36	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports this objective to the extent that it enables subdivision, use, and development in the Coastal Hazard overlays that does not increase the risk to people, property, or infrastructure.	Retain CE-05 (Risks from coastal hazards) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.300	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Oppose	Opposes CE-05. Considers that the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance. [See paragraph 4.46 to 4.49 and 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) and seeks amendment.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT PURPOSES	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.301	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Oppose	Opposes CE-05. Considers that the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance. [See paragraph 4.46 to 4.49 and 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as follows: CE-05 Risk from coastal hazards Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays <u>do not create an intolerable level of</u> reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.
Fabric Property Limited	425.33	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports CE-05 as notified.	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.62	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points
Grant Birkinshaw	52.5	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-06	Oppose	Opposes the Coastal Hazard overlay based on Tsunami occurrences. The Tsunami baseline is for CD evacuation procedures and as such is not appropriate in a legal document.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.299	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O6	Support in part	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected.	Amend CE-O6 (Natural systems and features): Natural systems and features that reduce the susceptibility of people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values</u> from damage by coastal hazards are created, maintained or enhanced.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.91	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O6	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.202	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O6	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-O6 (Natural systems and features) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.226	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O6	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-O6 (Natural systems and features) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.63	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O6	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-O6 (Natural systems and features) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points
Yvonne Weeber	340.23	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Support	CE-O7 is supported, as airport operations should not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain Objective CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.300	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Support in part	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected.	Amend CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities): Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values</u> .
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.92	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.227	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.115	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Support in part	Supports objective, but opposes the structure of the plan managing Natural Hazards as it is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter, the Natural Hazards Chapter as well as this chapter dealing with coastal hazards in the Coastal Environment. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that all Natural Hazards provisions are consolidated in the same place or stronger cross-referencing is provided.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.302	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Oppose	Considers that the activities listed have operational and functional constraints which ultimately govern the location of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities.	Opposes CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.303	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Amend	Considers that the activities listed have operational and functional constraints which ultimately govern the location of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities.	Amend CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities do not <u>create an intolerable level of increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.99	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Support	Supports the objective to provide for operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities while ensuring these activities do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.20	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Support	Supports this objective. Considers that Airport operations should not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.64	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.19	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Support in part	Supports CE-O8 (City centre zone) to the extent that it is enabling of development in the city centre.	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.301	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Support in part	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected.	Amend CE-O8 (City Centre Zone): Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.93	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.228	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.76	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Support	Supports the direction of this objective to provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure. This is because this objective recognises the economic and social benefits of the significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD. The social and economic benefits that the existing Wellington CBD has and its position in the city is fixed. As we respond and adapt to climate change and other hazard risks, decisions will be made on where retreat occurs and what is protected, but it is anticipated that retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.248	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Support in part	Objective CE-O8 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Supports Objective CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.249	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Amend	Considers that CE-O5 should be amended to better identify the effects of new subdivision, use and development may have on the existing environment. It is sought the word “new” is added to this objective recognise the additional impact that only new subdivision, use and development has on the existing environment.	Amend Objective CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as follows: Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while also ensuring that <u>new</u> subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.
Oyster Management Limited	404.37	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Support	Supports the direction of this objective to provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure. Considers this is because this objective recognises the economic and social benefits of the significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD. The social and economic benefits that the existing Wellington CBD has and its position in the city is fixed. As we respond and adapt to climate change and other hazard risks, decisions will be made on where retreat occurs and what is protected, but it is anticipated that retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur.	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.34	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Support in part	Fabric supports CE-O8 to the extent that it is enabling of development in the city centre. This reflects that the Wellington City Centre is intended to be the primary commercial centre for the wider Wellington region and retreat is not practical or likely.	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O8	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-O8 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points
Yvonne Weeber	340.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O9	Support	CE-O9 is supported as it enables green infrastructure as the primary method being used to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion. However, the policies and rules need to reflect that areas of the coastal environment should not be developed in the manner that has occurred in the past.	Retain Objective CE-O9 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.203	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O9	Amend	Considers that for consistency with Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the change to the RPS directs consideration of, which are not captured by green infrastructure.	Amend CE-O9 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) to include non-structural, soft engineering or mātauranga Māori approaches.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.229	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O9	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-O9 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.66	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O9	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-O9 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.44	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P1	Support	Supports the identification and mapping of the landward extent of the coastal environment at the broad scale level at which it was determined. Notwithstanding its submission point seeking amendment to the identification and mapping of the landward extent of the coastal environment as it applies to the Horokiwi site.	Retain CE-P1 (Identification of the coastal environment and of high coastal natural character areas within the coastal environment) as notified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.16	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P1	Amend	Considers that CE-P1 only focuses on urban development and should be amended to refer to existing lawful activities such as quarries.	CE-P1 (Identification of the coastal environment and of high coastal natural character areas within the coastal environment) should be amended to refer to existing lawful activities such as quarries.
Yvonne Weeber	340.25	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CE-P1 (Identification of the coastal environment and of high coastal natural character areas within the coastal environment) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.302	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P1	Support in part	Considers that this policy, or a new policy, needs to be amended to provide for the identification of outstanding areas of natural character in the coastal environment.	Amend CE-P1 (Identification of the coastal environment and of high coastal natural character areas within the coastal environment): 1. Identify and map the landward extent of the coastal environment. 2. Identify and map areas of very high and high natural character within the coastal environment and list the identified values in SCHED 12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas. <u>3. Identify and map areas of outstanding natural character in the coastal environment.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.94	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P1	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.204	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P1	Amend	Considers that Natural character ratings have not been scheduled at the area scale across the full extent of the coastal environment. To give effect to Policies 13, 14 and 15 of the NZCPS, the area scale natural character ratings need to be included in the PDP.	Amend CE-P1 (Identification of the coastal environment and of high coastal natural character areas within the coastal environment) to widen the scope of the policy to also refer to area scale natural character ratings, as follows: Identification of the coastal environment and of high coastal natural character areas within the coastal environment 1. Identify and map the landward extent of the coastal environment. 2. Identify and map <u>sites areas</u> of very high and high natural character <u>and area scale natural character ratings</u> within the coastal environment and list the identified values in <u>SCHED 12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.157	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P1	Oppose	Considers that there is insufficient detail provided about 'area scale natural character ratings' to determine whether they should or should not be included in SCHED12. Any amendments should be advanced as a variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.230	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P1	Support	Not specified.	Retain CE-P1 (Identification of the coastal environment and of high coastal natural character areas within the coastal environment) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.105	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Oppose in part	Considers that in the absence of any explicit recognition of the presence of the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms, Policy CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) could be applied in a manner that restricts appropriate upgrading of those wind farms or the establishment of replacement wind turbines in appropriate locations.	Retain Policy CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) with amendment to provide for the existing wind farms along Wellington's coastline and provide for upgrading within those wind farms, including by the placement of replacement wind turbines.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.106	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Amend	Considers that in the absence of any explicit recognition of the presence of the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms, Policy CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) could be applied in a manner that restricts appropriate upgrading of those wind farms or the establishment of replacement wind turbines in appropriate locations.	Amend Policy CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) to provide for the existing wind farms along Wellington's coastline and provide for upgrading within those wind farms, including by the placement of replacement wind turbines, by inserting the following (or similar) text: Provide for use and development in the landward extent of the coastal environment where it: 1. Consolidates existing urban areas; <u>or</u> 2. <u>Is necessary to enable the use, development, maintenance and upgrading of regionally significant infrastructure (including the repowering of existing wind farms by replacing and upgrading existing turbines and their support structures identified on the Plan Maps and associated electricity transmission facilities); and</u> 3.2- Does not establish new urban sprawl along the coastline;

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.45	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Support in part	Supports CE-P2 in part - largely accepts CE-P2 but seeks recognition of those existing activities which are lawfully established.	Not specified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.46	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Amend	Considers that CE-P2 recognises existing activities which are lawfully established.	Amend Policy CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) as follows: Provide for use and development in the landward extent of the coastal environment where it: 1. 2. <u>3. Relates to an existing lawfully established activity.</u>
Yvonne Weeber	340.26	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Amend	Considers that CE-P2 should be amended to have a third bullet point related to the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter. Namely, the "level of uncertainty about the full extent of the impacts of climate change and sea level rise. This means the planning framework needs to retain a level of flexibility to enable the City to adapt in response to changing circumstances." The bullet point given relating to use and development of the coastal environment should clearly state the level of uncertainty and need for caution, climate change adaptation and in some areas retreat.	Amend CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) as follows: Provide for use and development in the landward extent of the coastal environment where it: 1. Consolidates existing urban areas; and 2. Does not establish new urban sprawl along the coastline. 3. Takes into consideration the level of uncertainty about the full extent of the impacts of climate change (storm surges and costal inundation) and sea level rise.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.136	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Oppose	Considers that such matters are dealt with via the relevant natural hazard provisions of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.303	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Support in part	Considers the policy should be amended to be less definitive about providing for use and development. in all cases. That is because several other factors will need to be considered, other than the two listed in the policy.	Amend CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment): <u>Consider providing</u> for use and development in the landward extent of the coastal environment where it: 1. Consolidates existing urban areas; and 2. Does not establish new urban sprawl along the coastline.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.95	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.158	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Oppose	Considers that inserting the words 'consider providing' for use and development distorts the actual purpose of this policy (which is to make clear where use and development will be provided for).	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.304	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Support in part	It will also need to be amended if CE-P5 continues to apply only to areas of high natural character, rather than any area of natural character. If P5 remains unchanged, this policy will need to be significantly amended to ensure it gives effect to policy 13 NZCPS, and directs avoidance of significant adverse effects.	If relief sought on CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) is not made, amend CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) to give effect to policy 13 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement with regard to avoiding significant adverse effects.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.205	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Support	Considers that this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.231	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Amend	Considers it important that the environmental significance of the coastal environment is recognised.	Amend CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) to add a third point, as follows: <u>3. Does not adversely affect the environmental values of the coastal environment</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.137	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Oppose	Considers that the term "environmental values" is too broad and encapsulates both natural and physical resources. The intent of the changes are therefore not clear. Furthermore, it is inappropriate to require land use and development to avoid adversely effecting all effects, irrespective of their nature, scale or extent.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.159	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Oppose	Considers that the proposed additional text is not appropriate because it is not clear what is meant by 'environmental values'.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.304	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Support in part	Supports this objective to the extent that the use and development of the coastal environment, as set out in this policy, is addressed in the underlying land use zone and thus do not require an additional level of control within this chapter.	Supports CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.305	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Amend	Supports this objective to the extent that the use and development of the coastal environment, as set out in this policy, is addressed in the underlying land use zone and thus do not require an additional level of control within this chapter.	Seeks that CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) is amended to be reworked to focus on effects that specifically relate to the coastal environment and have not already been addressed, or cannot otherwise be addressed, by the underlying land use zone. [Inferred decision requested] [See paragraph 4.48 and 4.49 of the original submission]
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.306	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P2	Amend	Supports this objective to the extent that the use and development of the coastal environment, as set out in this policy, is addressed in the underlying land use zone and thus do not require an additional level of control within this chapter.	Seeks that CE-P2 (Use and development within the coastal environment) is amended to ensure the provisions give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those provisions that recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities (such as infrastructure) to locate within these areas and the associated management of effects. [Inferred decision requested] [See paragraph 4.48 and 4.49 of the original submission]
Grant Birkinshaw	52.6	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P3	Support	CE-P3 is supported.	Retain CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.27	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.305	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P3	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.206	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P3	Support in part	Supports the overall intent of CE-P3 to restore natural character.	Retain CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.207	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P3	Amend	Considers that natural character ratings have not been scheduled at the area scale across the full extent of the coastal environment. To give effect to Policies 13, 14 and 15 of the NZCPS, and assist with identification of the appropriate areas to restore, the area scale natural character ratings need to be included in the PDP and referred to in this policy.	Amend CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment) as follows: Provide for restoration or rehabilitation of the natural character values and coastal and riparian margins within the landward extent of the coastal environment by: 1. Recognising the values present that could be enhanced restored in areas of low and moderate natural character; 2. Encouraging natural regeneration of indigenous species, including where practical the removal of pest species; 3. Rehabilitating dunes or other natural coastal features or processes; 4. Restoring or protecting riparian and coastal margins; 5. Removing redundant structures that do not have heritage or amenity value; 6. Modifying structures that interfere with coastal or ecosystem processes; or 7. Providing for mana whenua to exercise their responsibilities as kaitiaki to protect, restore and maintain values in the coastal environment areas of indigenous biodiversity.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.232	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P3	Support	Important to empower and allow the betterment of the coastal environment.	Retain CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.62	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P3	Support	Supports proposed policy CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment).	Retain policy CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.307	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P3	Oppose	As drafted, this policy has broad application within the entire coastal environment, despite generally being focussed on matters within the coastal margins. Providing for the restoration and rehabilitation of 'natural character values' within the landward extent of the coastal environment is inappropriate in areas that are highly modified and otherwise urbanised environments. Considers that this policy should be refined to apply to the coastal margins only.	Opposes CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.308	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P3	Amend	As drafted, this policy has broad application within the entire coastal environment, despite generally being focussed on matters within the coastal margins. Providing for the restoration and rehabilitation of 'natural character values' within the landward extent of the coastal environment is inappropriate in areas that are highly modified and otherwise urbanised environments. Considers that this policy should be refined to apply to the coastal margins only.	Amend CE-P3 (Restoration and enhancement within the coastal environment) as follows: Provide for restoration or rehabilitation of the natural character values within the and coastal and riparian margins within the landward extent of the coastal environment where appropriate by: ...
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.306	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P4	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain CE-P4 (Customary harvesting within the coastal environment) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.233	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P4	Support	Ensures WCC is acting in accordance with Te Tiriti obligations.	Retain CE-P4 (Customary harvesting within the coastal environment) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.107	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Support in part	Considers that the 'or' in the preamble to Policy CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) should probably be 'and' to capture all areas of 'high coastal natural character'. Although the mapped extent of 'high coastal natural character areas' currently avoids the footprint of turbines and associated facilities within the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms, Meridian seeks to ensure that any earthworks or other activities associated with any future upgrading or repowering of turbines within these wind farms is not unduly restricted. Importantly, Policy CE-P5 applies to development within mapped areas of 'high coastal natural character'. The last clause (f) of Policy CE-P5 assumes that rehabilitation planting will always be appropriate or relevant for natural character. It may not be. Indeed, in some situations (such as rock faces) planting may conflict with the significant natural character values. In any event, Chapter ECO Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity includes a mitigation hierarchy which can address the need (or not) for rehabilitation planting. Clause (f) is not necessary and should be deleted.	Retain Policy CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.108	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Amend	Considers that the 'or' in the preamble to Policy CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) should probably be 'and' to capture all areas of 'high coastal natural character'. Although the mapped extent of 'high coastal natural character areas' currently avoids the footprint of turbines and associated facilities within the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms, Meridian seeks to ensure that any earthworks or other activities associated with any future upgrading or repowering of turbines within these wind farms is not unduly restricted. Importantly, Policy CE-P5 applies to development within mapped areas of 'high coastal natural character'. The last clause (f) of Policy CE-P5 assumes that rehabilitation planting will always be appropriate or relevant for natural character. It may not be. Indeed, in some situations (such as rock faces) planting may conflict with the significant natural character values. In any event, Chapter ECO Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity includes a mitigation hierarchy which can address the need (or not) for rehabilitation planting. Clause (f) is not necessary and should be deleted.	Amend Policy CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) (which applies only to use and development within mapped areas of 'high coastal natural character') as follows: Provide for use and development in areas of very high or <u>and</u> high coastal natural character in the coastal environment where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any Significant adverse effects on the identified values described in SCHED13 are avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values described in SCHED13 are avoided, remedied or mitigated; <u>and</u> 2. It can be demonstrated that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The particular values and characteristics of the areas of very high or high coastal natural character as identified in SCHED13 are protected from inappropriate use and development, considering the extent to which the values and characteristics of the area are vulnerable to change including the effects of climate change and other natural processes; b. Any proposed earthworks, building platforms and buildings or structures are of a scale and prominence that respects the identified values and the design and development integrates with the existing landform and dominant character of the area, <u>recognising the functional and operational needs of renewable electricity generation activities</u>; c. There is a functional or operational need for the activity to locate in the area; or d. The duration and nature of adverse effects are limited; e. <u>The use and development will upgrade, repower or replace existing renewable electricity generation assets and enable more effective use of natural resources for renewable electricity generation</u>; f. There are no reasonably <u>practicable</u> practical alternative locations that are outside of the coastal environment or are less vulnerable to change; and g. Restoration or rehabilitation planting of indigenous species will be incorporated to mitigate any adverse effects.
Yvonne Weeber	340.28	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.307	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Support in part	<p>Considers the policy does not give effect to NZCPS policy 13(1)(b), which requires that significant adverse effects are avoided on all areas of natural character of the coastal environment (other than outstanding). This policy only requires avoidance of significant adverse effects on identified areas of high natural character in SCHED 12.</p> <p>Seeks that this policy be amended to apply to all areas of natural character in the coastal environment, other than any areas of outstanding natural character.</p> <p>Delete the word 'identified' from 1. and 2.a.</p> <p>Add the word 'and' at the end of 1., to make clear that both 1. and 2. must be fulfilled.</p> <p>Amend 2.a. to make it clear that the consideration of the extent to which the values and characteristics are vulnerable to change etc is part of the consideration of appropriateness, but not all of it. This can be achieved by adding the words 'including by' before 'considering'.</p> <p>Change 'respects' in 2.b. to 'protects'.</p> <p>Delete 'operational' in 2.d. This test is far too broad.</p> <p>Add a clause providing that use or development will only be allowed where the natural character values of the area are retained.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) to give effect to policy 13(1)(b) of NZ Coastal Policy Statement and:</p> <p>Only allow use and development in high coastal natural character areas in the coastal environment where:</p> <p>1. Any significant adverse effects on the identified values described in SCHED12 are avoided and any other adverse effects on the identified values described in SCHED12 are avoided remedied or mitigated;</p> <p>2. It can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a. The particular values and characteristics of the high coastal natural character areas as identified in SCHED12 are protected from inappropriate use and development, <u>including by</u> considering the extent to which the values and characteristics of the area are vulnerable to change including the effects of climate change and other natural processes;</p> <p>b. Any proposed earthworks, building platforms and buildings or structures are of a scale and prominence that respects-protects the identified values and the design and development integrates with the existing landform and dominant character of the area;</p> <p>c. The duration and nature of adverse effects are limited;</p> <p>d. There is a functional or operational need for the activity to locate in the area;</p> <p>e. There are no reasonably practical alternative locations that are outside of the high coastal natural character areas or are less vulnerable to change; and</p> <p>f. Restoration or rehabilitation planting of indigenous species will be incorporated to mitigate any adverse effects.</p> <p><u>g. Use and development will only be allowed where natural character values of the area are retained.</u></p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.96	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.160	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Oppose	Meridian considers its proposed amended wording in submission point 221.108 more appropriately gives effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.208	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Amend	Considers the policy does not give effect to NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b) which is to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on natural character in all other areas which are not outstanding, rather than just in sites of high natural character. The policy needs be amended so that clause 1 applies to natural character in all areas of the coastal environment.	<p>Amend CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) to manage effects across all coastal natural character areas as follows:</p> <p>CE-P5 Use and development in high coastal natural character areas</p> <p>Only allow use and development in high coastal natural character areas in the coastal environment where:</p> <p>...</p>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.161	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Oppose	Meridian understands the point GWRC is trying to make (that effects on all scales of natural character in the coastal environment must be managed in accordance with NZCPS Policy 13). Consider that however, this Plan doesn't identify other 'natural character areas', so the requested relief will not achieve that outcome. Policy CE-P1 and P7, together, implement NZCPS Policy 13 and this Plan does not identify any areas of outstanding natural character in the coastal environment.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.234	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Amend	The submitter notes that the coastal environment is home to indigenous biodiversity and that should be provided for in the District Plan.	Amend CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) to add another point after Point 1, as follows: ... <u>2. Any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity are applied in accordance with ECO-P2.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.138	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to require land use and development to avoid adversely effecting all effects, irrespective of their nature, scale or extent.	Disallow
Director-General of Conservation	385.63	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Support	Supports proposed policy CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas).	Retain policy CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.62	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P5	Support	Supports CE-P5 as the submitter recognises the importance of high coastal natural character areas. The submitter supports the provision as proposed as it allows for development where there is a functional and operational need in these areas. The Ministry may at times need to locate educational facilities in these areas to meet the needs of existing communities. Where required, development of these facilities would be sympathetic to the surrounding landscape as required by this policy.	Retain CE-P5 (Use and development in high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.133	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Support	Supports the policy as it allows use and development within coastal and riparian margins inside of the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area.	Retain CE-P6 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment - located inside Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone, or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.29	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.308	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Oppose in part	Considers the policy should not be a blanket enabling policy as it needs to recognise that there may be limits to development in those areas. At the very least, the policy should refer to potential limits on the use of these areas in accordance with policies 11, 13 and 15 NZCPS (and the policies in this plan that give effect to those policies). The requirements of the NZCPS do not stop applying because a zone has been assigned to an area	Amend CE-P6 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area): <u>Consider providing for use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment where it is located in the highly modified Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City Centre Zone or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area, with reference to limits on use in these areas in accordance with policies 11, 13, and 15 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.97	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.235	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Support	CE-P6 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P6 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located inside the Port Zone...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.309	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Oppose	Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P6 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.68	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.310	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Amend	Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete or amend CE-P6 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) as follows: CE-P6 Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area <u>or the Natural Open Space zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u> Provide for use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment where it is located in the highly modified Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City Centre Zone, or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area <u>or the area of Natural Open Space Zone located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.69	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.311	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Amend	Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	If CE-P6 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) is not amended: Seeks that CE-P6 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) is amended to give relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.70	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.21	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P6	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.134	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Support	Supports the policy as it allows use and development within coastal and riparian margins outside of the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area where I can be demonstrated there is an operational and functional need for the activity in the area.	Retain CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment - located outside Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone, or Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.30	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Support	CE-P7 is supported, but it is noted that the policy conflicts with INF-CE-P21 and other coastal policies in relationship to the term 'upgrading'.	Retain CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone and the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.309	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Support in part	<p>Supports the policy in part. Considers 2.d. is not clear as to which effects are being mitigated. It appears that the Plan's approach is to only deal with natural character effects in this chapter, and have the biodiversity policies applying separately. However, 2.d. is not clear on that, and should refer specifically to 'natural character effects'.</p> <p>This policy needs to recognise that there may be limits to development in those areas. At the very least, the policy should refer to potential limits on the use of these areas in accordance with policies 11, 13 and 15 NZCPS (and the policies in this plan that give effect to those policies). The requirements of the NZCPS do not stop applying because a zone has or has not been assigned to an area.</p> <p>The policy should be amended to add a clause providing that use or development will only be allowed where the natural character values of the area are retained.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone and the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area):</p> <p>Only allow use and development within coastal and riparian margins in the coastal environment outside of the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any significant adverse effects on the natural character of the coastal environment are avoided and any other adverse effects on the natural character of the coastal environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 2. It can be demonstrated that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Any proposed earthworks, building platform, building or structure are able to integrate with the existing landform, do not dominate the natural character of the area and do not limit or prevent public access to, along or adjacent to the coast and waterbodies; b. There is a functional or operational need for the activity to locate within the coastal or riparian margin; c. There are no reasonably practical alternative locations that are outside of the coastal or riparian margins or are less vulnerable to change; and d. Restoration or rehabilitation planting of indigenous species will be incorporated to mitigate any adverse effects <u>on natural character</u>. e. <u>Use and development will only be allowed where the natural character values of the area are retained.</u> f. <u>Are within potential development limits in these areas in accordance with policies 11, 13, and 15 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.98	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.162	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Oppose	<p>Considers that the requested additional text is not necessary because the Plan already provides for those matters, including in the wording of Policy CE-P7 (1) and (2).</p>	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.236	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Support	<p>CE-P7 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.</p>	Retain CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone...) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.64	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Support	<p>Supports proposed policy CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone and the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area).</p>	Retain policy CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone and the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.312	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Oppose	<p>Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.71	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.313	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Amend	Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment) as follows: CE-P7 Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone, and the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area <u>or the area of Natural Open Space Zone located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u> Only allow use and development within coastal and riparian margins in the coastal environment outside of the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone or the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area <u>or the area of Natural Open Space zoned land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u> where ... 2. It can be demonstrated that: a. Any proposed earthworks, building platform, building or structure are able to integrate with the existing landform, do not dominate the natural character of the area and <u>where appropriate</u> do not limit or prevent public access to, along or adjacent to the coast and waterbodies; ... d. <u>Where appropriate</u> restoration or rehabilitation planting of indigenous species will be incorporated to mitigate any adverse effects. ...
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.72	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.314	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Amend	Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	If CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone and the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) is not amended: Seeks that CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone and the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) is amended to give relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.73	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.22	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P7	Support	Supports CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone and the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area).	Retain CE-P7 (Use and development within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment – located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone and the Evans Bay Marine Recreation Area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.109	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Support in part	Considers that policy CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) is potentially restrictive of vegetation removal that is necessary to support regionally significant infrastructure and needs to be amended to recognise and provide for the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain Policy CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.110	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Amend	Considers that policy CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) is potentially restrictive of vegetation removal that is necessary to support regionally significant infrastructure and needs to be amended to recognise and provide for the particular operational and functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure.	Amend Policy CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) as follows: Manage the removal of vegetation in the coastal environment as follows: 1. Allow for the removal of vegetation in the coastal environment outside of areas of very high or high coastal natural character. 2. Allow for the removal of exotic vegetation in the coastal environment within areas of very high or high coastal natural character. 3. Only allow for the removal of indigenous vegetation in the coastal environment within areas of very high or high coastal natural character that: a. Is of a scale that maintains the identified values; or b. Is associated with ongoing maintenance of existing public accessways; <u>or</u> c. <u>Is necessary to enable the operation, maintenance, repair or upgrading of regionally significant infrastructure.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.63	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Support	Supports recognition that vegetation clearance can be necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.47	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Support	Supports the ability to remove vegetation in the coastal environment outside of areas of very high or high coastal natural character.	Retain CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.135	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Support in part	Supports the policy as it manages the removal of vegetation in the coastal environment. It is however important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property. This is particularly important where a property is located outside of a reticulated water network and any surrounding environment includes vegetation.	Retain CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.136	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Amend	Supports the policy as it manages the removal of vegetation in the coastal environment. It is however important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property. This is particularly important where a property is located outside of a reticulated water network and any surrounding environment includes vegetation.	Amend CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) as follows: Manage the removal of vegetation in the coastal environment as follows: ... 3. Only allow for the removal of indigenous vegetation in the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas that: ... b. Is associated with ongoing maintenance of existing public accessways; <u>or</u> c. <u>It is necessary to avoid loss of life, injury or serious damage to property, including from the risk of fire.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Yvonne Weeber	340.31	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Amend	Considers that CE-P8 should be amended to consider coastal erosion and other environmental, social and cultural benefits of both indigenous and exotic vegetation in the coastal environment.	Amend CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) to consider coastal erosion and other environmental, social and cultural benefits of both indigenous and exotic vegetation in the coastal environment.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.310	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Support in part	Opposes the policy direction that provides generally for vegetation removal outside of high natural character areas. Opposes the policy direction that provides for exotic vegetation removal in high natural character areas. Exotic vegetation can contribute to natural character, and can also have ecosystem and habitat values. Supports the policy direction that vegetation removal within the coastal environment should be limited. However, this needs to be amended to apply to any area of natural character in the coastal environment, not just areas of high natural character. Limiting protections to high natural character areas only is inconsistent with policy 13 NZCPS. As discussed above, there is a lack of protection for SNAs in the coastal environment that are urban allotments. This policy was clearly intended to deal with natural character effects. However, in the absence of protections for these SNAs, the policy becomes even more important.	Amend CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment): <u>Only allow for vegetation clearance in the coastal environment where:</u> <u>a. The removal is of a scale that retains the biodiversity and natural character values of the area; and</u> <u>b. Is associated with ongoing maintenance of existing public accessways; and</u> <u>c. The removal does not contravene policy 11 or 13 NZCPS.</u> Manage the removal of vegetation in the coastal environment as follows:- a. Allow for the removal of vegetation in the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas; b. Allow for the removal of exotic vegetation in the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas; and c. Only allow for the removal of indigenous vegetation in the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas that: a. Is of a scale that maintains the identified values; or b. Is associated with ongoing maintenance of existing public accessways.-
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.163	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Oppose	Meridian considers its proposed amended wording in submission point 221.110 more appropriately gives effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.209	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Amend	Considers the policy does not give effect to NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b) which is to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on natural character in areas which are not outstanding, rather than just in sites of high natural character in isolation. Furthermore, allowing for the removal of indigenous vegetation in areas of low and moderate natural character could lead to a reduction in natural character and would not give effect to CE-O1.	Amend CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) as follows: Manage the removal of vegetation in the coastal environment as follows: 1. Allow for the removal of <u>exotic</u> vegetation in the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character <u>sites and</u> areas; 2. Allow for the removal of exotic vegetation in the coastal environment within high coastal natural character <u>sites and</u> areas; and 3. Only allow for the removal of indigenous vegetation in the coastal environment within high coastal natural character <u>sites and</u> areas that: a. Is of a scale that maintains the identified values; or b. Is associated with ongoing maintenance of existing public accessways.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.164	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Oppose	Considers that the requested amendments are not necessary because Policy CE-P1 and P7, together, implement NZCPS Policy 13.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.200	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Support in part	Support in principle.	Retain CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment), subject to amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.201	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Amend	Considers that policy should be amended to provide for indigenous vegetation removal for the maintenance of public roads as well as accessways, to align with CE-R6 and CE-S1.	Amend CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) as follows: ... 3. Only allow for the removal of indigenous vegetation in the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas that: a. Is of a scale that maintains the identified values; or b. Is associated with ongoing maintenance of existing public accessways <u>and public roads.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.237	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Support	CE-P8 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.23	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P8	Amend	Considers the removal of vegetation within the coastal environment unless adequate consideration has been made of coastal erosion and other environmental, social and cultural benefits of the vegetation. Coastal vegetation is often difficult to grow and maintain. While it may just look weedy and unkempt it has many important benefits to the environment. Changes are necessary to give effect to the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Council Proposed RPS - Plan Change 1.	Amend CE-P8 (Vegetation removal within the coastal environment) to consider coastal erosion and other environmental, social and cultural benefits of both indigenous and exotic vegetation in the coastal environment <u>in a manner consistent with the direction in the Proposed RPS -PC1 (and draft NPS-IB).</u>
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.48	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P9	Support	Supports that CE-P9 recognises existing quarry activities, and their expansion. The policy recognises the importance and role of existing quarry activities and provides a policy pathway for their expansion (outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal and riparian margins). Notwithstanding the sought amendment to the CE line as it relates to the Horokiwi site, the submitter supports policy CE-P9.	Retain CE-P9 (Mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment) as notified, with amendments to the Coastal Environment Overlay.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.311	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P9	Oppose in part	Opposes the blanket provision (in 1.) for existing activities, as this suggests their effects would not need to be considered if they require re-consenting. Opposes because it is inconsistent with the NZCPS requirement to avoid significant adverse effects on all areas of natural character, not only high natural character. Supports 3, but this should not be limited to areas of high natural character. Supports paragraph 4.	Amend CE-P9 (Mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment): Manage mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment as follows: 1. Allow for established mining and quarrying activities in the Coastal Environment <u>where their effects can be managed in accordance with the objectives and policies of this Plan;</u> 2. Only allow for the extension of established mining and quarrying activities or new quarrying and mining activities where it is located outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal and riparian margins and any potential adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 3. Avoid the extension of established mining and quarrying activities and the establishment of new mining and quarrying within <u>high</u> coastal natural character areas and within coastal and riparian margins in the coastal environment; and 4. Avoid the establishment of new mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.8	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P9	Oppose	Policy NFL-P9 is specific to mining and quarrying, and in relation to the Horokiwi site, is supported in that it recognises existing quarry activities, and their expansion. Specific to Horokiwi, the policy recognises the importance and role of existing quarry activities and provides a policy pathway for their expansion (outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal and riparian margins).	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.238	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P9	Support	CE-P9 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P9 (Mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.111	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P10	Oppose	Considers that Policy CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment) provides no guidance on what is considered 'inappropriate' in the coastal environment. This submission point is not saying that inappropriate activities should be allowed in the coastal environment. Rather, the point is that there is already sufficient useful guidance in other policies about what is considered inappropriate. Considers Policy CE-P10 adds no value and should be deleted.	Delete policy CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment) in its entirety.
Wellington City Council	266.111	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P10	Amend	Considers commas need to be added to the Policy for clarification purposes.	Amend CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment) as follows: Avoid the establishment of activities that are incompatible with, or detrimental to, the natural character and qualities within the landward extent of the coastal environment.
Yvonne Weeber	340.32	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.312	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P10	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.239	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P10	Support	CE-P10 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P10	Support	Supports proposed policy CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment).	Retain policy CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.315	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P10	Oppose	Opposes this policy. It is inappropriate for such a directive policy to apply to such a large and generally urbanised area, with highly variable levels of 'natural character and quality'. The extent to which an activity is 'incompatible with or detrimental to' with its surrounding environment, including its potential effects on coastal environment is addressed within the underlying land use zone provisions and the various natural environment overlays within the Proposed Plan.	Delete CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment) in its entirety.
Fabric Property Limited	425.35	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P10	Not specified	Considers Policy CE10.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. This policy fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD, and is inconsistent with CE-O8, which is to provide for activities in the City Centre Zone which do not increase the risk to people, property or infrastructure. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.	Not specified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P10	Support	Supports CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment).	Retain CE-P10 (Inappropriate activities within the coastal environment) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.33	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.313	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards): Identify coastal hazards within the District Plan and take a risk-based approach to the management of subdivision, use and development based on the following: 1. The sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of coastal hazards; 2. The risk posed to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values</u> by considering the likelihood and consequences of different coastal hazard events; and 3. The longer term impacts of climate change and sea level rise.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.99	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.210	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.240	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support	CE-P11 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.77	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support in part	Supports this policy in so far that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood and consequences of different coastal hazard events. The Proposed Plan clearly identifies the risk of various coastal hazard events e.g. a high risk that a property will be affected if there is a tsunami. However, the Proposed Plan does not identify the probability of such events (which are low). This makes the identification of hazards misleading and potentially alarming	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.250	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support	CE-P11 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.38	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support in part	Supports this policy to the extent that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood, and consequences of different coastal hazards.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.316	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.317	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as follows: Seeks that CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.95	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate ¹ . Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow
Wellington City Council	266.112	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers the policy isn't clear and needs minor changes.	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows: <u>Ensure</u> subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by: 1. Enable <u>Enabling</u> subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; (...)
Yvonne Weeber	340.34	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support	CE-P12 is supported, specifically the classification of Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area.	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.314	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk): Subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by: 1. Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; 2. Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development that addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values</u> in the low and medium hazard areas; and 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area unless there is a functional and operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.100	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.211	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Seeks to amend CE-P12 (levels of risk) as follows: Subdivision, use and development <u>minimises</u> reduces the risk to people, property and infrastructure by: ... 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area unless there is a functional and operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces <u>minimise</u> the risk to people, property and infrastructure.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.35	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.241	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support	CE-P12 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.78	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	<p>Opposes Policy CE-P12.1. This policy is very restrictive to enable only low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays. The Coastal Hazard Overlays apply to approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy does not appropriately recognise this context and existing built environment.</p> <p>Considers Policy CE-12.2 would also require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the Low and Medium Hazard Areas. All of Argosy's properties are located in Low or Medium Hazard Areas. Policy CE-12.2 should apply to the Coastal Hazard Inundation Overlay only. It is not appropriate to require mitigation for tsunami risk based on the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event. Further, it is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from coastal hazards, rather than to reduce or not increase the risk.</p> <p>Considers CE-P12.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. As noted above, the Proposed Plan fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; 2. Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development <u>to reduce or not increase that</u> addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in the low, and medium <u>and high hazard areas</u> 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area <u>of the Coastal Inundation Overlay</u> unless there is an functional and or operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.4	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. Additionally, mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.251	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support in part	CE-P12 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.252	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers that CE-P12 should be amended so that the policy enables mitigation of hazard risk in high hazard areas.	<p>Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p><u>New S</u> subdivision, use and development <u>reduces does not increase</u> the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the Coastal Hazard Overlays; 2. Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development that addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in the low and medium hazard areas; and 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area unless there is an functional and operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.63	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	The category of high hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from natural hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. Many natural hazard risks are going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. As such avoidance of subdivision and development in these areas is appropriate, and risks should be reduced where possible, rather than keeping the status quote i.e. not increasing risks.	Disallow
Ministry of Education	400.63	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support	Supports CE-P12 as the submitter may at times need to locate educational facilities in these areas to meet the needs of existing communities. The submitter notes that where required, development of these facilities would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce the risks to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.39	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Opposes CE-P12.1. Considers this policy is very restrictive in only enabling low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays, as it applies to approximately half of the CBD. Considers this policy does not appropriately recognise this context and existing built environment.	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows: Subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by: 1. Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays;
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.71	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	The category of high hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from natural hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. Many natural hazard risks are going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. As such avoidance of subdivision and development in these areas is appropriate.	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.40	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	Opposes CE-P12.1. Considers this policy is very restrictive in only enabling low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays, as it applies to approximately half of the CBD. Considers this policy does not appropriately recognise this context and existing built environment.	Delete CE-P12.1 (Levels of risk) in its entirety.
Oyster Management Limited	404.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers that Policy CE-12.2 would require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the Low and Medium Hazard Areas. Policy CE-12.2 should apply to the Coastal Hazard Inundation Overlay only. Considers that it is not appropriate to require mitigation for tsunami risk because of the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event. Further, the submitter considers that it is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from coastal hazards, rather than to reduce or not increase the risk.	Amend CE-12.2 (Levels of risk) as follows: ... 2. Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development to <u>reduce or not increase that</u> addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in the low, and medium, <u>and high hazard</u> areas;
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.72	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	The category of high hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from natural hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk.	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers Policy CE12.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. As noted above, the Proposed Plan fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.	Amend CE-12.3 (Levels of risk) as follows: ... 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area <u>of the Coastal Inundation Overlay</u> unless there is a functional and <u>or</u> operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that <u>reduces or does not increase</u> the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.73	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P12	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. Additionally, mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy (ref tsunami guidance). A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.318	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P12 (Levels of risk) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.319	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	<p>Opposes this policy.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Either delete or amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>Seeks that CE-P12 (Levels of risk) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.</p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.96	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	<p>The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.</p>	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.36	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	<p>Considers that CE-P12.1 is very restrictive to enable only low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays. The Coastal Hazard Overlays apply to approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy is not an appropriate control in this context and existing built environment.</p> <p>Similarly, Policy CE-12.2 would require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the Low and Medium Hazard Areas. Four of Fabric's properties are located in Low or Medium Hazard Areas. Policy CE-12.2 should apply to the Coastal Hazard Inundation Overlay only. It is not appropriate to require mitigation for tsunami risk based on the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event. Further, it is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from coastal hazards, rather than to reduce or not increase the risk.</p> <p>Policy CE10.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. This policy fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD, and is inconsistent with CE-O8, which is to provide for activities in the City Centre Zone which do not increase the risk to people, property or infrastructure. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.</p>	Opposes CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified and seeks amendments.
Fabric Property Limited	425.37	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	<p>Considers that Policy CE-P12.1 is very restrictive to enable only low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays. The Coastal Hazard Overlays apply to approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy is not an appropriate control in this context and existing built environment.</p> <p>Similarly, Policy CE-12.2 would require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the Low and Medium Hazard Areas. Four of Fabric's properties are located in Low or Medium Hazard Areas. Policy CE-12.2 should apply to the Coastal Hazard Inundation Overlay only. It is not appropriate to require mitigation for tsunami risk based on the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event. Further, it is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from coastal hazards, rather than to reduce or not increase the risk.</p> <p>Policy CE10.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. This policy fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD, and is inconsistent with CE-O8, which is to provide for activities in the City Centre Zone which do not increase the risk to people, property or infrastructure. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays;</p> <p>1. 2- Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development to reduce or not increase that addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in the low, and medium and high hazard areas;</p> <p>2. 3- Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area of the Coastal Inundation Overlay unless there is a functional and or operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.14	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. Additionally, mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. GNS guidelines for integrating tsunami modelling into land use planning supports a risk-based approach to avoid, mitigate, or reduce tsunami risk.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.35	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.315	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.101	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.212	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.242	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Support	CE-P13 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.20	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports this policy as it provides for additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.137	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports the policy as it enables additions to buildings that accommodate existing hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the additions enable the continued use of the existing building.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potential hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.36	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	CE-P14 is supported. However, the related planning maps should be clearly mapped using the language from CE-P14.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.316	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.102	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.243	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	CE-P14 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.79	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	Supports the direction that additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities should be enabled within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the risk can be mitigated. However, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk. It would also be reasonable for policy CE-P14 to enable uses of the same level of hazard sensitivity in additions to buildings, rather than enabling the continued existing use. The risk assessment framework in the Proposed Plan provides classifications of activities based on their risk level i.e. Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities. There is no reason for uses within the same level of hazard sensitivity to be differentiated.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified, subject to amendments.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.80	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Amend	Supports the direction that additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities should be enabled within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the risk can be mitigated. However, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk. It would also be reasonable for policy CE-P14 to enable uses of the same level of hazard sensitivity in additions to buildings, rather than enabling the continued existing use. The risk assessment framework in the Proposed Plan provides classifications of activities based on their risk level i.e. Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities. There is no reason for uses within the same level of hazard sensitivity to be differentiated.	Amend CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area): Enable additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area in the <u>Coastal Inundation Overlay</u> , where: 1. They enable the continued use <u>same level of hazard sensitivity of the existing use of the building</u> ; 2. The risk from the coastal hazard is low due to either: a. Proposed mitigation measures; or b. The size and the activity of the addition
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.5	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. Tsunami are not a 'remote' risk. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of this submission regarding hazard overlays be disallowed.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.253	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	CE-P14 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.64	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports CE-P14 as proposed.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.91	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	Supports the direction that additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities should be enabled within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the risk can be mitigated.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.92	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Amend	<p>Supports the direction that additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities should be enabled within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the risk can be mitigated. However, considers it difficult to provide mitigation measures for tsunami risk because of the remoteness of the risk.</p> <p>Considers it would be reasonable for policy CE-P14 to enable uses of the same level of hazard sensitivity in additions to buildings, rather than enabling the continued existing use. The risk assessment framework in the Proposed Plan provides classifications of activities based on their risk level i.e. Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities. Considers there is no reason for uses within the same level of hazard sensitivity to be differentiated.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>Enable additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area <u>in the Coastal Inundation Overlay</u>, where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They enable the continued use <u>same level of hazard sensitivity</u> of the existing <u>use of the building</u>; 2. The risk from the coastal hazard is low due to either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Proposed mitigation measures; or b. The size and the activity of the addition.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.74	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	<p>Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. Tsunami are not a 'remote' risk. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years.</p> <p>A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.</p>	Disallow / Toka Tū Ake EQC seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.
Investore Property Limited	405.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-R14 (Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures within in the coastal environment: - Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.320	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	<p>Opposes this policy.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.321	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Amend	<p>Opposes this policy.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Either delete or amend CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>Seeks that CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.</p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.97	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	<p>Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. Tsunami are not a remote risk. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.</p>	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.38	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports this policy as it provides for additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-P14 (Additionsto buildings) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.113	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Amend	Considers the policy isn't clear and needs minor changes in a manner consistent with the wording of CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas)	Amend CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as follows: Provide for hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard area, or any subdivision where the building platform for a hazard sensitive <u>activity activities</u> is within the low coastal hazard area, where it can be demonstrated that: (...)
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.138	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for hazard sensitive activities within the low and medium coastal hazard areas.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.37	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support in part	CE-P15 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.317	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.103	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.213	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.244	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	CE-P15 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.254	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	CE-P15 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	Supports CE-P15 as proposed. The submitter considers that where educational facilities are required in these areas, appropriate mitigation measures and evacuation plans should be implemented to ensure the safety of staff, students and the community.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.322	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.323	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as follows: Seeks that CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.98	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.21	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	Supports CE-P16 as it provides for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas.	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.38	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support in part	CE-P16 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.318	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.104	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.214	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Provide for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas, or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard-sensitive activity will be within the mediumcoastal hazard areas where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that minimise reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and ...
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.36	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.245	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	CE-P16 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.81	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support in part	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within medium hazard areas where appropriate. However, as noted above, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified, subject to amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.82	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Amend	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within medium hazard areas where appropriate. However, as noted above, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas): Provide for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas, or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard-sensitive activity will be within the medium coastal hazard areas where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and <u>or</u> 2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building in case of a tsunami.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.6	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami and other coastal hazards are possible with land use planning and building design, and land use planning may be required to ensure that tsunami evacuation routes are secured. It is therefore appropriate to require measures that reduce or do not increase risk from activities within medium coastal hazard areas, as well as requiring safe tsunami evacuation routes.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.255	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	CE-P16 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.93	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support in part	Supports the policy to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within medium hazard areas where appropriate	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.94	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Amend	Supports the policy to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within medium hazard areas where appropriate. However, notes that it is difficult to provide mitigation measures for tsunami risk because of the remoteness of the risk, so considers that it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Provide for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas, or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity will be within the medium coastal hazard areas where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and <u>or</u> 2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building in case of a tsunami.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.75	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and land use planning may be required to ensure that tsunami evacuation routes are secured. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. It is therefore appropriate to require measures that reduce or do not increase risk from activities within medium coastal hazard areas, as well as requiring safe tsunami evacuation routes.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.324	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.325	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Seeks that CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.99	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.39	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	Supports CE-P16 as it provides for potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas. Considers that it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.114	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Amend	Considers the policy isn't clear.	Amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Only allow hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area where , or any subdivision where the building platform for a hazard-sensitive activity will be within the medium coastal hazard area, where it can be demonstrated that: (...)
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.139	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for hazard sensitive activities within the low and medium coastal hazard areas.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.39	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support in part	CE-P17 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.319	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.105	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.215	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Only allow hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area where, or any subdivision where the building platform for a hazard-sensitive activity will be within the medium coastal hazard area, where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that minimise, reduce or not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard, and;
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.246	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support	CE-P17 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.83	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support in part	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables activities in the medium coastal hazard areas. However, due to the extent of the high coastal hazard area and the extent of potentially hazard sensitive activities, this policy should also apply in those scenarios.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified, subject to amendments.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.84	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support in part	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables activities in the medium coastal hazard areas. However, due to the extent of the high coastal hazard area and the extent of potentially hazard sensitive activities, this policy should also apply in those scenarios.	Amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) so that it also applies to hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard areas
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.7	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Oppose	It is not appropriate to allow hazard-sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the high coastal hazard area, not only due to the current risk but because that risk will increase in the near future due to the effects of climate change.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.256	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support	CE-P17 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.66	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support	Supports CE-P17 as proposed. The submitter considers that where educational facilities are required in these areas, appropriate mitigation measures and evacuation plans should be implemented to ensure the safety of staff, students and the community.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.326	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas)and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.327	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Seeks that CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.100	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.22	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Considers that the use of the term "avoid" is unnecessarily onerous and suggests that the establishment of Hazard-Sensitive Activities and Potentially-Hazard-Sensitive Activities within the High Coastal Hazard Areas should not occur at all.</p> <p>The requested amendment would provide appropriate policy support to the Restricted Discretionary status in rule CE-R20.</p> <p>The Restricted Discretionary status is enabling of activities, potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities in high coastal hazard areas within the City Centre Zone and this needs to be recognised with appropriate wording in the supporting policy.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>Avoid <u>Only allow</u> Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these high coastal hazard areas is not a practicable option; 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or do not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard; 3. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard; and 4. The activity does not involve the removal or modification of a natural system or feature that provides protection to other properties from the natural hazard.
Wellington City Council	266.115	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Considers the policy isn't clear and requires a consequential change to remove the capital 'H'.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>Avoid Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area, or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area <u>except</u> where it can be demonstrated that: (...)</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.140	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support	<p>Supports the policy as it allows hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area where the activity has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these areas is not a practicable option. However, FENZ considers the wording of CE-P18 is unclear and seeks an amendment to address this.</p>	<p>Retain (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area), with amendment.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.141	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Supports the policy as it allows hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area where the activity has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these areas is not a practicable option. However, FENZ considers the wording of CE-P18 is unclear and seeks an amendment to address this.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>Avoid Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where <u>unless</u> it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these high coastal hazard areas is not a practicable option;
Dawid Wojasz	295.5	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in an a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue.</p> <p>If the City Centre is not exempt from the overlay then point one in CE-P18 should be removed or amended.</p>	<p>Opposes application of High, Medium and Low Coastal Hazard overlay within the City Centre and seeks amendment.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dawid Wojasz	295.6	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue. (Option A)</p> <p>If the City Centre is not exempt from the overlay then point one in CE-P18 should be removed or amended.</p>	<p>Seeks that CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) is amended as follows:</p> <p>Avoid Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these high coastal hazard areas is not a practicable option;</p> <p>1-2 The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard;</p> <p>2-3 There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard; and</p> <p>3-4 The activity does not involve the removal or modification of a natural system or feature that provides protection to other properties from the natural hazard.</p>
Dawid Wojasz	295.7	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue. (Option B)</p>	<p>Seeks that CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) is amended to include high density as functional need to locate a building within the high hazard area.</p>
Yvonne Weeber	340.40	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support in part	<p>CE-P18 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.</p>	<p>Not specified.</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.320	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support in part	<p>Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.106	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	<p>Disallow</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.216	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>Avoid Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where it can be demonstrated that:...</p> <p>1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate minimise reduce or not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard, and...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.37	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.247	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support	CE-P18 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.85	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	Opposes this provision as it is not practical to avoid hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area.	Delete CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.8	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	It is not appropriate to allow hazard-sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the high coastal hazard area, not only due to the current risk but because that risk will increase in the near future due to the effects of climate change.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.257	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support in part	CE-P18 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.258	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	Considers that CE-P18 should be amended to enable the potential for Hazard Sensitive Activities and Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the High Coastal Hazard Area to be provided in some circumstances where the risks can be managed through mitigation measures.	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows: Avoid <u>Only allow</u> Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these high coastal hazard areas is not a practicable option; <u>or is within an existing urban area;</u> 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that it <u>reduces</u> or <u>does not increase</u> the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard;
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.64	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	The category of high coastal hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from coastal hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. As such avoidance of subdivision and development in these areas is appropriate even within an existing urban area. Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk.	Disallow
Ministry of Education	400.67	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support	Supports CE-P18 as proposed. The submitter considers that where educational facilities are required in these areas, appropriate mitigation measures and evacuation plans should be implemented to ensure the safety of staff, students and the community.	Retain CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.95	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose in part	Opposes CE-P18 in part as the submitter considers it is not practical to avoid hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the High Coastal Tsunami Hazard Area.	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows: Avoid hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the High Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the High Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the High Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay and locating outside of these high Coastal Hazard areas Inundation Overlay is not a practicable option; 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal inundation hazard; 3. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal inundation hazard; and 4. The activity does not involve the removal or modification of a natural system or feature that provides protection to other properties from the natural hazard.
Oyster Management Limited	404.96	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	Considers it is not practical to avoid hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the High Coastal Tsunami Hazard Area.	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows: Avoid hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the High Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the High Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high Coastal Hazard areas Inundation Overlay and locating outside of these high Coastal Hazard areas Inundation Overlay is not a practicable option; 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal inundation hazard; 3. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal inundation hazard; and 4. The activity does not involve the removal or modification of a natural system or feature that provides protection to other properties from the natural hazard.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.76	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	It is not appropriate to allow hazard-sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the high coastal tsunami hazard area. While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling).	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.40	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose in part	Seeks amendment of CE-P18 to change the word “avoid” to “only allow where...”. The use of the term “avoid” is unnecessarily onerous and suggests that the establishment of Hazard-Sensitive Activities and Potentially Hazard-Sensitive Activities within the High Coastal Hazard Areas should not occur at all. The requested amendment would provide appropriate policy support to the Restricted Discretionary status in rule CE-R20. The Restricted Discretionary status is enabling of Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities in high coastal hazard areas within the City Centre Zone and this needs to be recognised with appropriate wording in the supporting policy.	Opposes CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities) in part and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Seeks amendment of CE-P18 to change the word “avoid” to “only allow where...”.</p> <p>The use of the term “avoid” is unnecessarily onerous and suggests that the establishment of Hazard-Sensitive Activities and Potentially Hazard-Sensitive Activities within the High Coastal Hazard Areas should not occur at all.</p> <p>The requested amendment would provide appropriate policy support to the Restricted Discretionary status in rule CE-R20. The Restricted Discretionary status is enabling of Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities in high coastal hazard areas within the City Centre Zone and this needs to be recognised with appropriate wording in the supporting policy.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities) as follows:</p> <p>Avoid <u>Only allow</u> Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the...</p> <p>2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or do not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard;</p> <p>...</p>
Wellington City Council	266.116	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Amend	Considers the policy needs minor amendments for consistency with the rest of the chapter/plan.	<p>Amend CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operational port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays</p> <p>Enable subdivision, development and use associated with the Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or more than 10 employees associated with either of these activities or the creation of vacant allotments.</p>
Yvonne Weeber	340.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support in part	CE-P19 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.321	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.107	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.217	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.248	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support	CE-P19 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.116	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support in part	Supports policy, but opposes the structure of the plan managing Natural Hazards as it is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter, the Natural Hazards Chapter as well as this chapter dealing with coastal hazards in the Coastal Environment. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that all Natural Hazards provisions are consolidated in the same place or stronger cross-referencing is provided.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.328	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.329	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Seeks that CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.101	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.100	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support	Supports policy that enables subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazards Overlay.	Retain CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.25	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support in part	CE-P20 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.322	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.108	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.218	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlays where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or over 10 employees associated with either of these activities by ensuring that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that <u>minimise</u> do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure; and ...
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.38	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.249	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support	CE-P20 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.117	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support in part	Supports policy, but opposes the structure of the plan managing Natural Hazards as it is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter, the Natural Hazards Chapter as well as this chapter dealing with coastal hazards in the Coastal Environment. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that all Natural Hazards provisions are consolidated in the same place or stronger cross-referencing is provided.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.330	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.331	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Seeks that CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.102	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.101	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support	Supports policy that enables subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazards Overlay.	Retain CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.26	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.323	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays): Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees or the creation of vacant allotments.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.109	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.219	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.250	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support	CE-P21 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.86	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Amend	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre zone in some instances. However, it is impractical to only enable activities in buildings which will not be occupied by employees, and this would be inconsistent with the purpose and objectives and policies in the City Centre zone. The city centre is a major employment hub and contains entertainment, educational, government and commercial activities which involve employees.	Amend CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays): Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees or the creation of vacant allotments
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.259	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Oppose	CE-P21 is opposed as notified. Considers that the policy places inappropriate restrictions on the City Centre Zone. It sought that this policy is deleted, and considered that more appropriate outcomes are achieved by CE-P22.	Delete CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) in its entirety.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.84	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the deletion of CE-P21 as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that CE-P21 is retained as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.97	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support in part	Supports the policy in that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre in some instances.	Retain CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.99	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Amend	Supports the policy in that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre in some instances. However, considers it is impractical to enable only activities in buildings that will not be occupied by employees, and this would be inconsistent with the purpose and objectives and policies in the City Centre zone. The city centre is a major employment hub and contains entertainment, educational, government and commercial activities which involve employees.	Amend CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees or the creation of vacant allotments."

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support in part	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre zone in some instances. However, it is impractical to only enable activities in buildings which will not be occupied by employees, and this would be inconsistent with the purpose and objectives and policies in the City Centre zone. The city centre is intended to be the primary centre for the region and contains entertainment, educational, government and commercial activities which involve employees.	Retain Policy CE-P21 (Subdivision), with amendment.
Fabric Property Limited	425.43	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Amend	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre zone in some instances. However, it is impractical to only enable activities in buildings which will not be occupied by employees, and this would be inconsistent with the purpose and objectives and policies in the City Centre zone. The city centre is intended to be the primary centre for the region and contains entertainment, educational, government and commercial activities which involve employees.	Amend Policy CE-P21 (Subdivision) as follows: ... Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, <u>or employees</u> or the creation of vacant allotments.
Wellington City Council	266.117	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that; (...)
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.324	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.110	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.220	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that <u>minimise</u> reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property; and...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.39	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.251	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	CE-P22 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.87	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Amend	Supports this provision to the extent that it recognises that development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre zone is appropriate in some instances. This is important because the CBD is a social and economic hub of Wellington and it is important to recognise the existing investment in the CBD. However, as noted above, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays): Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property; and or 2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.260	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	CE-P22 is supported as notified.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.68	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	Supports CE-P22 as proposed. The submitter considers that where educational facilities are required in these areas, appropriate mitigation measures and evacuation plans should be implemented to ensure the safety of staff, students and the community.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.100	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support in part	Supports the policy to the extent it recognises development in coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre is appropriate in some instances, given it is the social and economic hub of Wellington and there is significant existing investment in the CBD.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.101	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Amend	Supports the policy to the extent it recognises development in coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre is appropriate in some instances, given it is the social and economic hub of Wellington and there is significant existing investment in the CBD. However, considers it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays): Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property; and or 2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.77	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. It is appropriate to require measures that reduce or do not increase risk from activities within medium coastal hazard areas, as well as requiring safe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling).	Disallow
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.2	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	Supports CE-P22 as it clearly allows for development and use of sites within the City Centre Zone and within all Coastal Hazard Overlays, provided the development includes appropriate mitigation.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.43	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support	CE-P23 is supported. The protection, restoration and enhancement of coastal natural systems and features to reduce risks posed by coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure are supported.	Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.325	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P23 (Natural systems and features): Protect, restore, and enhance natural systems and features where they will reduce the existing risk posed by coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.111	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.221	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.252	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support	CE-P23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.27	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support	Supports the protection, restoration and enhancement of coastal natural systems and features to reduce risks posed by coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain CE-23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.118	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Amend	Considers the policy needs minor wording change.	Amend CE-P24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure) as follows: Enable green infrastructure undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractors or agents within the identified Coastal Hazard Overlay where <u>this they</u> will reduce the risk from coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure.
Yvonne Weeber	340.44	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Support	CE-P24 is supported. The use of green infrastructure in coastal hazard mitigation is supported.	Retain CE-P24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.326	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure): Enable green infrastructure undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractors or agents within the identified Coastal Hazard Overlay where they will reduce the risk from coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.112	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.222	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to have regard to Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the change to the RPS directs consideration of, which aren't captured by green infrastructure. We therefore seek for this policy to be broadened.	Seeks to amend policy to include non-structural, soft engineering or mātauranga Māori approaches.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.253	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Support	CE-P24 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.28	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Support	Supports the use of green infrastructure in coastal hazard mitigation.	Retain CE-24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.327	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P25	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P25 (Green infrastructure and planning coastal hazard mitigation works): Encourage green infrastructure measures when undertaking planned coastal hazard mitigation works within the identified Coastal Hazard Overlays where they will reduce the risk from coastal hazards risk to people, property and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.113	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P25	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.223	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P25	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to have regard to Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the change to the RPS directs consideration of, which aren't captured by green infrastructure. We therefore seek for this policy to be broadened.	Amend CE-P25 (Green infrastructure and planning coastal hazard mitigation works) to include non-structural, soft engineering or mātauranga Māori approaches.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.254	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P25	Support	CE-P25 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P25 (Green infrastructure and planning coastal hazard mitigation works) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.45	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.328	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.114	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.224	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to have regard to Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the change to the RPS directs consideration of, which aren't captured by green infrastructure. We therefore seek for this policy to be broadened.	Amend CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) to include non-structural, soft engineering or mātauranga Māori approaches.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.255	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Support	CE-P26 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.332	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Oppose	<p>The directive nature of this policy, coupled with the conjunction “and” sets an unduly onerous threshold for hard engineering measures which protect regionally significant infrastructure. It also discourages proactive maintenance and repair of hard engineering structures, as the policy pathway only triggers (due to the conjunction) when there is an ‘immediate risk to life or property’.</p> <p>Leaving such structures until the risk reaches this threshold may also result in a larger scale repair/replacement programme, resulting in larger environmental effects and costs.</p> <p>Considers that the conjunction ‘or’ should be used between each limb.</p> <p>Considers that this policy should relate to new sea walls, and not the upgrading, maintenance or repair of existing sea walls (or existing sea walls that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure).</p>	Opposes CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.333	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Amend	<p>The directive nature of this policy, coupled with the conjunction “and” sets an unduly onerous threshold for hard engineering measures which protect regionally significant infrastructure. It also discourages proactive maintenance and repair of hard engineering structures, as the policy pathway only triggers (due to the conjunction) when there is an ‘immediate risk to life or property’.</p> <p>Leaving such structures until the risk reaches this threshold may also result in a larger scale repair/replacement programme, resulting in larger environmental effects and costs.</p> <p>Considers that the conjunction ‘or’ should be used between each limb.</p> <p>Considers that this policy should relate to new sea walls, and not the upgrading, maintenance or repair of existing sea walls (or existing sea walls that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure).</p>	<p>Either delete, or amend CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as follows:</p> <p>Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The engineering measures are needed to protect existing nationally and regionally significant infrastructure and it can be demonstrated that there is no practicable alternative; <u>or</u> 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; <u>or</u> 3. The construction of the hard engineering measures will not <u>create an intolerable</u> increase the risk from Coastal Hazards on adjacent properties that are not protected by the hard engineering measures; <u>or</u> 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; <u>or</u> 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; <u>and/or</u> 6. <u>Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or</u> 7. 6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Support	Supports policy which recognises that, in some instances, hard engineering measures within the coastal environment are necessary to reduce an immediate risk of serious harm to property or infrastructure.	Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.329	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R1	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain CE-R1 (Customary harvesting by tangata whenua within the coastal environment) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.182	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.120, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.256	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R1	Support	CE-R1 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R1 (Customary harvesting by tangata whenua within the coastal environment) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.46	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R2	Support	CE-R2 is supported. The restoration and enhancement of the coastal environment is supported.	Retain CE-R2 (Restoration and enhancement activities within the coastal environment: 1. Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and 2. Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.330	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R2	Oppose	Considers it is not clear what activity this is permitting. Either delete this PA, or include much more detail as to what is intended. Only permit activities that are consistent with the requirement to protect the coastal environment's natural character, biodiversity and landscapes. Note that all areas of natural character are required to have significant adverse effects avoided. In our view the requirements of CE-R3.1 should apply in all areas of the coastal environment. Further, as noted above, the definition of restoration is not necessarily applicable to all types of restoration.	Delete CE-R2 (Restoration and enhancement activities within the coastal environment).
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.183	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.120, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.331	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R2	Oppose	Considers it is not clear what activity this is permitting. Either delete this PA, or include much more detail as to what is intended. Only permit activities that are consistent with the requirement to protect the coastal environment's natural character, biodiversity and landscapes. Note that all areas of natural character are required to have significant adverse effects avoided. In our view the requirements of CE-R3.1 should apply in all areas of the coastal environment. Further, as noted above, the definition of restoration is not necessarily applicable to all types of restoration.	Clarify CE-R2 (Restoration and enhancement activities within the coastal environment) to provide more detail on intent of rule.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.184	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.120, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.257	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R2	Support	CE-R2 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R2 (Restoration and enhancement activities within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and...) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.47	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R3	Support	CE-R3 is supported. The restoration and enhancement of the coastal environment is supported.	Retain CE-R3 (Restoration and enhancement activities within the coastal environment: 1. Within high coastal natural character areas; or 2. Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.332	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R3	Support in part	Considers these requirements should apply in all areas of the coastal environment, as well as in riparian margins	Amend CE-R3 (Restoration and enhancement activities within the coastal environment) to apply in all areas of the coastal environment and riparian margins.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.258	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R3	Support	CE-R3 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R3 (Restoration and enhancement activities within the coastal environment: Within high coastal natural character areas; or...) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.49	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R4	Support	Supports a permitted activity rule (with no controls) for vegetation trimming or removal noting that vegetation trimming or removal within an SNA within the CE is managed under the ECO chapter of the PDP.	Retain CE-R4 (Vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, outside of high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.142	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R4	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the trimming or removal of vegetation within the coastal environment.	Retain CE-R4 (Vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, outside of high natural character areas) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.48	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R4	Oppose	CE-R4 is opposed, as it generally make vegetation trimming and removal permitted. Coastal environment vegetation takes a long time to grow in extreme environments and needs to have a higher level of protection than what is being proposed in the Plan.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.333	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R4	Oppose	Opposes this rule, given the requirement in policy 13 NZCPS to avoid significant adverse effects on all areas of natural character. It is also unclear why this rule does not exclude significant natural areas, as the other rules in this part do. Vegetation outside SNAs is also important for the maintenance of biodiversity. Seeks that this PA is deleted.	Delete CE-R4 (Vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, outside of high coastal natural character areas).
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.259	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R4	Support	CE-R4 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R4 (Vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, outside of high coastal natural character areas) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.334	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R4	Oppose	CE-R4 is inefficient and should be addressed to the extent relevant within the underlying zone provisions.	Delete CE-R4 (Vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, outside of high coastal natural character areas) in it's entirety.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.143	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R5	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the trimming or removal of vegetation within the coastal environment.	Retain CE-R5 (Exotic vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of a significant natural area) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.49	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R5	Oppose	CE-R5 is opposed, as it generally make vegetation trimming and removal permitted. Coastal environment vegetation takes a long time to grow in extreme environments and needs to have a higher level of protection than what is being proposed in the Plan.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.334	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R5	Oppose	Considers exotic vegetation can form part of natural character, and can also contribute to the maintenance of biodiversity. We therefore seek that this PA is deleted.	Delete CE-R5 (Exotic vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of an significant natural area).
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.260	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R5	Support	CE-R5 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R5 (Exotic vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of an significant natural area) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.144	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R6	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the trimming or removal of vegetation within the coastal environment.	Retain CE-R6 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of significant natural area) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.50	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R6	Oppose	CE-R6 is opposed, as it generally make vegetation trimming and removal permitted. Coastal environment vegetation takes a long time to grow in extreme environments and needs to have a higher level of protection than what is being proposed in the Plan.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.335	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R6	Support in part	<p>Considers that if there are to be PAs for vegetation removal or trimming in the coastal environment, it is appropriate that there are standards that apply to that permitted activity. We therefore seek that this rule applies more broadly to the whole coastal environment, outside of SNAs (and that the activities managed by R4 and R5 are instead managed by this PA).It should also apply to exotic vegetation.</p> <p>In terms of the requirements of CE-S1: We support the general 50m2 limit.</p> <p>The exemption in c. would allow for a large amount of vegetation removal, and we seek that it is brought into line with the 10m distance in the ECO rules.</p> <p>In terms of the assessment criteria, we oppose this being limited to 'identified' coastal natural character values, particularly in the context of this plan only identifying areas of high natural character.</p> <p>We also seek that biodiversity values are part of the assessment criteria. This is because of the absence of provisions to maintain biodiversity outside of SNAs in the ECO chapter.</p>	<p>Amend CE-R6 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of significant natural area):</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with CE-S1 is achieved [amend exemption in CE-S1.c to 10m]</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of CE-R6.1.a cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard; and 2. The matters in CE-P8 [note proposed deletion of "identified" values in the policy] 3. Biodiversity values.</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.336	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R6	Support in part	Considers the matters of discretion should cross reference the new ECO policy (sought above) aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity outside of SNAs. It should also refer to the new policy (sought above) to ensure that policy 11 NZCPS is given effect to, outside of SNAs. It should also reference relevant ECO policies.	<p>Amend CE-R6 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of significant natural area):</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of CE-R6.1.a cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard; and 2. The matters in CE-P8 [add cross reference to relevant ECO policies, new policy ECO-PX relating to maintenance of biodiversity outside Significant Natural Areas and new policy CE-PX relating to giving effect to policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy statement outside of Significant Natural Areas]</p>
Waka Kotahi	370.202	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R6	Support	Support permitted activity standard for indigenous vegetation removal subject to compliance with CE-S1 as it provides for removal of indigenous vegetation as a permitted activity where it is necessary for the safe and efficient operation of any formed public road	Retain CE-R6 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of significant natural area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.261	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R6	Support	CE-R6 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R6 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of significant natural area) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.66	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R6	Oppose	The rule CE-R6 needs to be aligned with the wording of Policy 11 of the NZCPS and should be amended.	Opposes rule CE-R6 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of significant natural area) in its current form and seeks amendment.
Director-General of Conservation	385.67	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R6	Amend	The rule CE-R6 needs to be aligned with the wording of Policy 11 of the NZCPS and should be amended. Submitter requests the wording under this rule and standard are amended to be in line with Policy 11 of the NZCPS which seeks to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid adverse effects of activities on indigenous ecosystems and vegetation types that are threatened in the coastal environment, or are naturally rare; and • avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on areas of predominantly indigenous vegetation in the coastal environment; and • avoid adverse effects of activities on indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk in the New Zealand Threat Classification System lists; and • avoid adverse effects of activities on habitats of indigenous species where the species are at the limit of their natural range, or are naturally rare. 	Seeks to amend the CE-R6 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas but outside of significant natural area) to be aligned with Policy 11 of the NZCPS. To ensure the rules/standards do not impact the following as a Permitted Activity: threatened or naturally rare vegetation types, threatened or at risk indigenous species, and the habitats of indigenous species.
Yvonne Weeber	340.51	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R7	Oppose	CE-R7 is opposed as it is generally very permissive for a list of activities that have not been listed in the plan.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.337	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R7	Oppose	Considers it is generally inappropriate to have PAs in the coastal environment, particularly in the context of a plan that only identifies high natural character areas. This does not give effect to policy 13 NZCPS. Seeks that this PA is deleted.	Delete CE-R7 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying within the coastal environment but: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal or riparian margins).
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.338	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R7	Oppose	Considers RD may be more appropriate. Ensure that the matters of discretion refer to a broader range of policies than only CE P2 and P10. Those policies are very narrow, and do not allow the decision maker adequate scope to consider the effects. Because it is unclear what activity will be considered under this rule, the matters of discretion may need to reference all the policies of the CE chapter, and also the ECO chapter.	Amend CE-R7 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying within the coastal environment but: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal or riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Permitted <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: Compliance is achieved with the rules and standards for activities in the underlying zones. Matters of discretion: <u>1. The matters in CE-P1 to CE-P26, and ECO-P1 to ECO-P7.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.115	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R7	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.225	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R7	Amend	Considers that provision has been made to control subdivision, use and development, however, we consider amendment would give effect fully to Policy 3 of the Operative RPS and support plan users by providing clarification and assisting interpretation.	Amend CE-R7.2 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying within the coastal environment but: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and Outside of coastal or riparian margins) by Adding reference to the use of design guides to support implementation.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.262	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R7	Support	CE-R7 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R7 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying within the coastal environment but: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.335	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R7	Oppose	This rule is inefficient and does not relate to effects management within the Coastal Environment. Instead, the triggers are non-compliance with rules or standards of the underlying land use zone. Considers that this rule should be deleted. If consideration of coastal environment provisions is relevant to a restricted discretionary activity within the underlying land use zone, this should instead be referenced within those matters of discretion. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R7 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying within the coastal environment) in it's entirety.
Yvonne Weeber	340.52	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R8	Oppose	CE-R8 is opposed as it is generally very permissive for a list of activities that have not been listed in the plan.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.339	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R8	Oppose	Opposed to PA status for activities in the coastal environment within coastal or riparian margins. In our view, it would be more appropriate to apply discretionary or noncomplying status to this activity in all zones.	Amend CE-R8 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary or non-complying within the coastal environment, within coastal or riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Permitted Discretionary
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.116	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R8	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.340	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R8	Oppose	If a RD rule is to remain for certain zones, it should reference more policies aimed at protecting natural character and maintaining and protecting biodiversity.	Amend CE-R8 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary or non-complying within the coastal environment, within coastal or riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with the rules and standards for land use activities in the underlying zones. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: Compliance with the requirements of CE-R8.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: The matters in CE-P6, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3 [and all other policies protecting natural character and maintaining and protecting biodiversity].
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.117	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R8	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.263	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R8	Support	CE-R8 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R8 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary or non-complying within the coastal environment, within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.336	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R8	Oppose	This rule is inefficient and does not relate to effects management within the Coastal Environment. Instead, the triggers are non-compliance with rules or standards of the underlying land use zone. Considers that this rule should be deleted. If consideration of coastal environment provisions is relevant to a restricted discretionary activity within the underlying land use zone, this should instead be referenced within those matters of discretion. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R8 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary or non-complying within the coastal environment, within coastal or riparian margins) in it's entirety.
Yvonne Weeber	340.53	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R9	Oppose	CE-R9 is opposed as it is generally very permissive for a list of activities that have not been listed in the plan.	Not specified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.341	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R9	Oppose	Seeks to amend to non-complying status.	Amend CE-R9 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas): 1. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Non-complying</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.118	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R9	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.264	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R9	Support	CE-R9 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R9 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.50	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R10	Support	Supports rule CE-R10 and in particular the restricted discretionary activity status.	Retain CE-R10 (Extension of existing mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.54	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R10	Oppose	CE-R10 is opposed as it relates to the mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment, which is generally opposed.	Not specified.
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R10	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is not clear. Rule CE-R10 provides a restricted discretionary activity and non-complying activity status and therefore provides a consenting and assessment process and framework.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.342	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R10	Oppose	Considers the activity should be non-complying, particularly in the context of this Plan's approach of only identifying high natural character areas, and the requirements of policy 13 NZCPS.	Amend CE-R10 (Extension of existing mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Non-complying</u>
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.9	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R10	Oppose	The PDP restricted discretionary activity status is supported and provides an appropriate framework in which to consider the effects of existing quarry and mining activities.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.119	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R10	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.265	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R10	Amend	CE-R10 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Amend CE-R10 (Extension of existing mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment) to add the following matter of discretion: <u>“the long-term emissions profile of such an activity, in particular the impact of such an emissions profile on future generations.”</u>
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.10	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	The matter is not an appropriate matter of discretion. It is not clear if the matter is restricted to the activity itself or the end use to the extracted material.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.55	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R11	Oppose	CE-R11 is opposed as it relates to the mining and quarrying activities within the coastal environment, which is generally opposed.	Not specified.
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.14	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R11	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is not clear. Rule CE-R11 provides a NC activity status and therefore provides a consenting and assessment process and framework.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.343	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R11	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain CE-R11 (New quarrying and mining activities and new plantation forestry within the coastal environment) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.120	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R11	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.266	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R11	Amend	CE-R11 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Amend the activity status of CE-R11 (New quarrying and mining activities and new plantation forestry within the coastal environment) to prohibited.
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.11	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Oppose	The non-complying activity status within the PDP is supported and provides a comprehensive assessment framework in which to consider new quarry and mining activities. A prohibited activity status would not allow for consideration of the nature of the activity or environment in which it is proposed.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.56	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R12	Oppose	CE-R12 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R12 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures, within the coastal environment: 1. Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and 2. Outside of coastal and riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.344	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R12	Oppose	Considers it inappropriate to have PAs for activities that may have significant adverse effects on natural character, i.e. outside the identified high natural character areas. Delete this PA. Ensure that the RD matters of discretion reference policies aimed at protecting natural character and maintaining and protecting biodiversity.	Amend CE-R12 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures, within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas; and outside of coastal and riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with the rules and standards for buildings and structures in the underlying zones. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of CE R12.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CE-P2, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3 <u>[add references to policies protecting natural character and maintaining and protecting indigenous biodiversity]</u> .
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.121	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R12	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.267	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R12	Support	CE-R12 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R12 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures, within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.261	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R12	Oppose in part	CE-R12 is opposed as it stands and should be redrafted.	Opposes CE-R12 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures, within the coastal environment: - Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and - Outside of coastal and riparian margins.) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.262	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R12	Amend	Considers that CE-R12 should be redrafted to include permitted activity criteria which relate to the coastal environment, and the outcomes of this chapter which are trying to be achieved. The permitted activity criteria relate to the development standards of the underlying zoning as opposed to any coastal environment criteria. As such, it is not clear what this rule is trying to achieve until the matters of discretion are applied.	Seeks that CE-R12 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures, within the coastal environment: - Outside of high coastal natural character areas; and - Outside of coastal and riparian margins.) is redrafted to include permitted activity criteria which relate to the coastal environment, and the outcomes of this chapter which are trying to be achieved.
Ministry of Education	400.69	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R12	Support	Supports CE-R12 as the submitter supports the permitted activity standards and matters of discretion as proposed.	Retain CE-R12 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures, within the coastal environment: Outside of high coastal natural character area...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.337	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R12	Oppose	<p>This rule is inefficient and does not relate to effects management within the Coastal Environment. Instead, the triggers are non-compliance with rules or standards of the underlying land use zone.</p> <p>Considers that this rule should be deleted. If consideration of coastal environment provisions is relevant to a restricted discretionary activity within the underlying land use zone, this should instead be referenced within those matters of discretion.</p> <p>Considers that the matters of discretion listed under CE-R12 include policies relating to Public Access along coastal margins. This rule does not apply to coastal margins.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete CE-R12 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures, within the coastal environment) in it's entirety.
Fabric Property Limited	425.44	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R12	Support	<p>Properties at 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay, 215 Lambton Quay and 33 Customhouse Quay are also located in the coastal environment.</p> <p>Supports enabling construction, additions or alterations to buildings in the coastal environment as a permitted activity, or otherwise as a restricted discretionary activity where there is non-compliance with the zone. It is appropriate to enable development in the coastal environment that consolidates existing urban areas, consistent with CE-P2.</p>	Retain CE-R12 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.145	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R13	Support	Supports the rule as the rule framework for the construction, addition, or alteration of buildings and structures within the coastal environment does not hinder FENZ's ability to establish fire stations within the coastal environment.	Retain CE-R13 (Construction, addition, or alteration of buildings and structures within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.57	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R13	Support	CE-R13 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.345	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R13	Support in part	Seeks extension this rule to apply anywhere in the coastal environment, because of the requirements of policy 13 NZCPS in respect of all areas of natural character. Matters of discretion should reference policies that are aimed at the protection of natural character in the coastal environment, not only in high natural character areas, as well as policies aimed at protecting and maintaining biodiversity	<p>Amend CE-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas):</p> <p>...</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The matters in CE-P2, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3 [add references to policies protecting natural character and maintaining and protecting indigenous biodiversity]...</p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.122	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R13	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.268	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R13	Support	CE-R13 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures within the coastal environment, within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.146	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R14	Support	Supports the rule as the rule framework for the construction, addition, or alteration of buildings and structures within the coastal environment does not hinder FENZ's ability to establish fire stations within the coastal environment.	Retain CE-R14 (Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures within the coastal environment: within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.58	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R14	Support	CE-R14 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	<p>Retain CE-R14 (Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures within in the coastal environment:</p> <p>- Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.346	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R14	Oppose	Considers it is inappropriate to be managed by a PA. Delete the PA. Matters of discretion should reference policies that are aimed at the protection of natural character in the coastal environment, not only in high natural character areas, as well as policies aimed at protecting and maintaining biodiversity.	Amend CE-R14 (Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures within in the coastal environment within coastal or riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with the rules and standards for buildings and structures in the underlying zones. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: Compliance with the requirements of CE R14.1.a cannot be achieved; Matters of discretion are: The matters in CE-P2, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3 [add references to policies protecting natural character and maintaining and protecting indigenous biodiversity]
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.123	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R14	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.269	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R14	Support	CE-R14 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R14 (Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures within in the coastal environment: Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.263	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R14	Oppose in part	CE-R14 is opposed as it stands and should be redrafted.	Opposes CE-R14 (Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures within in the coastal environment: - Within coastal or riparian margins) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.264	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R14	Amend	Considers that CE-R14 should be redrafted to include permitted activity criteria which relate to the coastal environment, and the outcomes of this chapter which are trying to be achieved. The permitted activity criteria relate to the development standards of the underlying zoning as opposed to any coastal environment criteria. As such, it is not clear what this rule is trying to achieve until the matters of discretion are applied.	Seeks that CE-R14 (Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures within in the coastal environment: - Within coastal or riparian margins) is redrafted to include permitted activity criteria which relate to the coastal environment, and the outcomes of this chapter which are trying to be achieved.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.338	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R14	Oppose	This rule is inefficient and does not relate to effects management within the Coastal Environment. Instead, the triggers are non-compliance with rules or standards of the underlying land use zone. Considers that this rule should be deleted. If consideration of coastal environment provisions is relevant to a restricted discretionary activity within the underlying land use zone, this should instead be referenced within those matters of discretion. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R14 (Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures within in the coastal environment) in it's entirety.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.147	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R15	Support	Supports the rule as the rule framework for the construction, addition, or alteration of buildings and structures within the coastal environment does not hinder FENZ's ability to establish fire stations within the coastal environment.	Retain CE-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures within the coastal environment and within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.59	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R15	Support	CE-R15 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures within in the coastal environment and within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.347	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R15	Oppose	Considers it is inappropriate to be managed by a PA. Delete the PA. Matters of discretion should reference policies that are aimed at the protection of natural character in the coastal environment, not only in high natural character areas, as well as policies aimed at protecting and maintaining biodiversity.	Amend CE-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures within in the coastal environment and within coastal or riparian margins): 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with the rules and standards for buildings and structures in the underlying zones. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of CE-R15.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: The matters in CE-P7, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3 <u>[add references to policies protecting natural character and maintaining and protecting indigenous biodiversity]</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.124	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R15	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.270	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R15	Support	CE-R15 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures within in the coastal environment and within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.265	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R15	Oppose in part	CE-R15 is opposed as it stands and should be redrafted.	Opposes CE-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures within in the coastal environment and within coastal or riparian margins) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.266	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R15	Amend	Considers that CE-R15 should be redrafted to include permitted activity criteria which relate to the coastal environment, and the outcomes of this chapter which are trying to be achieved. The permitted activity criteria relate to the development standards of the underlying zoning as opposed to any coastal environment criteria. As such, it is not clear what this rule is trying to achieve until the matters of discretion are applied.	Seeks that CE-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures within in the coastal environment and within coastal or riparian margins) is redrafted to include permitted activity criteria which relate to the coastal environment, and the outcomes of this chapter which are trying to be achieved.
Ministry of Education	400.70	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R15	Support	Supports CE-R15 as the submitter supports the permitted activity standards and matters of discretion as proposed.	Retain CE-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures within in the coastal environment and within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.339	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R15	Oppose	This rule is inefficient and does not relate to effects management within the Coastal Environment. Instead, the triggers are non-compliance with rules or standards of the underlying land use zone. Considers that this rule should be deleted. If consideration of coastal environment provisions is relevant to a restricted discretionary activity within the underlying land use zone, this should instead be referenced within those matters of discretion. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures within in the coastal environment and within coastal or riparian margins) in it's entirety.
Yvonne Weeber	340.60	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Support	CE-R16 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.348	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.125	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.271	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Support	CE-R16 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.43	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas. Fabric notes is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Retain CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.340	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Oppose	Considers that to avoid unnecessary duplication in the Proposed Plan, this chapter should focus on those additional consent requirements necessary to manage effects within the coastal hazard overlays that cannot be adequately dealt with by the underlying zone rules. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) in it's entirety.
Yvonne Weeber	340.61	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R17	Support	CE-R17 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R17 (Green infrastructure for the purposes of coastal hazard mitigation works undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractor or agent within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.349	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R17	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R17 (Green infrastructure for the purposes of coastal hazard mitigation works undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractor or agent within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.126	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R17	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.272	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R17	Support	CE-R17 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R17 (Green infrastructure for the purposes of coastal hazard mitigation works undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractor or agent within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.23	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support	Supports this rule as proposed including the Permitted activity status, and Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings which do not comply with CE-R18.1.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.148	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support	Supports the rule as the rule framework for the construction, addition, or alteration of buildings and structures within the coastal environment does not hinder FENZ's ability to establish fire stations within the coastal environment.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.62	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support	CE-R18 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.350	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.127	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.273	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support	CE-R18 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.88	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports this rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within the coastal hazards overlays. However, it is not appropriate to place controls on buildings in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay. Due to the nature of tsunamis, it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays): <u>e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay</u>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.9	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support in part	Supports rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within coastal hazard overlays.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.103	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within coastal hazard overlays. However, considers it is not appropriate to place controls on buildings in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay, due to the nature of tsunamis, it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... <u>e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay</u>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.78	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.104	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within coastal hazard overlays. However, considers it is not appropriate to place controls on buildings in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay, due to the nature of tsunamis, it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend CE-R18.2.b (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... b. The addition is to a potentially hazard sensitive activity or a hazard sensitive activity within a high coastal hazard area <u>other than the high tsunami hazard area.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.79	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years ¹ . A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	405.44	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support in part	Supports the rule but considers that it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Retain CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.45	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports the rule but considers that it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ... <u>e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay.</u>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.43	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.341	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.342	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) in its entirety. (Option A).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.103	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.343	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Seeks that CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option B).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.104	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.45	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support in part	Supports this rule as proposed including the Permitted activity status, and Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings which do not comply with CE-R18.1. In the event that the risk level for the Tsunami Hazard Overlay is not reduced to medium, it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted, to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Retain Rule CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.46	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports this rule as proposed including the Permitted activity status, and Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings which do not comply with CE-R18.1. In the event that the risk level for the Tsunami Hazard Overlay is not reduced to medium, it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted, to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend Rule CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... <u>e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay.</u>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.15	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.63	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Support	CE-R19 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.351	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.128	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.274	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Support	CE-R19 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.118	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Amend	Amend typographical error in rule title.	Amend CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as follows: Airport, operation <u>a</u> port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay
CentrePort Limited	402.119	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Amend	Considers that large parts of the Port Operations including the Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the Coastal Hazard Overlay. A permitted activity limitation to 10 passengers or 10 employees for port activities that by definition need to adjoin the coastal marine area is impractical. It is considered that if there is no practical alternative and this can be demonstrated, the Port activities with greater than 10 passengers or employees should be able to be a permitted activity.	Amend CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as follows: 1. <u>a</u> Activity status: Permitted Where: <u>a. a</u> does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or <u>b. b</u> does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or <u>c. c</u> can be demonstrated that there is no other practical alternative for the location of the activity.
CentrePort Limited	402.120	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Support in part	Supports CE-P19 with amendments - typographical error in rule title and new clause c.	Retain CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.344	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.345	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as follows: Seeks that CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option A).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.105	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.346	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) in its entirety. (Option B).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.106	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support	Supports CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified, as it is enabling of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas in the City Centre Zone.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.149	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support in part	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community.	Supports CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.150	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community.	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or b. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public. <u>Note: The above restrictions do not apply to emergency service facilities.</u>
Yvonne Weeber	340.64	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support	CE-R20 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.352	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.129	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.275	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support	CE-R20 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.89	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	Supports this rule to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre zone where those activities are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas. However, it is unclear why potentially hazard sensitive activities should be permitted where a building will be occupied by 10 or less employees of an activity. This number appears to be arbitrary and impractical. For example, five offices that are occupied by 10 or less employees are unlikely to have a different risk profile to one office occupied by 50 employees. This rule also does not achieve the objectives and policies of the coastal hazard overlays, specifically Objective CE-O8 and Policy CE-P21. The rule should also be clarified to reflect that it would be very difficult for buildings to entirely avoid being occupied by members of the public occasionally e.g. a courier driver dropping off a parcel or a tradesperson undertaking a repair. Argosy supports this rule to the extent that activities which cannot comply with CE-R20.1 are restricted discretionary	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas): Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied predominantly by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or 2. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied predominantly by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public
Ministry of Education	400.71	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support	Supports CE-R20 as the submitter considers the matters of discretion to be appropriate where the permitted activity standards are not met.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.105	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support in part	Supports the rule to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre zone where those activities are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.106	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	Supports the rule to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre zone where those activities are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas. However, considers it is unclear why potentially hazard sensitive activities should be permitted where a building will be occupied by 10 or less employees of an activity. This number appears to be arbitrary and impractical. For example, five offices that are occupied by 10 or less employees are unlikely to have a different risk profile to one office occupied by 50 employees. This rule also does not achieve the objectives and policies of the coastal hazard overlays, specifically Objective CE-O8 and Policy CE-P21. The rule should also be clarified to reflect that it would be very difficult for buildings to entirely avoid being occupied by members of the public occasionally e.g. a courier driver dropping off a parcel or a tradesperson undertaking a repair.	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas): Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied predominantly by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or 2. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied predominantly by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.80	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-R20	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk.	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.107	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support in part	Supports CE-R20 to the extent that activities which cannot comply with CE-R20.1 are restricted discretionary.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.47	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	<p>Supports the intention of CE-R20 to enable of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas in the City Centre Zone.</p> <p>Considers it to be arbitrary that a building being occupied by more than 10 employees triggers a restricted discretionary activity and it is unclear how this changes the risk profile. Seeks that this rule be amended to focus on buildings occupied by members of the public.</p> <p>There also needs to be clarification to reflect that it would be very difficult for buildings to entirely avoid being occupied by members of the public occasionally e.g. a courier driver dropping off a parcel or a tradesperson undertaking a repair.</p>	Supports CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone), with amendment.
Fabric Property Limited	425.48	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	<p>Supports the intention of CE-R20 to enable of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas in the City Centre Zone.</p> <p>Considers it to be arbitrary that a building being occupied by more than 10 employees triggers a restricted discretionary activity and it is unclear how this changes the risk profile. Seeks that this rule be amended to focus on buildings occupied by members of the public.</p> <p>There also needs to be clarification to reflect that it would be very difficult for buildings to entirely avoid being occupied by members of the public occasionally e.g. a courier driver dropping off a parcel or a tradesperson undertaking a repair.</p>	<p>Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone) as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied predominantly by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or</p> <p>2. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied predominantly by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public.</p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.16	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk.	Disallow
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.25	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support	Supports the Permitted activity status for potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area provided by CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area)	Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard areas) notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support	CE-R21 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.353	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.130	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.</p> <p>Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.276	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support	CE-R21 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.108	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the low coastal hazard area	Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.347	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Oppose	Considers that to avoid unnecessary duplication with the Proposed Plan and for other reasons, this chapter should focus on those additional consent requirements necessary to manage effects within the coastal hazard overlays that cannot be adequately dealt with by the underlying zone rules. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) in it's entirety.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.151	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support in part	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community.	Supports CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.152	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Amend	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community.	Amend CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The development does not involve the construction of a childcare service, retirement village educational facility, hospital, emergency service facility or health care facility; or b. If the development involves the construction of residential units, the total number of residential units on a site is no more than three.
Yvonne Weeber	340.66	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support	CE-R22 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.354	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.131	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.277	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support	CE-R22 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.90	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support	Supports hazard sensitive activities being permitted in the low coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.72	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support	Supports CE-R22 as the submitter supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for the establishment of educational facilities in the low coastal hazard area. In addition, the submitter considers the matters of discretion to be appropriate.	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.348	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.349	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as follows: Seeks that CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option A).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.107	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.350	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) in its entirety. (Option B).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.108	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.67	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support	CE-R23 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.355	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.132	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.278	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support	CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.91	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.109	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.351	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.352	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: Seeks that CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option A).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.109	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.353	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) in its entirety. (Option B).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.110	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow
VicLabour	414.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Amend	Considers that the provision may insufficient given recent evidence that sea level rise and weather impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not long ago. Considers that Council needs to consider a complete prohibition on all development of potentially or actually hazard sensitive activities within areas at-risk of coastal inundation or tsunami as a result of sea level rise.	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that a prohibited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.139	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it is inconsistent with the primary submission made by WIAL on this matter.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.68	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support	CE-R24 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.356	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.133	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.279	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support	CE-R24 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.121	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Amend	Considers that hard engineering options are often the only options for protection and enhancement of Port Infrastructure which by necessity needs to be in the Coastal Environment. Therefore there should be an exclusion for the Special Purpose Port Zone.	Amend CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) to exclude the Special Purpose Port Zone from the rule.
CentrePort Limited	402.122	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose in part	Considers that hard engineering options are often the only options for protection and enhancement of Port Infrastructure which by necessity needs to be in the Coastal Environment. Therefore there should be an exclusion for the Special Purpose Port Zone.	Opposes CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.354	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	<p>Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>Considers that the rule should only be applicable to new hard engineering structures. The ongoing upgrade, maintenance and repair of existing hard engineering structures that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure should be permitted, as WIAL has provided for in the underlying Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.74	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.355	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Amend	<p>Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>Considers that the rule should only be applicable to new hard engineering structures. The ongoing upgrade, maintenance and repair of existing hard engineering structures that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure should be permitted, as WIAL has provided for in the underlying Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>CE-R24 New A4 hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area except measures associated with regionally significant infrastructure</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Discretionary</p> <p>(Option A).</p> <p>[Note that it should not be ISPP as it does not relate to housing]</p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.64	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support	<p>Supports the amendment to allow for operation, maintenance and repair to existing hard engineering structures.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.356	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. Considers that the rule should only be applicable to new hard engineering structures. The ongoing upgrade, maintenance and repair of existing hard engineering structures that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure should be permitted, as WIAL has provided for in the underlying Natural Open Space Zone. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.75	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.103	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support	Supports provisions for hard protection structures as a Discretionary Activity within the Coastal Environment.	Retain CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.69	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Support	CE-R25 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R25 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.357	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R25 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.134	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.280	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Support	CE-R25 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R25 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
VicLabour	414.25	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Amend	Considers that the provision may insufficient given recent evidence that sea level rise and weather impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not long ago. Considers that Council needs to consider a complete prohibition on all development of potentially or actually hazard sensitive activities within areas at-risk of coastal inundation or tsunami as a result of sea level rise.	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that a prohibited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R25 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)
Yvonne Weeber	340.70	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Support	CE-R26 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.358	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.135	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.281	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Support	CE-R26 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.73	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Support	Supports CE-R26 as it enables hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas as Discretionary Activities.	Retain CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport...) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.357	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.358	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: Seeks that CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option A).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.111	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.359	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) in its entirety. (Option B).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.112	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.26	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Amend	Considers that the provision may insufficient given recent evidence that sea level rise and weather impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not long ago. Considers that Council needs to consider a complete prohibition on all development of potentially or actually hazard sensitive activities within areas at-risk of coastal inundation or tsunamis as a result of sea level rise.	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that a prohibited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.140	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it is inconsistent with the primary submission made by WIAL on this matter.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.71	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support	CE-R27 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.359	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.282	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support	CE-R27 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.267	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support in part	CE-R27 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.268	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Amend	Considers that CE-R27 should be amended to change the activity status of Hazard Sensitive Activities within the High Coastal Hazard Area from Non-Complying to Discretionary to enable the potential for these activities to be provided where the risks can be managed through mitigation measures.	Amend CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u>
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.65	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within high coastal hazard overlay should remain non-compliant. Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from increasing coastal hazard risk.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.83	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-R21 and SUB-R25 are retained as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.85	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that CE-R27 is retained as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.74	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support	Supports CE-R27 as the submitter considers that the non-complying activity status for hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area is appropriate.	Retain CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport...) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.27	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Amend	<p>Considers that the provisions relating to restrictions on new development in areas at risk of coastal inundation and tsunami due to sea level rise may be insufficient given recent evidence that sea level rise and weather impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not long ago.</p> <p>Considers that Council needs to consider a complete prohibition on all development of potentially or actually hazard sensitive activities within areas at-risk of coastal inundation or tsunami as a result of sea level rise.</p>	Seeks that a prohibited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities). [Inferred decision requested]
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.153	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S1	Support in part	<p>Supports the standard as it enables preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life through providing for the clearance of vegetation as a permitted activity in circumstances where FENZ is required to remove vegetation for the purposes of extinguishing or preventing the spread of fire or, where a notice has been served on a landholder to clear vegetation from a firebreak, in accordance with relevant sections of the FENZ Act.</p> <p>It is however important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property. This is particularly important where a property is located outside of a reticulated water network and the surrounding environment includes native bush.</p>	Supports CE-S1 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.154	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S1	Amend	<p>Supports the standard as it enables preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life through providing for the clearance of vegetation as a permitted activity in circumstances where FENZ is required to remove vegetation for the purposes of extinguishing or preventing the spread of fire or, where a notice has been served on a landholder to clear vegetation from a firebreak, in accordance with relevant sections of the FENZ Act.</p> <p>It is however important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property. This is particularly important where a property is located outside of a reticulated water network and the surrounding environment includes native bush.</p>	<p>Amend CE-S1 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas) as follows:</p> <p>The following as exempt from the maximum permitted area of removal:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Vegetation removal that is required in accordance with sections 43 or 64 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017; and Customary harvesting; and <u>h. It is necessary to avoid loss of life, injury or serious damage to property, including from the risk of fire.</u></p>
Yvonne Weeber	340.72	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S1	Amend	Considers that the assessment criteria in CE-S1 should be amended to prevent all indigenous vegetation trimming and removal within the high natural character areas of the coastal environment without a full management plan.	<p>Amend CE-S1 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within in the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The effects on identified coastal natural character values and measures proposed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects. 2. <u>A management plan for the removal, revegetation and ongoing management of the high coastal natural character area.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.360	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S1	Support in part	Supports the general 50m2 limit. Considers the exemption in c. would allow for a large amount of vegetation removal, and seeks that it is brought into line with the 10m distance in the ECO rules. In terms of the assessment criteria, opposes this being limited to 'identified' coastal natural character values, particularly in the context of this plan only identifying areas of high natural character. The identified values in the schedule are also very brief. We also seek that biodiversity values (including those required to be protected by policy 11 NZCPS) are part of the assessment criteria. This is because of the absence of provisions to maintain biodiversity outside of SNAs in the ECO chapter.	Amend CE-S1 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within in the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas): 1. Indigenous vegetation removal must not exceed 50m2 in total area per 12 month contiguous period per site. The following are exempt from the maximum permitted area of removal: a. Vegetation removal addressing an imminent threat to people or property represented by deadwood, diseased or dying vegetation; b. Vegetation removal that is necessary to ensure the safe and efficient operation of any formed public road or access; c. Vegetation removal within 25 10m from the external wall of an existing building; d. Vegetation removal within 1m width either side of an existing fence or other structure; e. Vegetation removal of 2.5m in total width for maintenance of public access track (where undertaken by WCC, GWRC or their agents); f. Vegetation removal that is required in accordance with sections 43 or 64 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017; and g. Customary harvesting. Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. The effects on identified coastal natural character values and measures proposed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects. <u>2. Biodiversity values included those protected by policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.203	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S1	Support	Support wording as notified as it provides for removal of indigenous vegetation as a permitted activity where it is necessary for the safe and efficient operation of any formed public road.	Retain CE-S1 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within in the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.68	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S1	Oppose	The rule CE-S1 needs to be aligned with the wording of Policy 11 of the NZCPS and should be amended.	Opposes rule CE-S1 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within in the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas) in its current form and seeks amendment.
Director-General of Conservation	385.69	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S1	Amend	The rule CE-S1 needs to be aligned with the wording of Policy 11 of the NZCPS and should be amended. Submitter requests the wording under this rule and standard are amended to be in line with Policy 11 of the NZCPS which seeks to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid adverse effects of activities on indigenous ecosystems and vegetation types that are threatened in the coastal environment, or are naturally rare; and • avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on areas of predominantly indigenous vegetation in the coastal environment; and • avoid adverse effects of activities on indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk in the New Zealand Threat Classification System lists; and • avoid adverse effects of activities on habitats of indigenous species where the species are at the limit of their natural range, or are naturally rare. 	Seeks to amend the CE-S1 (Indigenous vegetation trimming or removal within in the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas) to be aligned with Policy 11 of the NZCPS. To ensure the rules/standards do not impact the following as a Permitted Activity: threatened or naturally rare vegetation types, threatened or at risk indigenous species, and the habitats of indigenous species.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.155	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S2	Support in part	Considers FENZ may have an operational and functional need to establish and operate fire stations in the coastal environment. Fire stations tend to have a maximum height of 8-9m and a gross floor area greater than 50m2. As such, FENZ seeks to exclude emergency service facilities from CE-S2.	Supports CE-S2 (New buildings and structures within the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.156	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S2	Amend	Considers FENZ may have an operational and functional need to establish and operate fire stations in the coastal environment. Fire stations tend to have a maximum height of 8-9m and a gross floor area greater than 50m2. As such, FENZ seeks to exclude emergency service facilities from CE-S2.	Amend CE-S2 (New buildings and structures within the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas) as follows: ... <u>Note: Emergency service facilities are exempt.</u>

General District-wide Matters - Earthworks

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Yvonne Weeber	340.73	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S2	Amend	Considers that CE-S2 should be amended so that design standards are considered in relationship to where they are seen from and what they will look like. New buildings and structures within the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas should be built and designed in a manner that fits in to the high coastal natural character.	Amend CE-S2 (New buildings and structures within the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Whether the building or structure and its scale and location is integrated into the landform to limit prominence and protect the identified values and characteristics and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects; and 2. The effect of the reflectivity and colour of external materials on the identified values and characteristics; 3. <u>Views of the buildings and their form and colour in relationship to the high coastal natural character areas</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.226	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-S2	Amend	Considers that buildings or structures in sites of high natural character do not exceed the relevant standards. Request these amendments to ensure the proposed approach gives effect to NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b). Seeks any consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns	Amend CE-S2 (New buildings and structures within the coastal environment and within high coastal natural character areas) as follows: 1. Buildings or structures in high coastal natural character <u>sites and</u> areas must not exceed: a. A maximum height of 5m above ground level; and b. A gross floor area of 50m2 2. The exterior façade and roof must be finished in a colour that is contained within Groups A, B or C of BS5252 and that does not exceed a reflectance value of 30%. (Note: Some colours in Groups A, B or C of BS5252 have a reflectance value of over 30% and are therefore not compliant.)
John Tiley	142.15	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Not specified	Considers that the Earthworks chapter subjugates any visual amenity and open space values to the interests of development.	Seeks that an explanation of "sustainable" management of earthworks is offered.
John Tiley	142.16	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	Considers that the Earthworks introduction should be amended as there is no reference to any obligation to avoid or even mitigate harmful effects.	Seeks that the Earthworks chapter include an obligation to mitigate or avoid harmful effects. [Inferred decision requested].
John Tiley	142.17	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	Considers that the sentence 'To a large extent, these effects can be addressed through careful design and management of physical works' is not true as any earthworks will compromise a ridgeline's community and amenity values.	Seeks that no earthworks are allowed to occur on ridgelines to ensure these remain in their undisturbed natural state. [Inferred decision requested].
Churton Park Community Association	189.15	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Not specified	Considers that the Earthworks chapter subjugates any visual amenity and open space values to the interests of development.	Seeks that an explanation of "sustainable" management of earthworks is offered.
Churton Park Community Association	189.16	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	Considers that the Earthworks introduction should be amended as there is no reference to any obligation to avoid or even mitigate harmful effects.	Seeks that the Earthworks chapter include an obligation to mitigate or avoid harmful effects. [Inferred decision requested].
Churton Park Community Association	189.17	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	Considers that the sentence 'To a large extent, these effects can be addressed through careful design and management of physical works' is not true as any earthworks will compromise a ridgeline's community and amenity values.	Seeks that no earthworks are allowed to occur on ridgelines to ensure these remain in their undisturbed natural state. [Inferred decision requested].
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.51	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Support	Supports the clarification that the earthworks rules do not apply to quarrying activities provided for in the Quarry Zone on the basis it recognises the nature and scale of earthworks associated with quarry activities. The relevance of the Earthworks chapter to quarry activities is that technically a quarry activity would involve earthworks, and therefore outside the Quarry Zone, the earthworks chapter applies.	Retain the Earthworks Chapter Introduction as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.43	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Support	Considers it is important that earthworks are managed to minimise adverse effects.	Retain objectives within Earthworks chapter as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.44	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Support	Considers it is important that earthworks are managed to minimise adverse effects.	Retain policies within Earthworks chapter as notified.
Tawa Community Board	294.13	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	Considers that climate change is driving more frequent and more severe climatic events.	Seeks that Earthworks heights are amended to support more resilience.
Tawa Community Board	294.14	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	Considers that climate change is driving more frequent and more severe climatic events.	Seeks increased construction setbacks from retaining walls and embankments, including stream embankments.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.17	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Support	The Earthworks chapter is supported as it specifies that Earthworks provisions do not apply to quarrying activities provided for in the Special Purpose Quarry Zone. It is important to make this clear to avoid confusion and potential duplication and inconsistency, given quarrying is a unique activity distinct from earthworks. It is right that quarrying should be specifically addressed elsewhere through the relevant zone rules separate from earthworks.	Retain the comment in the Earthworks chapter that states "the provisions in this chapter do not apply to quarrying activities provided for in the Special Purpose Quarry Zone" as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.174	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	<p>Considers the structure of the PDP is such that rules relating to earthworks and subdivision in proximity of the National Grid are addressed under the respective Earthworks and Subdivision chapters. Considers that while not necessarily the submitter's preference, they are not opposed to this approach subject to appropriate linkages between the chapters so that plan users can clearly understand (and find) the relevant rules and corresponding policy framework.</p> <p>Considers that for Rule EW-R22 there is no supporting policy framework and no guidance within the introductory text to the Earthworks Chapter to refer plan users to the Infrastructure Chapter. The submitter seeks specific National Grid provisions as outlined in separate submission points. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p> <p>Submitter seeks either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to the inclusion of a specific National Grid policy within the INF chapter, cross reference to that chapter, or • Provision of a specific National Grid policy within the EW chapter. 	<p>Amend the Earthworks Chapter to provide appropriate policy recognition to managing earthworks within the National Grid Yard and provide the policy direction for EW-R22. Subject to the inclusion of a specific National Grid policy within the INF chapter, cross reference to that chapter as follows:</p> <p>Other relevant District Plan provisions</p> <p>It is important to note that in addition to the provisions in this chapter, the following Part 2: District-Wide chapters may also be of relevance, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport - The Transport Chapter contains provisions relating to transport matters. • Subdivision - The Subdivision Chapter contains provisions which manage subdivision of land. • Trees – The Notable Tree chapter contains specific provisions relating to the management of notable trees, including works within the root protection area. • <u>Infrastructure - the earthworks chapter includes rules to implement objectives and policies in the Infrastructure Chapter where certain types of earthworks are within the National Grid Yard.</u> <p>...</p> <p>or</p> <p>2. Provision of a specific National Grid policy within the Earthworks chapter as follows: <u>Earthworks or vertical holes within the National Grid Yard.</u> <u>Avoid earthworks or vertical holes within the National Grid Yard which may compromise the safe and efficient functioning, operation, maintenance and repair, upgrading and development of the National Grid.</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.175	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Support	<p>Supports the provision of standards specific to earthworks on the basis such activities can compromise the National Grid and are a form of development contemplated by the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Considers that earthworks also have the potential to restrict Transpower's ability to access the line and locate the heavy machinery required to maintain support structures around the lines and may lead to potential tower failure and significant constraints on the operation of the line. Considers the provision of a rule framework achieves Policies 2 and 10 of the NPS-ET.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Supports EW provisions, subject to amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.32	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Support	Support	Retain EW – Ngā Mahi Apu Whenua – Earthworks as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.227	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	Considers that currently rules only have assessment matters regarding the extent and effect of non-compliance on identified, ecological values or amenity values or landscape values for earthworks in riparian areas. To have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 (policies FW.3 and 15) Greater Wellington considers an amendment is required to include matters of control or discretion which protect cultural values.	Seeks to include matter of control or discretion regarding the 'potential for adverse effects on water quality of any waterbody, wahi tapu, wahi taonga and habitat of any significant indigenous species.'
Waka Kotahi	370.204	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Support	Support that the provisions do not relate to infrastructure activities– as this enables Waka Kotahi to undertake works to infrastructure as provided for by the infrastructure chapter.	Retain the following as notified: The provisions of this Chapter do not apply in relation to activities provided for in the Infrastructure Chapter, unless specifically stated in the rule or standard concerned'
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.360	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	Opposes the earthworks provisions insofar as they relate to the Airport Zone. [See paragraphs 4.93 to 4.96 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Earthworks chapter introduction is amended to delete the reference to EW-R20 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) to EW-S14 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) so that the chapter does not apply to the Airport Zone.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.17	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.361	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	Supports the Operative District Plan application of Earthworks provisions to the Airport Zone.	Seeks that the Airport Zone is exempt from the Earthworks provisions to the same extent that it was in the Operative District Plan.
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.18	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.362	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Not specified	Considers that there is an explicit note in the introductory text that the provisions of the earthworks chapter "do not apply in relation to activities provided in the Airport Zone, except for the extent specified in EW-R20 and EW-S14". The drafting of EW-R20 is such however, that the exemption establishes a more onerous, complex and uncertain consenting pathway for earthworks within the Airport Zone than other zones and the operative planning framework.	Clarify the extent to which the Earthworks chapter applies within the Airport Zone.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.363	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Not specified	The starting presumption that all discretionary earthwork activities within with the Airport Zone will be publicly notified is inappropriate and unjustified.	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.364	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / General EW	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Earthworks chapter is amended to rework how it relates to the Airport Zone, done through the Schedule 1 Resource Management Act process.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.21	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Amend	Considers that as an alternative to the proposed HNZPT amendment of EW-P7 to cover scheduled archaeological sites and Sites of Significance to Māori, additional policies could be added to the earthworks chapter to address archaeological sites and Sites of Significance to Māori.	Add additional policies to the earthworks chapter to address archaeological sites and Sites of Significance to Māori, as an alternative to the proposed HNZPT amendment of EW-P7 (Earthworks on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures, and within heritage areas).
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.11	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.10	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.9	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Support	The submitter seeks for additional policies to be added to the earthworks chapter to address archaeological sites and Sites of Significance to Māori. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because sites of significance to Māori should be taken into account and protected in relation to earthworks.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.361	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Amend	Considers that this chapter's provisions are silent on earthworks in wetlands and their margins. It appears that WCC still has a role in respect of works in these areas. As discussed above (in relation to the ECO chapter), we seek a suite of new earthworks provisions protecting wetlands and their margins, or amendments to the notified provisions to achieve this. In terms of rules, they should at the very least require setbacks from all natural wetlands. We note that there are rules regulating earthworks in riparian margins, but not wetland margins	Add new EW-OX, EW-PX, EW-RX, and EW-SX provisions to protect wetlands and their margins.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.362	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Amend	Seeks a non-complying rule for earthworks where the SNA contains matters identified in policy 11 NZCPS, replicating ECO R1.6. The section 88 requirements should be: 1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and 2. Demonstrating that ECO P5 has first been met, and the effects management hierarchy at ECO-P21 has been applied to other adverse effects.	Add new rule EW-R7 (Earthworks within a significant natural area): <u>3. Activity status: Non-complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The Significant Natural Area includes matters identified in policy 11 of the NZ Coastal Policy statement</u> <u>Section 88 requirements:</u> <u>1. Identifying the indigenous biodiversity values and potential impacts from the proposal; and</u> <u>2. Demonstrating that ECO P5 has first been met, and the effects management hierarchy at ECO-P21 has been applied to other adverse effects.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.141	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to include a new rule in the Proposed Plan to this effect. Earthworks within SNAs is already provided for by EW-R7 (1) and (2) and within the Coastal Environment through EW-R10 and EW-R11. Introducing further rules is inefficient and add to further repetition, duplication and complexity within the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.228	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Amend	Considers that the earthworks policies do not adequately recognise the potential impacts of sedimentation on tangata whenua values, particularly with regard to mahinga kai and access for mahinga kai purposes. A new policy should be inserted that recognises the potential adverse effects of earthworks on water bodies and mahinga kai and this should also be a relevant matter of discretion for restricted discretionary rules in this chapter, to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (policy FW.3).	Add a new Policy to the Earthworks chapter to avoid adverse effects of earthworks on surface water bodies, Māori freshwater values, including mahinga kai and access.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.67	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Amend	Considers the potential impacts of earthworks and sedimentation on sites of significance need to be acknowledged as a separate policy.	Add new policy to EW chapter: <u>Avoid adverse effects of earthworks on Tangata Whenua freshwater values especially when they may impact on mahinga kai, kai moana and access.</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.68	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / New EW	Amend	Considers that the Accidental Discovery Protocol and its implementation can be improved by embedding the process in the Earthworks chapter.	Add new policy to the Earthworks chapter that acknowledges the importance of Accidental Discovery to maintaining and protecting the sites and areas of significance to Māori and iwi.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.22	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Support in part	Supports EW-01 (Management of earthworks), provided an amendment is made to EW-01.2.	Retain EW-01 (Management of earthworks) with amendments.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.12	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.11	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.23	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Amend	Considers that the potential adverse effects referenced in EW-01.2 are too narrow and restricted to 'adverse effects on visual amenity values'. Considers that EW-01 should be amended to allow for consideration of a broader range of adverse effects, and not limited to only visual amenity.	Amend EW-01 (Management of earthworks) as follows: ... 2. Minimises adverse effects <u>on the environment, including effects</u> on visual amenity values <u>and, including</u> changes to natural landforms. ...
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.12	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.22	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Not specified	<p>Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to EW-01 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP.</p> <p>There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned.</p> <p>Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain.</p> <p>The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone.</p> <p>West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.23	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Amend	Considers that Marshall's Ridge should be given protection through the strengthening of the policy.	Amend EW-01 (Management of earthworks) to give further protection to Marshall's Ridge and other ridgelines within the area.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.229	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Support	Considers that minimising the risks associated with slope instability is consistent with hazard provisions in the RPS. Supports slope failure being incorporated into the earthworks chapter to manage impacts on slope stability	Retain EW-01 (Management of earthworks) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.283	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Support	EW-01 is supported as it recognises the importance of earthworks being carried out in a way that reduces the potential adverse effects, particularly from sediment runoff impacting urban streams and the harbour.	Retain EW-01 (Management of earthworks) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.269	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Support in part	Objective EW-01 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective EW-01 (Management of Earthworks) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.270	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Amend	Considers that Objective EW-01 should be amended to be more specific with regard to the effect being managed. Kāinga Ora consider "visual amenity values" is too vague in the context of earthworks assessment.	<p>Amend Objective EW-01 (Management of Earthworks) as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks are undertaken in a manner that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is consistent with the anticipated scale and form of development in the relevant zone; 2. Minimises adverse effects on visual amenity values, including changes to the appearance of natural landforms; 3. Minimises erosion and sediment effects beyond the site; 4. Minimises risks associated with slope instability; and 5. Protects the safety of people and property.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.139	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-01	Oppose	Considers visual amenity is a well understood RMA concept and is an important consideration in assessing the appropriateness of earthworks activity.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.24	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P1	Not specified	<p>Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to EW-P1 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP.</p> <p>There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned.</p> <p>Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain.</p> <p>The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone.</p> <p>West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.25	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P2	Not specified	<p>Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to EW-P2 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP.</p> <p>There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned.</p> <p>Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain.</p> <p>The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone.</p> <p>West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.230	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P2	Support	Considers that minimising the risks associated with slope instability is consistent with hazard provisions in the RPS. Supports slope failure being incorporated into the earthworks chapter to manage impacts on slope stability	Retain EW-P2 (Provision for minor earthworks) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.231	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P2	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52 in Proposed Change 1 to RPS. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend EW-P2 (Provision for minor earthworks) as follows: Enable the efficient use and development of land by providing for earthworks and associated structures where: 1. The risk associated with instability is minimised not increased ; ...
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.40	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P2	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.284	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P2	Support	Minor earthworks are important for many activities in the city: provision for these, within a clear expectation of 'best practice' is practical.	Retain EW-P2 (Provision for minor earthworks) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.271	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P2	Support in part	EW-P2 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain EW-P2 (Provision for minor earthworks) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.272	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P2	Amend	Considers that EW-P2 should be amended to be more specific with regard to the effect being managed. Kāinga Ora consider "visual amenity" is too vague in the context of earthworks assessment.	Amend EW-P2 (Provision for minor earthworks) as follows: Enable the efficient use and development of land by providing for earthworks and associated structures where: 1. The risk associated with instability is not increased; 2. Erosion, dust and sedimentation effects on land and water bodies will be minimal; and 3. effects on visual amenity. The appearance of earthworks would be insignificant.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.140	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P2	Oppose	Considers visual amenity is a well understood RMA concept and is an important consideration in assessing the appropriateness of earthworks activity.	Disallow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.26	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P3	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to EW-P3 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.232	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P3	Support	Considers that minimising the risks associated with slope instability is consistent with hazard provisions in the RPS. Supports slope failure being incorporated into the earthworks chapter to manage impacts on slope stability	Retain EW-P3 (Maintaining stability) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.273	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P3	Support in part	EW-P3 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain EW-P3 (Maintaining stability) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.274	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P3	Amend	Considers that EW-P3 should be amended to remove reference to examples to simplify the policy.	Amend EW-P3 (Maintaining stability) as follows: Require earthworks to be designed and carried out in a manner that maintains slope stability and minimises the risk of slope failure associated with natural hazards such as earthquakes and increased rainfall intensities arising from climate change.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.27	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P4	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to EW-P4 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.233	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P4	Support in part	Supports the requirement for earthworks to adopt effective erosion and sediment control measures and dust control measures for earthworks proposals	Retain EW-P4 (Erosion, dust and sediment control) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.234	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P4	Amend	Considers that to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (policies FW.3 and 15) and give effect to the NPS-FM, this policy should be strengthened to better protect waterways and the coastal environment. This policy should more directly require details about erosion sediment control methods that are currently incorporated as assessment matters and their provision through erosion and sediment control plans. This will aid in the understanding of requirements by plan users	Seeks to amend EW-P4 (Erosion, dust and sediment control) to require erosion and sediment control measures which are designed and will be managed in accordance the principles and methods in the GWRC's Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Wellington Region 2021 and which are set out in an erosion and sediment control plan.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.285	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P4	Support	EW-P4 is supported as it gives a clear expectation that earthwork risks such as erosion, sediment and dust are properly managed, which is essential to improving protections for freshwater, and reducing dust nuisance, within the city.	Retain EW-P4 (Erosion, dust and sediment control) as notified.
John Tiley	142.18	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P5	Amend	Considers that once a ridgeline or hilltop is compromised to any extent, effects cannot be minimised, mitigated or remedied. This wording is misleading.	Seeks that EW-P5 (Effects on earthworks on landform and visual amenity) is rewritten.
Churton Park Community Association	189.18	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P5	Amend	Considers that once a ridgeline or hilltop is compromised to any extent, effects cannot be minimised, mitigated or remedied. This wording is misleading.	Seeks that EW-P5 (Effects on earthworks on landform and visual amenity) is rewritten.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.52	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P5	Not specified	Neutral on the policy directive to minimise adverse effects on natural landforms.	Not specified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.53	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P5	Amend	Opposes the reference to hilltops and ridgelines, noting the Hilltops and Ridgelines are specifically addressed in NFL-P2 .	Amend EW-P5 (Effects on earthworks on landform and visual amenity) as follows: Require earthworks and associated structures, including structures used to retain or stabilise landslips, to be designed and constructed to minimise adverse effects on natural landforms and visual amenity and where located within identified ridgelines and hilltops ensure the effects are mitigated or remedied.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.28	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P5	Amend	Considers that Marshall's Ridge should be given protection through the strengthening of the policy.	Amend EW-P5 (Effects on earthworks on landform and visual amenity) to give further protection to Marshall's Ridge and other ridgelines within the area.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.29	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P5	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to EW-P5 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.286	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P5	Support	EW-P5 is supported as it gives a clear expectation that earthworks must be done in a way that does not compromise landscape values, which form an important part of Wellington's natural character.	Retain EW-P5 (Effects on earthworks on landform and visual amenity) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.275	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P5	Support in part	EW-P5 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain EW-P5 (Effects on earthworks on landform and visual amenity) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.276	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P5	Amend	Considers that EW-P5 should be amended to be more specific with regard to the effect being managed. Kāinga Ora consider “visual amenity” is too vague in the context of earthworks assessment.	Amend EW-P5 (Effects on earthworks on landform and visual amenity) as follows: Require earthworks and associated structures, including structures used to retain or stabilise landslips, to be designed and constructed to minimise adverse effects on <u>the appearance of natural landforms and visual amenity</u> and where located within identified ridgelines and hilltops ensure the effects are mitigated or remedied.
Waka Kotahi	370.205	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P6	Support	Supports wording of policy as notified as it provides for management of effects on the transport network	Retain EW-P6 (Earthworks and the transport network) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.24	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P7	Support in part	[No reasons given other than decision, refer to original submission]	Retain EW-P7 (Earthworks on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures, and within heritage areas) with amendment.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.14	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P7	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P7	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.25	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P7	Amend	Considers that for improved consistency, EW-P7 should also cover scheduled archaeological sites and Sites of Significance to Māori.	Amend EW-P7 (Earthworks on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures, and within heritage areas) as follows: EW-P7: Earthworks on the site of heritage buildings, and heritage structures, and within heritage areas, <u>within the extent of scheduled archaeological sites and within Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.</u> Manage earthworks within sites occupied by heritage buildings and heritage structures, and within heritage areas, <u>within the extent of scheduled archaeological sites and within Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</u> , having regard to: 1. The identified heritage values of the scheduled item or heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area; 2. The extent to which the earthworks would detract from those identified values and setting; and 3. Whether the earthworks can be achieved without altering the significance of the item or heritage area.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.15	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P7	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.14	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P7	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.10	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P7	Support	The submitter seeks for additional policies to be added to the earthworks chapter to address archaeological sites and Sites of Significance to Māori. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because sites of significance to Māori should be taken into account and protected in relation to earthworks.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.287	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P7	Support	EW-P7 is supported as it gives a clear expectation that earthworks must be done in a way that does not compromise landscape values, which form an important part of Wellington's natural character.	Retain EW-P7 (Earthworks on the site of heritage buildings and heritage structures, and within heritage areas) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.288	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P8	Support	EW-P8 is supported as it provides for earthworks whilst requiring they do not risk notable trees is practical	Retain EW-P8 (Earthworks within the root protection area of notable trees) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.363	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P9	Oppose in part	Notes that the Earthworks chapter introduction states that the Earthworks Chapter includes policies and rules that implement the objectives in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter where earthworks proposals affect Significant Natural Areas. This policy takes a different approach to the ECO policy dealing with appropriate uses in SNAs (ECO P2). ECO P2 lists the purposes for which vegetation clearance may be appropriate. This policy is silent on the reasons why earthworks may be acceptable. We oppose this approach, as the policy may be used in support of activities beyond those which were intended to be provided for. Seeks that the policy list the relevant activities (as the similar ECO policy does) in an exhaustive list. 'Identified values' will not necessarily protect all the relevant values.	Amend EW-P9 (Minor earthworks within significant natural areas): <u>Consider enabling</u> Enable earthworks within Significant Natural Areas identified within SCHED8 where they are of a minor scale and nature that maintains the identified biodiversity values, <u>to provide for:</u> (list permitted activities only, in accordance with our submission below on the Permitted rules)
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.364	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P9	Oppose in part	As an alternative to the above submission point, delete this policy and rely on EW-P10.	Delete EW-P9 (Minor earthworks within significant natural areas).
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.235	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P9	Amend	Considers the tenure of these policies is more enabling than other similar policies which 'only allow for earthworks where..'	Amend EW-P9 (Minor earthworks within significant natural areas): <u>Enable Only allow for</u> earthworks within Significant Natural Areas identified within SCHED8 where they are of a minor scale and nature that maintains the identified biodiversity values.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.289	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P9	Support	EW-P9 is supported as it provides for earthworks in SNA areas, whilst requiring they maintain biodiversity values, is practical.	Retain EW-P9 (Minor earthworks within significant natural areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.70	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P9	Support	Supports proposed Policy EW-P9 (Minor earthworks within significant natural areas).	Retain policy EW-P9 (Minor earthworks within significant natural areas) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.54	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P10	Not specified	Considers that the ECO policy cross references should be clarified as to whether they are correct.	Seeks that the ECO policy cross references in EW-P10 (Earthworks within significant natural areas) should be clarified as to whether they are correct. [Inferred decision requested]
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.55	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P10	Support	Supports that EW-10 defers to policies within the ECO Chapter.	Retain EW-P10 (Earthworks within significant natural areas) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.365	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P10	Support in part	Considers this chapter takes a different approach to the Subdivision chapter – in the Subdivision chapter, policies from the ECO chapter are (roughly) replicated. In the Earthworks chapter however, the policy is framed with reference back to the relevant ECO policies. In our view, that is simpler approach which should be consistent across the plan's chapters. In our alternative relief for EW-P9, we sought that that policy was deleted and instead earthworks in SNAs were managed by EW-10 only. The policy should not start from a direction to provide for earthworks. The references to ECO policies need to be updated to ensure they are accurate. We have attempted to rectify this below	Amend EW-P10 (Earthworks within significant natural areas): <u>Consider providing Provide</u> for earthworks of a more than minor scale within Significant Natural Areas only where it can be demonstrated that any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values are addressed in accordance with ECO-P2 ₁ and the matters in ECO-P4 ₃ and ECO-P7 ₅ .
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.236	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P10	Amend	Considers the tenure of these policies is more enabling than other similar policies which 'only allow for earthworks where..'	Amend EW-P10 (Earthworks within significant natural areas): <u>Provide Only allow for</u> earthworks of a more than minor scale within Significant Natural Areas only where it can be demonstrated that any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values are addressed in accordance with ECO-P2 and the matters in ECO-P4 and ECO-P7.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.290	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P10	Support	EW-P10 is supported as it provides for earthworks in SNA areas, whilst requiring they maintain biodiversity values, is practical.	Retain EW-P10 (Earthworks within significant natural areas) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.71	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P10	Support in part	Supports in part Policy EW-P10 (Earthworks within significant natural areas). Policy EW-10 references ECO-P2, however it seems more likely that this point should refer to ECO-P1.	Supports policy EW-P10 (Earthworks within significant natural areas) in part, but seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.72	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P10	Amend	Considers that policy EW-10 should be clarified. Policy EW-10 references ECO-P2, however it seems more likely that this point should refer to ECO-P1.	Seeks clarification confirm whether the correct policies are referenced under EW-P10 (Earthworks within significant natural areas).
Director-General of Conservation	385.73	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P10	Amend	Considers that policy EW-10 should be clarified. Policy EW-10 references ECO-P2, however it seems more likely that this point should refer to ECO-P1.	Seeks that after clarification of referred policies in policy EW-P10 Earthworks within significant natural areas, that the wording of policy EW-P10 be changed.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.366	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P11	Support in part	Considers it is inconsistent with NZCPS policy 13 to only extent protection to high natural character areas. As such, this policy needs to apply to any area of natural character in the coastal environment, not only HNC areas in SCHED 12. As previously submitted, policies should not refer to identified values. Operational need is extremely broad and should be deleted.	Amend EW-P11 (Earthworks within High Coastal Natural Character Areas within the coastal environment): Only allow for earthworks within High Coastal Natural Character Areas where: 1. They are of a scale and for a purpose that is compatible with the identified values described in SCHED12 , including restoration and conservation activities; 2. They are undertaken in a manner that avoids significant adverse effects and avoids, remedies or mitigates any other adverse effects on the identified values of the High Coastal Natural Character Areas described in SCHED12 ; 3. There is a functional need or operational need for the earthworks to be undertaken within a High Coastal Natural Character Area; and 4. They incorporate measures to restore and rehabilitate disturbed areas.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.291	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P11	Support	EW-P11 is supported as it provides for earthworks in high natural character coastal areas, whilst requiring the avoidance of adverse effects sends an important signal for particular care to be taken in such sensitive environments.	Retain EW-P11 (Earthworks within High Coastal Natural Character Areas within the coastal environment) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.367	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Support in part	Considers the policy is not clear as to whether the requirements at 1-5 also apply to the Port Zone etc. Considers those requirements do need to apply in all zones. Operational need is extremely broad and should be deleted.	Amend EW-P12 (Earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment) to clarify whether requirements 1-5 apply to the Port Zone. ... 3. There is a functional need or operational need for the earthworks to be undertaken within a coastal or riparian margin;
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.237	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Amend	Considers the tenure of these policies is more enabling than other similar policies which 'only allow for earthworks where..'	Amend EW-P12 (Earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment) as follows: <u>Provide Only allow</u> for earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment where located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City Centre Zone; and ...
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.292	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Support	EW-P12 is supported as it provides for earthworks in coastal and riparian margins gives an important signal for particular care to be taken in such sensitive environments where there is a real risk to water quality and habitat. The cumulative impacts from this within a city environment means that each such activity must be undertaken with a high level of care.	Retain EW-P12 (Earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.74	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Support	Supports proposed Policy EW-P12 which is in line with the NZCPS.	Retain Policy EW-P12 (Earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.365	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Oppose	Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion. Or relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes EW-P12 (Earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.135	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Oppose	Considers Natural Open Space Zone Between Lyall Bay and Moa Point include areas below MHWS. Much of the earthworks being considered for this area will be subject s6 matter of national importance and promotes integrated management and consistency with regional plan.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.366	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Amend	<p>Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion.</p> <p>Or relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend EW-P12 (Earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment where located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City Centre Zone, <u>and within the Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u>; and</p> <p>Only allow for earthworks within coastal and riparian margins in the coastal environment located outside of the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or the City Centre Zone <u>or the Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u> where:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. They would not significantly increase the flooding risk, when compared to the existing situation, including by compromising the effectiveness of community scale natural hazard mitigation structures; and</p> <p>5. They incorporate measures to restore and rehabilitate disturbed areas; <u>and</u></p> <p><u>6. They involve earthworks that support or protect regionally significant infrastructure.</u></p> <p>... (Option A).</p>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.136	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Oppose	Considers Natural Open Space Zone Between Lyall Bay and Moa Point include areas below MHWS. Much of the earthworks being considered for this area will be subject s6 matter of national importance and promotes integrated management and consistency with regional plan.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.367	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Amend	<p>Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion.</p> <p>Or relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>If EW-P12 (Earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment) is not amended:</p> <p>Seeks that EW-P12 (Earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment) is amended to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning. (Option B).</p>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.137	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Oppose	Considers Natural Open Space Zone Between Lyall Bay and Moa Point include areas below MHWS. Much of the earthworks being considered for this area will be subject s6 matter of national importance and promotes integrated management and consistency with regional plan.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.368	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Oppose	Opposes this policy to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion. Or relief to a similar effect if the area of Natural Open Space zoned land is rezoned to an alternative zoning. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Delete EW-P12 (Earthworks within coastal margins and riparian margins within the coastal environment) in its entirety. (Option C).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.138	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P12	Oppose	Considers Natural Open Space Zone Between Lyall Bay and Moa Point include areas below MHWS. Much of the earthworks being considered for this area will be subject s6 matter of national importance and promotes integrated management and consistency with regional plan.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.368	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P13	Support in part	Seeks deletion of "operational need" as it is too broad.	Amend EW-P13 (Earthworks within riparian margins outside of the coastal environment): ... 2. There is a functional need or operational need for the earthworks to be undertaken within a riparian margin;
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.293	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P13	Amend	Considers that EW-P13 needs strengthening to reflect that poor earthworks management can have negative effects on both urban streams and the harbour.	Seeks a new point added to EW-P13 (Earthworks within riparian margins outside of the coastal environment). This is requested to be added after Point number 1 and read: <u>They are undertaken in a manner that avoids significant adverse effects and avoids, remedies or mitigates any other adverse effects on the natural character of the riparian margin;</u>
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.56	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P14	Oppose	Opposes EW-14 because of potential relevance to Horokiwi for any earthworks undertaken on the land forming part of the quarry on the eastern side of the Horokiwi Road, which do not fall within the existing use certificate. The land is within a special amenity landscape with a large portion within the coastal environment, and zoned General Rural. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that the coastal environment line as it relates to Horokiwi is amended. [Refer to original submission, including figure and attachments]
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.45	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P14	Support in part	Considers that the MRZ area of their land will be subject to another layer of restrictions for earthworks to facilitate the proposed residential development of the site.	Retain EW-P14 (Earthworks within special amenity landscapes) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.369	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P14	Support in part	Seeks deletion of references to 'identified' values.	Amend EW-P14 (Earthworks within special amenity landscapes): Manage earthworks within identified special amenity landscapes as follows: 1. Provide for earthworks within special amenity landscapes outside the coastal environment only where: a. They maintain the identified values of the special amenity landscape; and b. They are undertaken in a way that avoids, remedies or mitigates any adverse effects on the identified values of the special amenity landscape. 2. Provide for earthworks within special amenity landscapes within the coastal environment only where: a. They maintain the identified values of the special amenity landscape; and b. They are undertaken in a way that avoids any significant adverse effects and avoids, remedies or mitigates any other adverse effects on the identified values of the special amenity landscape. 3. Require earthworks within special amenity landscapes to incorporate measures that: a. Restore or rehabilitate disturbed areas; b. Minimise changes to the landform; and c. Recognise and provide for Tangata Whenua cultural and spiritual values and practices.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.294	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P14	Support	EW-P14 is supported as it provides for earthworks in special amenity landscapes gives an important signal that ensures earthworks do not compromise landscape values, which form an important part of Wellington's natural character.	Retain EW-P14 (Earthworks within special amenity landscapes) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.370	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P15	Support in part	Seeks deletion of references to 'identified' values.	Amend EW-P15 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes): Manage earthworks within identified outstanding natural features and landscapes as follows: 1. Only allow for earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes outside the coastal environment where: a. They are of a scale that protects the identified values of the outstanding natural features and landscapes; and b. They are undertaken in a way that avoids any significant adverse effects and avoids, remedies or mitigates any other adverse effects on the identified values of the outstanding natural features and landscapes. 2. Avoid earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment unless: a. They are of a scale that protects with the identified values of the outstanding natural features and landscapes; and b. They are undertaken in a way that avoids any adverse effects on the identified values of the outstanding natural features and landscapes. 3. Require earthworks within outstanding natural landscapes to incorporate measures that: a. Restore or rehabilitate disturbed areas; b. Minimise changes to the landform; and c. Recognise and provide for Tangata Whenua cultural and spiritual values and practices.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.295	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P15	Support	EW-P15 is supported as it provides for earthworks in outstanding natural features and landscapes gives an important signal that ensures earthworks do not compromise these values, which form an important part of Wellington's natural character.	Retain EW-P15 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.75	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P15	Support	Supports proposed Policy EW-P15 which is in line with Policies 13 & 15 of the NZCPS.	Retain Policy EW-P15 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.30	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P16	Not specified	Considers that "Well functioning urban environment" does not apply to EW-P16 because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.238	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P16	Support	Considers it is essential to limit earthworks undertaken within Flood Hazard Overlays, allowing them only where the flooding risk is not increased, and the conveyance of floodwaters is not affected.	Retain EW-P16 (Earthworks within Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.371	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P17	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain EW-P17 (Earthworks on community scale natural hazard mitigation structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.239	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P17	Support	Considers it is important to restrict the earthworks undertaken on community scale natural hazard mitigation structures, only allowing these works where the form and functioning of these structures is not affected in the long term.	Retain EW-P17 (Earthworks on community scale natural hazard mitigation structures) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.372	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P18	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain EW-P18 (Earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation works) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.240	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P18	Support	Considers it is appropriate to enable earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation works where the matters listed in the policy result, including a reduction in the risk at a community scale and are part of a planned works programme.	Retain EW-P18 (Earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation works) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.123	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P18	Support in part	Considers that CentrePort should be listed as appropriate to carry out natural hazard mitigation works. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network and land transport infrastructure within these landholdings. Natural Hazard Mitigation works are required from time to time. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	Retain EW-P18 (Earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation works), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.124	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P18	Amend	Considers that CentrePort should be listed as appropriate to carry out natural hazard mitigation works. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network and land transport infrastructure within these landholdings. Natural Hazard Mitigation works are required from time to time. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	Amend EW-P18 (Earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation works) as follows: ... 2. They are part of a planned natural hazard mitigation works programme by a central government agency, GWRC, the Council, <u>CentrePort</u> or a nominated contractor or agent and will be maintained by one or more of these parties at the completion of the works; ...
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.373	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P19	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain EW-P19 (Earthworks associated with soft engineering natural hazard mitigation works) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.241	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P19	Support	Considers it is appropriate to provide for earthworks associated with soft engineering natural hazard mitigation works where there is a risk reduction benefit, and do not increase the risk to another property, and have a maintenance programme in place.	Retain EW-P19 (Earthworks associated with soft engineering natural hazard mitigation works) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.125	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P19	Support in part	Considers that CentrePort should be listed as appropriate to carry out natural hazard mitigation works. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network and land transport infrastructure within these landholdings. Natural Hazard Mitigation works are required from time to time. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	Retain EW-P19 (Earthworks associated with soft engineering natural hazard mitigation works), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.126	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P19	Amend	Considers that CentrePort should be listed as appropriate to carry out natural hazard mitigation works. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network and land transport infrastructure within these landholdings. Natural Hazard Mitigation works are required from time to time. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	Amend EW-P19 (Earthworks associated with soft engineering natural hazard mitigation works) as follows: ... 2. They are undertaken by a central government agency, GWRC, the Council, <u>CentrePort</u> or a nominated contractor or agent; ...
Wellington City Council	266.119	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P20	Amend	Considers amendment will clarify how EW-P20 (Earthworks in development areas) applies to the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area and ridgetop area.	Amend EW-P20 (Earthworks in development areas) as follows: Enable earthworks associated with the development of the Lincolnshire Farm and Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Areas where the design of those earthworks: (...) 5. Protects ridgeline and hilltop <u>ridgetop</u> areas from inappropriate earthworks.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.242	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P20	Amend	Considers the tenure of these policies is more enabling than other policies. These greenfield developments have the potential for significant effects on surrounding areas in terms of compatibility and effects downstream in Porirua Stream and Onepoto Arm of Porirua Harbour.	Amend EW-P20 (Earthworks in development areas) as follows: Enable Only allow for earthworks associated with the development of the Lincolnshire Farm and Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Areas where the design of those earthworks: ...
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.3	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P20	Oppose in part	Opposes any earthworks in the Glenside West Area, as it is meant to be a protected area under DPC33.	EW-P20 (Earthworks in development areas) is opposed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.2	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P20	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.296	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P20	Support	EW-P20 is supported as it provides for earthworks for reasons including development of water sensitive design, is useful, as this sort of design needs to be encouraged in green fields development areas.	Retain EW-P20 (Earthworks in development areas) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.69	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-P20	Support in part	Supports EW-P20 in part.	Amend EW-P20 (Earthworks in development areas) by adding a clause that specifies: <u>Earthworks in development areas will avoid practices that will send additional sediment to Porirua Harbour and will avoid impacts downstream of Porirua Stream.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.206	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R1	Support	Supports earthworks as a permitted activity for the purposes of piling, trenching, and geotechnical investigations, and restricted discretionary where standards are not complied with.	Retain EW-R1 (Earthworks for the purposes of piling, trenching, maintaining sports fields, undertaking geotechnical investigations and grave digging, the replacement or removal of underground petroleum storage systems associated with service stations) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.65	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R1	Support	Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.92	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R1	Support in part	EW-R1 is generally supported as specific pathway for the replacement or removal of underground petroleum storage systems associated with service stations as a permitted activity subject to compliance with Standards EW-S5 and EW-S6. This approach is supported in part, given this is an activity specifically addressed and managed under the NESCS, but it is considered this activity should not be limited to just service stations and should apply more broadly to other sites and activities that may necessitate the removal or replacement of underground petroleum systems.	Retain EW-R1 (Earthworks for the purposes of piling, trenching, maintaining sports fields, undertaking geotechnical investigations and grave digging, the replacement or removal of underground petroleum storage systems associated with service stations) with amendment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.93	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R1	Amend	Considers that 'service stations' should be excluded from EW-R1. It is considered Earthworks should not be limited to just service stations and should apply more broadly to other sites and activities that may necessitate the removal or replacement of underground petroleum systems.	Amend the title of EW-R1 (Earthworks for the purposes of piling, trenching, maintaining sports fields, undertaking geotechnical investigations and grave digging, the replacement or removal of underground petroleum storage systems associated with service stations) as follows: Earthworks for the purposes of piling, trenching, maintaining sports fields, undertaking geotechnical investigations and grave digging, the replacement or removal of underground petroleum storage systems associated with service stations.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.297	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R2	Support	EW-R2 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R2 (Earthworks for the purposes of maintaining tracks associated with permitted activities in Rural Zones) as notified.
Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	486.7	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R2	Amend	Considers that EW-R2 should be amended with an additional clause that enables Zealandia operations to continue as per other areas in the plan. Considers that EW-R2 may prevent maintenance and management work of bridges and associated infrastructure within Zealandia.	Amend EW-R2 (Earthworks for the purposes of maintaining tracks associated with permitted activities in Rural Zones) to list the Karori Sanctuary Trust as an approved operator.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.298	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R3	Support	EW-R3 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R3 (Earthworks for the purposes of constructing tracks associated with permitted activities in Rural Zones) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.207	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R4	Support	Supports permitted activity status for earthworks for the purposes of maintaining public walking or cycling tracks in open space zones and restricted discretionary where standards are not complied with.	Retain EW-R4 (Earthworks for the purposes of maintaining public walking or cycling tracks in Open Space Zones) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.299	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R4	Support	EW-R4 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R4 (Earthworks for the purposes of maintaining public walking or cycling tracks in Open Space Zones) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.208	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R5	Support	Supports permitted activity status for earthworks for the purposes of constructing public walking or cycling tracks in open space zones and restricted discretionary where standards are not complied with.	Retain EW-R5 (Earthworks for the purposes of constructing public walking or cycling tracks in Open Space Zones) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.300	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R5	Support	EW-R5 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R5 (Earthworks for the purposes of constructing public walking or cycling tracks in Open Space Zones) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.301	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R6	Support	EW-R6 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R6 (General earthworks) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.277	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R6	Support	EW-R6 is supported.	Retain EW-R6 (General earthworks) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.127	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R6	Support in part	Support subject to resolving submission point on EW-S1. Standard S1 applies as a permitted activity condition under Rules EW-R6 (General Earthworks and R19 (relating to earthworks in the Coastal Environment) stating that the total area of earthworks must not exceed 250m2 per site in any 12-month period. For a very large landholding with large sites such as at CentrePort 250m2 is inadequate to be able to deal with the area of earthworks that are required from time to time.	Retain EW-R6 (General Earthworks), subject to amendment sought in relation to EW-S1 (Area) to exclude the Port Zone from the standard.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.35	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R6	Amend	Considers that limited and public notification preclusion should be broadened to include all standards EW-S1 to EW-S6	Amend EW-R6 (General earthworks) to: Applications under this rule which result from non-compliance with EW-R6.1.a.i and EW-R6.1.a.iii-vi are precluded from being publicly or limited notified. Applications under this rule that result from non-compliance with EW-R6.1.a.ii are precluded from being publicly notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.57	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R7	Support	Supports rule EW-R7 and in particular the default restricted discretionary activity status.	Retain EW-R7 (Earthworks within a significant natural area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.374	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R7	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes 1.a.i. and seeks that it is deleted. SNAs are usually complex ecosystems, that involve interactions between the fauna and vegetation with the landform that supports them. Allowing any earthworks wherever there is vegetation is contrary to the requirement to protect these areas under s6(c) and s31. Lizards for example often make their homes in rocky areas, which under this rule would be able to be bulldozed without consent. This permitted activity is also likely to be inconsistent with policy 11 NZCPS, given the often sparsely vegetated nature of Wellington's coastal environment.</p> <p>ii. needs to be limited to a certain amount of earthworks, either by referencing that in the rules, or by reference to a standard. This would replicate the approach taken in the corresponding vegetation clearance rule in ECO R.1.a.vii. We seek that the permitted earthworks are subject to the same limits as the permitted vegetation clearance, being a maximum earthworks of 2.5m width in total, to accommodate the track.</p> <p>iii. no longer references the correct ECO rule.</p> <p>iv. this refers to a deleted rule in ECO R1. If residential SNAs are returned to the plan in line with our submission, we have submitted above that vegetation clearance for the installation of services must be controlled at least, so that the Council retains the ability to at least minimise the damage done to the SNA. We make the same submission here – this activity should be controlled. It should also be limited to existing residential units. New development in SNAs should have a higher consenting requirement, at least RDA.</p> <p>v. We have made submissions about the accompanying vegetation clearance rules above in the ECO chapter. We seek the same amendments here. PA status is only appropriate for the maintenance of existing fences in SNAs.</p> <p>We also seek that limits on the amounts of earthworks permitted for these activities, as per the above submission on ECO R1.2.a.i.,ii. and iv. This can either be done by reference to limits in the EW rule below, or reference to a new standard</p>	<p>Amend EW-R7 (Earthworks within a significant natural area):</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The earthworks: i. do not involve the removal of any indigenous vegetation; or ii. are for the maintenance of existing public walking or cycling tracks, as carried out the Council, GWRC, or their approved contractor <u>(either refer to a new standard, or include maximum earthworks of 2.5m width in total, to accommodate the track); or</u> iii. are required for the purpose of ECO-R1.1.a.iv <u>(flood protection control); or</u> iv. required for the purpose of ECO R1.a.viii (installation of services); or v. associated with the <u>maintenance of existing</u> fencing, farm drainage creating farm access tracks in accordance with ECO-R1.2.a.i or ECO-R1.2.a.ii or ECO-R1.2.a.iv. <u>(insert earthworks limits as sought for ECO R1.2 above, either here or by reference to a standard)</u></p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.375	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R7	Support in part	Considers this rule should default to non-complying.	<p>Amend EW-R7 (Earthworks within a significant natural area):</p> <p>2. Restricted Discretionary Non-complying</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.376	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R7	Support in part	<p>If relief sought in the above submission point is not granted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the matters of discretion referencing EW- P10. This is on the proviso that ECO-P1 is amended in the manner sought in our submission on that policy. - Seeks an exclusion where the SNA includes matters identified in policy 11 NZCPS. <p>This should become non-complying (new rule sought below)</p>	<p>Amend EW-R7 (Earthworks within a significant natural area):</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of EW-R7.1 cannot be achieved b. The Significant Natural Area does not include matters identified in policy 11 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in EW-P10 <u>[provided amendments to ECO-P1 are accepted]</u></p>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.302	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R7	Support	EW-R7 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R7 (Earthworks within a Significant Natural Area) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.26	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R8	Support in part	Considers that for improved consistency, EW-R8 should also cover scheduled archaeological sites and Sites of Significance to Māori.	Retain EW-R8 (Earthworks on the site of scheduled heritage buildings and structures, and within heritage areas) with amendment.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.16	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R8	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.15	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R8	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.11	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R8	Support	The submitter seeks for additional policies to be added to the earthworks chapter to address archaeological sites and Sites of Significance to Māori. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because sites of significance to Māori should be taken into account and protected in relation to earthworks.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.27	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R8	Amend	Considers that for improved consistency, EW-R8 should be broadened to include scheduled archaeological sites.	Amend EW-R8 (Earthworks on the site of scheduled heritage buildings and structures, and within heritage areas) as follows: EW-R8: Earthworks on the site of scheduled heritage buildings and structures, and within heritage areas, <u>and within scheduled archaeological sites.</u>
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.17	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R8	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.16	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R8	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.120	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R8	Amend	Considers this rule needs to be amended so that resource consent is not required for earthworks in legal road in a heritage area.	Amend EW-R8 (Earthworks on the site of scheduled heritage buildings and structures, and within heritage areas) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. <u>Compliance is achieved with EW-S10; or</u> b. <u>The earthworks are located within legal road.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.303	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R8	Support	EW-R8 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R8 (Earthworks on the site of scheduled heritage buildings and structures, and within heritage areas) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.377	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R9	Support	Supports the rule.	Retain EW-R9 (Earthworks within the root protection area of notable trees) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.304	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R9	Support	EW-R9 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R9 (Earthworks within the root protection area of notable trees) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.378	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R10	Support in part	Considers that in order to give effect to NZCPS policy 13 this rule should apply in all areas of natural character in the coastal environment.	Amend EW-R10 (Earthworks within High Coastal Natural Character Areas within the coastal environment)
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.305	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R10	Support	EW-R10 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R10 (Earthworks within High Coastal Natural Character Areas within the coastal environment) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.379	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Oppose in part	Considers it is not clear that these rules give effect to the NZCPS, which must be complied with regardless of zoning. Amend to ensure this is addressed.	Amend EW-R11 (Earthworks within coastal or riparian margins within the coastal environment) to give effect to the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.142	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission as no detail is provided regarding the amendments proposed, therefore it is difficult to determine the appropriateness or otherwise of the amendments in terms of section 32 of the RMA. It is also difficult to ascertain which parts of the NZCPS this submission is referring to. [Inferred reference to submission 345.379]	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.306	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Support	EW-R11 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R11 (Earthworks within coastal or riparian margins within the coastal environment) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.128	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Support in part	Support subject to resolving submission point on EW-S1. Standard S1 applies as a permitted activity condition under Rules EW-R6 (General Earthworks and R19 (relating to earthworks in the Coastal Environment) stating that the total area of earthworks must not exceed 250m2 per site in any 12-month period. For a very large landholding with large sites such as at CentrePort 250m2 is inadequate to be able to deal with the area of earthworks that are required from time to time.	Retain EW-R11 (Earthworks within coastal or riparian margins within the coastal environment), subject to amendment sought in relation to EW-S1 (Area) to exclude the Port Zone from the standard.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.369	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Oppose	<p>Opposes this rule to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion.</p> <p>Considers that this rule is inefficient and does not relate to effects management within the Coastal Environment. Instead, the trigger is non-compliance with a general earthworks rule (EW-P6) and associated standards. Submitter notes that this rule is subject to the ISPP, which is inappropriate for activities that do not have a clear link to one of the mandatory outcomes.</p> <p>Considers that this rule should be entirely reworked to standalone and reflect those elements of EW-P6 that are relevant to the coastal margins.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45, 4.32 to 4.39 of original submission for further detail.]</p>	Opposes EW-R11 (Earthworks within coastal or riparian margins within the coastal environment) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.139	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Oppose	<p>Considers Natural Open Space Zone Between Lyall Bay and Moa Point include areas below MHWS. Much of the earthworks being considered for this area will be subject s6 matter of national importance and promotes integrated management and consistency with regional plan.</p>	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.370	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Amend	<p>Opposes this rule to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion.</p> <p>Considers that this rule is inefficient and does not relate to effects management within the Coastal Environment. Instead, the trigger is non-compliance with a general earthworks rule (EW-P6) and associated standards. Submitter notes that this rule is subject to the ISPP, which is inappropriate for activities that do not have a clear link to one of the mandatory outcomes.</p> <p>Considers that this rule should be entirely reworked to standalone and reflect those elements of EW-P6 that are relevant to the coastal margins.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45, 4.32 to 4.39 of original submission for further detail.]</p>	Seeks that EW-R11 (Earthworks within coastal or riparian margins within the coastal environment) is amended to include the relevant area of Natural Open Space zoned land, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.140	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Oppose	<p>Considers Natural Open Space Zone Between Lyall Bay and Moa Point include areas below MHWS. Much of the earthworks being considered for this area will be subject s6 matter of national importance and promotes integrated management and consistency with regional plan.</p>	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.371	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Amend	<p>Opposes this rule to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion.</p> <p>Considers that this rule is inefficient and does not relate to effects management within the Coastal Environment. Instead, the trigger is non-compliance with a general earthworks rule (EW-P6) and associated standards. Submitter notes that this rule is subject to the ISPP, which is inappropriate for activities that do not have a clear link to one of the mandatory outcomes.</p> <p>Considers that this rule should be entirely reworked to standalone and reflect those elements of EW-P6 that are relevant to the coastal margins.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45, 4.32 to 4.39 of original submission for further detail.]</p>	Seeks that EW-R11 (Earthworks within coastal or riparian margins within the coastal environment) is amended to be standalone and independent of EW-P6, which is subject to a ISPP process.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.141	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Oppose	Considers Natural Open Space Zone Between Lyall Bay and Moa Point include areas below MHWS. Much of the earthworks being considered for this area will be subject s6 matter of national importance and promotes integrated management and consistency with regional plan.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.372	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Amend	<p>Opposes this rule to the extent that it does not recognise or provide for the existing hard engineering structures located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point which protect regionally significant infrastructure, including WCC's wastewater network and Wellington International Airport, as well as Moa Point Road, from the effects of coastal erosion.</p> <p>Considers that this rule is inefficient and does not relate to effects management within the Coastal Environment. Instead, the trigger is non-compliance with a general earthworks rule (EW-P6) and associated standards. Submitter notes that this rule is subject to the ISPP, which is inappropriate for activities that do not have a clear link to one of the mandatory outcomes.</p> <p>Considers that this rule should be entirely reworked to standalone and reflect those elements of EW-P6 that are relevant to the coastal margins.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45, 4.32 to 4.39 of original submission for further detail.]</p>	Seeks that EW-R11 (Earthworks within coastal or riparian margins within the coastal environment) is amended to reflect those specific matters that require control within the coastal margins.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.142	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R11	Oppose	Considers Natural Open Space Zone Between Lyall Bay and Moa Point include areas below MHWS. Much of the earthworks being considered for this area will be subject s6 matter of national importance and promotes integrated management and consistency with regional plan.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.380	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R12	Oppose in part	Considers it is unclear what "Compliance is achieved with EW12" means as it appears to be a reference to this rule.	Amend EW-R12 (Earthworks within riparian margins (outside the coastal environment) reference to EW-512.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.307	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R12	Support	EW-R12 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R12 (Earthworks within riparian margins (outside the coastal environment) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.46	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R13	Support in part	Considers that the MR2 area of the Submitters land will be subject to another layer of restrictions for earthworks to facilitate the proposed residential development of the site.	Retain EW-R13 (Earthworks within special amenity landscapes) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.381	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R13	Oppose	Considers the rule does not appear to give effect to policy 15 NZCPS, where the SAL or ONFL is in the coastal environment.	Amend EW-R13 (Earthworks within special amenity landscapes) to give effect to policy 15 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.308	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R13	Support	EW-R13 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R13 (Earthworks within special amenity landscapes) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.382	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R14	Oppose	Considers the rule does not appear to give effect to policy 15 NZCPS, where the SAL or ONFL is in the coastal environment.	Amend EW-R14 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes) to give effect to policy 15 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.309	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R14	Support	EW-R14 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R14 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.
Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	486.8	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R14	Amend	<p>Considers that EW-R14 should be amended with an additional clause that enables Zealandia operations to continue as per other areas in the plan.</p> <p>Considers that EW-R14 may prevent maintenance and management work of bridges and associated infrastructure within Zealandia.</p>	Amend EW-R14 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes) to list the Karori Sanctuary Trust as an approved operator.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John Tiley	142.19	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R15	Not specified	Considers that the EW-S13 assessment criteria for assessing applications made under EW-R15 are entirely subjective and offer no protection for ridgelines.	Seeks that EW-S13 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes, within special amenity landscapes and within the ridgelines and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) is rewritten to offer greater control over earthworks in this area.
Churton Park Community Association	189.19	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R15	Not specified	Considers that the EW-S13 assessment criteria for assessing applications made under EW-R15 are entirely subjective and offer no protection for ridgelines.	Seeks that EW-S13 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes, within special amenity landscapes and within the ridgelines and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) is rewritten to offer greater control over earthworks in this area.
Wellington City Council	266.121	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R15	Amend	Considers change requested will clarify how EW-R15 (Earthworks within the ridgeline and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) applies to the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area and ridgetop area.	Amend EW-R15 (Earthworks within the ridgeline and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) as follows: Earthworks within the ridgeline and hilltops <u>overlay or within the ridgetop area of the</u> Upper Stebbings <u>and</u> Glenside West Development Area 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with EW-S13 ₂ ; and b. <u>For the ridgetop area of the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area the earthworks are for the purpose of constructing public footpaths or tracks.</u> 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of EW-R15.1 _a cannot be achieved; and b. The total area of earthworks in any 5-year period does not exceed: i. 500m ² per site <u>within the ridgeline and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area</u> ; and c. The maximum cut height or fill depth does not exceed 1.5m above ground level measured vertically.
Wellington City Council	266.122	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R15	Amend	Considers new EW-R15.4 Non-Complying activity for earthworks that are not related to new public footpaths or tracks in the ridgetop area of the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area is necessary.	Amend EW-R15 (Earthworks within the ridgeline and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) to add another activity status EW-R15.4 applying to All Zones as follows: (...) 4. <u>Activity status: Non-complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with the requirements of EW-R15.1.b cannot be achieved.</u>
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.31	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R15	Amend	Considers that Marshall's Ridge should be given protection through the strengthening of the rule.	Amend EW-R15 (Earthworks within the ridgeline and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) to give further protection to Marshall's Ridge and other ridgelines within the area.
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.4	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R15	Amend	Considers that all earthworks in Lincolnshire Farm and Upper Stebbings-Glenside West should be reclassified from Restricted Discretionary to Discretionary and that the two Wellington councils enforce this activity status rigorously. Earth working creates noise over a wide area for long periods outside of the winter months whilst the layers of soil are being laid and compressed, and involves the unnecessary use of large quantities of diesel to power the machinery required. The CO ₂ produced creates an unnecessary adverse climate change impact. It also creates a dust hazard affecting people's health. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Amend EW-R15 (Earthworks within the ridgeline and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary ... 3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.3	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R15	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.310	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R15	Support	EW-R15 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R15 (Earthworks within the ridgeline and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.243	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R16	Amend	Considers the notified Rule EW-R16.2.1 appears to refer to the incorrect Policy as the assessment matters. The Plan incorrectly refers to EW-P14, which is the policy relating to earthworks in outstanding natural features and landscapes.	Amend EW-R16 (Earthworks within the Flood Hazard Overlay) to correct reference to EW-P16 (the specific policy relating to earthworks in Flood Hazard Overlay).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.278	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R17	Support in part	EW-R17 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain EW-R17 (Earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation works within the Flood Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.279	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R17	Amend	Considers that EW-R17 should be amended so that the ability to undertake earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation as a permitted activity is extended beyond the parties currently listed in this rule.	Amend EW-R17.1 (Earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation works within the Flood Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: The natural hazard mitigation works are undertaken by a Central Government Agency, GWRC, the Council, <u>Kāinga Ora</u> , or a nominated contractor or agent for the express purpose of natural hazard mitigation works.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.86	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R17	Oppose	Greater Wellington note that entities currently listed are mandated to undertake natural hazard mitigation works under several pieces of legislation, including for emergency works. Kāinga Ora do not have this mandate and should work with other agencies to undertake earthworks where relevant.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.129	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R17	Support in part	Considers that CentrePort should be listed as appropriate to carry out natural hazard mitigation works. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network and land transport infrastructure within these landholdings. Natural Hazard Mitigation works are required from time to time including soft engineering. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	Retain EW-R17 (Earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation works within the Flood Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.130	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R17	Amend	Considers that CentrePort should be listed as appropriate to carry out natural hazard mitigation works. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network and land transport infrastructure within these landholdings. Natural Hazard Mitigation works are required from time to time including soft engineering. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works	Amend EW-R17 (Earthworks associated with natural hazard mitigation works within the Flood Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The natural hazard mitigation works are undertaken by a Central Government Agency, GWRC, the Council, <u>CentrePort</u> or a nominated contractor or agent for the express purpose of natural hazard mitigation works.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.131	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R18	Amend	<p>Considers that CentrePort should be listed as appropriate to carry out natural hazard mitigation and soft engineering works. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network and land transport infrastructure within these landholdings. Natural Hazard Mitigation works are required from time to time including soft engineering. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.</p> <p>It is noted that the Special Purpose Airport zone has a permitted rule EW-R20 and its own standard.</p>	<p>Amend EW-R18 (Earthworks associated with soft engineering natural hazard mitigation works within Flood Hazard Overlays and Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>The soft engineering natural hazard mitigation works are undertaken by a central government agency, GWRC, the Council, <u>CentrePort</u> or a nominated contractor or agent for the express purpose of soft engineering natural hazard mitigation works.</p>
Z Energy Limited	361.13	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R20	Support	EW-R20 is supported as it enables earthworks in the Airport zone as a permitted activity where compliance with the relevant standards is achieved.	Retain EZ-R20 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.373	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R20	Oppose	[Not specified]	Opposes EW-R20 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.374	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R20	Amend	[Not specified]	<p>Amend EW-R20 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is achieved with EW-S14.1 to <u>EW-S14.4 and EW-S14.2</u>; and b. Compliance is achieved with EW-S14.2; and c. Earthworks are for the purposes of the upgrade or maintenance of existing formed roads and public accessways; or d. Earthworks are for the purposes of construction, upgrade, maintenance or repair of the Airport pavement (apron and taxiway surfaces); or e. Earthworks permitted by any other rule.</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of EW-20.1a cannot be achieved; or <u>b. Earthworks associated with the construction of new legal roads.</u></p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards; 2. Relevant matters in <u>AIRPZ-P3 and AIRPZ-P4, AIRPZ-P4 and AIRPZ-P5</u>; 3. Visual appearance and mitigation; and 4. Geomorphological impacts. <u>5. Traffic impacts caused by transporting earth and construction fill material.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					Activity status: Discretionary Where:- a. Compliance with EW-R20.1.b, c or d cannot be achieved. Notification Status: an application for resource consent made in respect of rule EW-R20.2 must be publicly notified. [Note reference to AIRPZ-P3 and P4 are to the Annexure B version of these provisions, not the Airport Chapter as notified] (Option A).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.375	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R20	Oppose	[Not specified]	Delete EW-R20 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) in its entirety. (Option B).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.376	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R20	Not specified	EW-R20.1 implies that only those activities listed are permitted in the zone. This includes EW-R20.1.e which notes that any earthworks permitted by any other rule are also permitted within the Airport Zone.	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.377	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R20	Not specified	There is no clear activity status for earthworks that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements specified in subparagraph EW-R20.1.e.	Clarify the Activity Status for earthworks that do not comply with permitted activity requirements specified in subparagraph EW-R20.1.e.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.378	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R20	Not specified	Despite the reference to earthworks within the Airport Zone being permitted where they comply with other provisions within the earthworks chapter, EW-20.3.a appears to render any earthworks that are not for the purposes of the upgrade or maintenance of existing formed roads and public accessways or for the purpose of construction, upgrade, maintenance or repair of the Airport pavement a discretionary activity.	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.379	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R20	Amend	A number of the rules that are relevant to the Airport Zone, by reference within EW-R20.1.e are subject to the ISPP. For the reasons discussed in paragraphs 4.32 to 4.39, this is inappropriate for earthwork activities that do not relate to the implementation of the NPSUD.	Seeks that the Earthworks chapter is amended to remove ISPP for provisions that do not relate to the implementation of the NPS-UD.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.380	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R20	Amend	The matters of discretion with respect to EW-R20.4. "Geomorphological impacts" is too broad. This matter of discretion should be refined to specify which aspects of the geomorphology require consideration or deleted.	Seeks that EW-R20.4 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) is amended to specify which aspects of the geomorphology require consideration or deleted.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.311	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R21	Support	EW-R21 is supported as it provides for earthworks activities whilst providing discretion on potential environmental risks.	Retain EW-R21 (Earthworks within Sites and Areas of Significance Category A and Category B) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.70	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R21	Support	Supports EW-R21.	Retain EW-R21 (Earthworks for the purposes of piling, trenching, maintaining sports fields, undertaking geotechnical investigations and grave digging, the replacement or removal of underground petroleum storage systems associated with service stations) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.176	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R22	Amend	<p>Supports the provision of standards specific to earthworks on the basis such activities can compromise the National Grid and are a form of development contemplated by the NPS-ET. Considers that earthworks also have the potential to restrict Transpower's ability to access the line and locate the heavy machinery required to maintain support structures around the lines and may lead to potential tower failure and significant constraints on the operation of the line. Considers the provision of a rule framework achieves Policies 2 and 10 of the NPS-ET.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to Rule EW-R22 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move the depth standards from the standard EW-S15 to the rule to provide more clarity and provide a clear relationship to the exemptions; - Amend the default activity status to non-complying where permitted conditions are not complied with (and as a subsequent amendment, deletion of the discretionary matter and notification clause). <p>A non-complying activity status is considered the most effective means of giving effect to the NPS-ET's objective of managing the adverse effects of the network and managing the adverse effects of other activities on the network.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend EW-R22 (Earthworks in the national grid yard) as follows:</p> <p>EW-R22 Earthworks <u>or vertical holes</u> in the national grid yard All Zones</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted Where:</p> <p>a. <u>Earthworks or vertical hole depth must be no greater (measured vertically) than:</u> <u>i. 300 millimetres within 6 metres of the outer visible edge of a foundation of any National Grid support structure; or</u> <u>ii. Between 6 metres and 12 metres from the outer visible edge of a foundation of any National Grid support structure.</u></p> <p>b. Compliance is achieved with EW-S15_1</p> <p>...</p> <p>All Zones</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Non complying Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of EW-R22.1 cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:-</p> <p>1. The extent and effect of non compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards;</p> <p>2. Impacts on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid;</p> <p>3. The risk to the structural integrity of the affected National Grid support structure(s);</p> <p>3. Any impact on the ability of Transpower to access the National Grid;</p> <p>4. The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property;</p> <p>5. Technical advice provided by Transpower; and</p> <p>6. Any effects on National Grid support structures including the creation of an unstable batter.</p> <p>Notification Status:- An application for resource consent made in respect of rule EW-R22.2 is precluded from being publicly notified. Notice of any application for resource consent under this rule must be served on Transpower New Zealand Limited in accordance with Clause 10(2)(i) of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedures) Regulations 2003.</p>
Firstgas Limited	304.41	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-R23	Amend	<p>Considers that EW-R23 should be amended not to require a copy of a Pipeline Easement Permit to the Council. The Pipeline Easement Permit is issued by Firstgas and is a paper-based permit issued to the contractor at the time of the works taking place. It would therefore not be achievable for a copy to be provided to Council prior to the commencement of the work.</p>	<p>Amend EW-R23 (Earthworks within the gas transmission pipeline corridor) as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. For any earthworks within a gas pipeline easement area, a Pipeline Easement Permit is obtained and a copy of the permit is provided to the Council prior to the commencement of the earthworks; or</p> <p>b. For any earthworks outside of a gas pipeline easement area, written advice of the work is provided to the gas transmission pipeline owner and operator at least 15 working days prior to the commencement of the earthworks; and</p> <p>c. Compliance is achieved with EW-S15.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Phillippa O'Connor	289.11	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that the earthworks triggers are too low and lack nuance.</p> <p>Considers that the Auckland unitary plan baseline in residential zones of 500m2 is considered more appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend EW-S1 (Area) as follows:</p> <p>EW-S1</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>1. The total area of earthworks must not exceed 250m2 <u>500m2</u> per site in any 12-month period.</p>
Phillippa O'Connor	289.12	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that assessment criteria #5 of EW-S1 should only apply if the site is within a Significant Natural Area (SNA) or if the site has a known ecological feature (such as a stream or wetland) rather than requiring an additional report to be prepared for a consent application where there are no ecological features on a site.</p>	<p>Amend EW-S1 (Area) as follows:</p> <p>EW-S1</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>...</p> <p>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. The extent to which the earthworks are designed and will be managed in accordance with the principles and methods in the GWRC's Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Wellington Region 2021_ and</p> <p>5. For applications involving areas of earthworks exceeding 1000m2 in any 12-month period, the results of an ecological survey conducted by a suitably qualified expert.</p>
Phillippa O'Connor	289.13	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that assessment criteria #5 of EW-S1 should only apply if the site is within a Significant Natural Area (SNA) or if the site has a known ecological feature (such as a stream or wetland) rather than requiring an additional report to be prepared for a consent application where there are no ecological features on a site.</p>	<p>Apply assessment criteria 5 of EW-S1 (5. For applications involving areas of earthworks exceeding 1000m2 in any 12-month period, the results of an ecological survey conducted by a suitably qualified expert) only if the site is within a Significant natural Area of where the site has a known ecological feature.</p>
Woolworths New Zealand	359.33	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes the inclusion of assessment criteria (5) which requires applications involving areas of earthworks exceeding 1000m2 in any 12-month period to provide the results of an ecological survey conducted by a suitably qualified expert. This assessment criteria should only apply if the site is within a Significant Natural Area (SNA) or if the site has a known ecological feature (such as a stream or wetland) rather than requiring an additional report to be prepared for a consent application where there are no ecological features on a site.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Oppose in part EW-S1 (Area) and seeks amendment as follows:</p> <p>Delete assessment criteria point 5 from EW-S1 (Area).</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.34	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Amend	Considers that earthworks area triggers are too low and lack nuance and should be amended. The Auckland Unitary Plan baseline in CMUZ of 500m ² is considered more appropriate noting that an infringement to the 250m ² standard could feasibly occur with any development in CMUZ.	Amend EW-S1 (Area) as follows: All Zones 1. The total area of earthworks must not exceed 250m² <u>500m²</u> per site in any 12-month period. Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Whether the stability of land or buildings or structures in or on the site or adjacent sites is likely to be adversely affected; 2. The extent to which the earthworks will reflect and be sympathetic to the natural qualities of the surrounding landform; 3. The effectiveness of measures to retain dust, silt and sediment on site during the course of earthworks; 4. The extent to which the earthworks are designed and will be managed in accordance the principles and methods in the GWRC's Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Wellington Region 2021; and 5. For applications involving areas of earthworks exceeding 1000m² in any 12 month period, the results of an ecological survey conducted by a suitably qualified expert.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.94	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Support in part	EW-S1 is generally supported for its intent, as it seeks to provide an upper threshold to the permitted contiguous area of earthworks. It is unclear in the s32 analysis why this area (250m ²) has been prescribed apart from being identified as 'Low-risk earthworks' ⁵ . As it stands, any development or redevelopment of most sites in the district will infringe this standard as most sites exceed 250m ² in area and most developments typically require earthworks across the majority of the site.	Retain EW-S1 (Area) with amendment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.95	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Amend	Considers that EW-S1 should be amended so that the 250m ² limit is increased to a greater permitted threshold and to better relate to the permitted cut and fill volumes in Standard EW-S4.	Amend EW-S1 (Area) to increase the limit of the total area of earthworks to better relate to the permitted cut and fill volumes in EW-S4 (Transport of cut or fill material).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.280	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Support in part	EW-S1 is partially supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain EW-S1 (Area) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.281	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Amend	Considers that EW-S1 should be amended to ensure the assessment criteria reflect the effects sought to be managed, and to align with the objectives and policies of the chapter. It is considered the current wording of the assessment criteria is not supported by the overarching objectives and policies. It is queried and requested that amendments are made to the thresholds for permitted activity earthworks across the different zone to recognise that different thresholds are appropriate across different zones.	Amend EW-S1 (Area) as follows: <u>Medium Density Residential Zone, High Density Residential Zone, and Neighbourhood Centre Zone</u> 1. The total area of earthworks must not exceed 250m ² per site in any 12 month period. <u>Local Centre Zone, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Zone, City Centre Zone, General Industrial Zone, Open Space Zone, Natural Open Space Zone, and Sport and Recreation Zone, All Special Purpose Zones</u> 2. The total area of earthworks must not exceed 500m ² per site in any 12 month period. <u>General Rural Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, All Development Areas</u> 3. The total area of earthworks must not exceed 1000m ² per site in any 12 month period. Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: ... 5. For applications involving areas of earthworks exceeding 1000m² in any 12 month period, the results of an ecological survey conducted by a suitably qualified expert.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.132	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S1	Amend	Considers that for a very large landholding with large sites such as at CentrePort 250m2 is inadequate to be able to deal with the area of earthworks that are required from time to time. Standard S1 applies as a permitted activity condition under Rules EW-R6 (General Earthworks and R19 (relating to earthworks in the Coastal Environment) stating that the total area of earthworks must not exceed 250m2 per site in any 12-month period.	Seeks that the Special Purpose Port Zone is excluded from EW-S1 (Area).
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.96	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S2	Support	Supports as the standard prescribes a maximum permitted cut height and fill depth which, as per the proposed definitions, is measured upon the completion of earthworks. [See original submission for further details]	Retain EW-S2 (Cut height and fill depth) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.282	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S2	Support in part	EW-S2 is partially supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain EW-S2 (Cut height and fill depth) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.283	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S2	Amend	Considers that EW-S2 should be amended to align the matters of discretion more appropriately with the issue being managed by this standard, in this case stability and visual effects resulting from cut faces/retaining structures. With respect to the management of visual effects, it is considered that reference to examples can be removed to simplify this policy.	Amend EW-S2 (Cut height and fill depth) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: ... 7. The effectiveness of measures to retain dust, silt and sediment on site during the course of earthworks; 8. The extent to which the earthworks are designed and will be managed in accordance the principles and methods in the GWRC's Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Wellington Region 2021; 9. The need for, and effectiveness of, measures to reduce the visual prominence and particularly visual intrusiveness of the earthworks, and any buildings and other structures associated with or subsequently located on them, including: a. Designing and engineering to reflect natural landforms and natural features such as cliffs, escarpments, streams and wetlands; b. Avoiding unnatural scar faces; c. Favouring untreated cut faces over artificial finishes in areas where bare rock is common; d. Favouring alternatives to the use of sprayed concrete on cut faces, such as anchored netting; e. Designing and finishing retaining walls or stabilising structures to reflect existing buildings and structures, in urban settings; f. Designing and finishing retaining walls or stabilising structures to reduce their apparent size by, for example, employing features that break up the surface area and create patterns of light and shadow; g. Retaining existing vegetation above, below and at the sides of earthworks and associated structures; h. Integrating new landscaping and associated planting to conceal or soften the appearance of earthworks and associated structures; i. Concealing views of earthworks and associated structures from streets, other public places and other properties through the positioning of proposed or future buildings; and j. Placing pipes below ground or integrating them into earthworks and associated structures.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.87	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S2	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the deletion of the assessment criteria as all criteria listed are related to the standard. Deleting these criteria would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 or give effect to the operative RPS	Disallow / Seeks that EW-S2 is retained as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.244	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S3	Support	Considers that minimising the risks associated with slope instability is consistent with hazard provisions in the RPS. Supports slope failure being incorporated into the earthworks chapter to manage impacts on slope stability	Retain EW-S3 (Existing slope angle) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.245	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S3	Amend	Considers the Natural Resources Plan defines erosion prone land as greater than 20 degrees. A slope of 34 degrees or higher, as drafted, is very steep. Using this slope has the potential to create more effects on the environment than the standard would anticipate. Greater Wellington also notes that 34 degrees is difficult to calculate on the ground.	Seeks for WCC to consider reducing the existing slope angle to 20 degrees for consistency with the Natural Resources Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Halliday	25.28	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S4	Amend	<p>The volume of material permitted to be transported off site is too low and needs to be increased to facilitate increased volumes of material being transported as a permitted activity. 200m3 equates to around 27 movements utilising a 7.5m3 truck which is too low now for most Wellington Sites.</p> <p>Most development is occurring in the outer suburbs where new roads are wide, traffic volumes are low and there is a short term expectation of truck movements associated with development. The current 200m3 appears to be arbitrary and not supported by evidence.</p>	<p>Amend EW-S4 (Transport of cut or fill material) as follows:</p> <p>1. The combined volume of cut material resulting from earthworks transported off the site and clean fill material required for earthworks transported onto the site must not exceed:</p> <p>a. 2,000m3 in the City Centre, Centres, Mixed use and General industrial zones; or b. 200m3 in all other Zones. <u>400m3 in all other Zones.</u></p>
Rod Halliday	25.29	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S4	Amend	A higher level of movement should also be allowed in the Development Areas where there is expected to be development activity.	<p>Amend EW-S4 (Transport of cut or fill material) as follows:</p> <p>1. The combined volume of cut material resulting from earthworks transported off the site and clean fill material required for earthworks transported onto the site must not exceed:</p> <p>a. 2,000m3 in the City Centre, Centres, Mixed use and General industrial zones, <u>and Future Urban Zone/Development Areas;</u> or b. 200m3 in all other Zones.</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.246	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S4	Amend	Considers that for consistency with the Natural Resources Plan, it is worth noting similar rules in the regional plan which occur for different purposes for the same activity. For example, Rule R70 of the Natural Resources Plan controls clean fills and Rule R99 controls earthworks. Note also that the limits can be different between plans and rules, so all relevant provisions should be considered.	Seeks for WCC to consider including advice note referring to similar rules in the Natural Resources Plan which may be relevant.
Waka Kotahi	370.209	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S4	Support in part	Support EW-S4 but seeks amendment.	Retain EW-S4 (Transport of cut or fill material), subject to amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.210	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S4	Amend	Consider EW-S4 should include stabilising the material in the truck bed to prevent clean fill material from falling onto the road and should also provide direction to ensure that truck wheels do not truck mud and/or debris into the road reserve. This inclusion would be consistent with EW-P6.	<p>Amend EW-S4 (Transport of cut or fill material) as follows:</p> <p>1. The combined volume of cut material resulting from earthworks transport ted off the site and clean fill material required for earthworks transported onto the site must not exceed:</p> <p>a. 2,000m3 in the City Centre, Centres, Mixed use and General industrial zones; or b. 200m3 in all other Zones.</p> <p><u>2. Transported material must be stabilised, and the truck wheels must be kept clean, to prevent the falling or trucking of material into the road reserve.</u></p>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.97	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S4	Support in part	EW-S4 is generally supported as it prescribes a combined maximum volume of cut material transported off the site and clean fill material transported onto the sites. However, the s32 analysis indicates (but does not explicitly state) that this standard only seeks to restrict the total material transported to and from the site with no restriction on the volume of material within the site. This approach is supported in principle but better clarity on this interpretation is sought.	Retain EW-S4 (Transport of cut or fill material) with amendment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.98	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S4	Amend	Considers that EW-S4 should be clarified. The s32 analysis indicates (but does not explicitly state) that this standard only seeks to restrict the total material transported to and from the site with no restriction on the volume of material within the site. This approach is supported in principle but better clarity on this interpretation is sought.	Amend EW-S4 (Transport of cut or fill material) to clarify the interpretation of restrictions on the volume of material within the site.
Ministry of Education	400.75	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S4	Support	Supports CE-S4. The submitter particularly supports assessment criteria 1(e) which considers the presence of sensitive land uses including schools along the proposed route as it manages effects associated with the transport of materials from sites.	Retain EW-S4 (Transport of cut or fill material) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.28	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S10	Support in part	Considers that for improved consistency, EW-S10 should be broadened to include scheduled archaeological sites.	Retain EW-S10 (Earthworks on the site of scheduled heritage buildings and structures, and within heritage areas) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.18	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S10	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.17	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S10	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.29	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S10	Amend	Considers that for improved consistency, EW-S10 should be broadened to include scheduled archaeological sites.	Amend EW-S10 (Earthworks on the site of heritage building, heritage structures or on a site within a heritage area) as follows: EW-S10: Earthworks on the site of heritage building, heritage structures or on a site within a heritage area, or within a scheduled archaeological site.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.19	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S10	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.18	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S10	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Donna Sherlock	384.1	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S10	Oppose	Submitter considers that this rule of only 10m2 per annum should not have blanket application on rural heritage areas such as the submitter's land. It is 9.1ha, but the heritage area footprint is <100m2.	Opposes SW-S10 (Earthworks on the site of heritage building, heritage structures or on a site within a heritage area) in its current form and seeks amendment.
Donna Sherlock	384.2	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S10	Amend	Submitter considers that this rule of only 10m2 per annum should not have blanket application on rural heritage areas such as the submitter's land. It is 9.1ha, but the heritage area footprint is <100m2.	Seeks that SW-S10 (Earthworks on the site of heritage building, heritage structures or on a site within a heritage area) should not be a blanket provision and that rural land should be treated differently [Inferred decision requested].
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.65	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S10	Support	Supports the exclusion of scheduled archaeological sites from this standard, and considers that the policies, rules and standards for earthworks within scheduled archaeological sites in the Historic heritage chapters are more appropriate to manage these	Retain EW-S10 (Earthworks on the site of heritage building, heritage structures or on a site within a heritage area) as notified.
John Tiley	142.20	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S13	Amend	Considers that the EW-S13 assessment criteria for assessing applications made under EW-R15 are entirely subjective and offer no protection for ridgelines.	Seeks that EW-S13 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes, within special amenity landscapes and within the ridgelines and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) is rewritten to offer greater control over earthworks in this area.
Churton Park Community Association	189.20	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S13	Amend	Considers that the EW-S13 assessment criteria for assessing applications made under EW-R15 are entirely subjective and offer no protection for ridgelines.	Seeks that EW-S13 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes, within special amenity landscapes and within the ridgelines and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) is rewritten to offer greater control over earthworks in this area.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.123	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S13	Amend	Considers amendment necessary for consistency with other amendments in relation to the ridgetop area of the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area.	<p>Amend EW-S13 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes, within special amenity landscapes and within the ridgelines and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Areas) as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes, within special amenity landscapes and within the ridgelines and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area <u>Earthworks within: outstanding natural features and landscapes; special amenity landscapes; ridgelines and hilltops overlay; or the ridgetop area of the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area</u></p> <p>1. Earthworks must not exceed:</p> <p>a. A maximum cut height or fill depth greater than 1.5m above ground level measured vertically; and b. the following within any 5-year period: i. 100m² in total area per site within an identified outstanding natural feature and landscape; or ii. 200m² in total area per site within identified special amenity landscapes; or iii. 200m² in total area per site within <u>the ridgelines and hilltops overlay or the ridgetop area</u> in the Upper Stebbings <u>and</u> Glenside West Development Area.</p> <p>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance on identified values and characteristics of outstanding natural features and landscapes, special amenity landscapes, and the ridgelines and hilltops, and the ridgetop area in the Upper Stebbings <u>and</u> Glenside West Development Area and the ability to integrate and be sympathetic with the surrounding landform; and 2. The degree to which the effect of the earthworks can be remedied or mitigated.</p>
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.32	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S13	Amend	Considers that Marshall's Ridge should be given protection through the strengthening of the standard.	Amend EW-S13 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes, within special amenity landscapes and within the ridgelines and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) to give further protection to Marshall's Ridge and other ridgelines within the area.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.47	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S13	Support in part	Considers that the MRZ area of the Submitters land will be subject to another layer of restrictions for earthworks to facilitate the proposed residential development of the site.	Retain EW-S13 (Earthworks within outstanding natural features and landscapes, within special amenity landscapes and within the ridgelines and hilltops in the Upper Stebbings Glenside West Development Area) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.247	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S14	Amend	Considers the Natural Resources Plan defines erosion prone land as greater than 20 degrees. A slope of 34 degrees or higher, as drafted, is very steep. Using this slope has the potential to create more effects on the environment than the standard would anticipate. Greater Wellington also notes that 34 degrees is difficult to calculate on the ground.	Seeks for WCC to consider reducing the existing slope angle to 20 degrees for consistency with the Natural Resources Plan.
Z Energy Limited	361.14	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S14	Support in part	EW-S14 is supported as it includes a 'catch all' standard (EW-S14(3)) for earthworks in 'all areas' which is assumed to include the Broadway Precinct where a Z Energy service station is located.	Retain EW-S14 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.15	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S14	Amend	EW-S14 should be clarified on whether it relates to permanent structures and aboveground structures and therefore does not relate to temporary and/or aboveground ground structures.	Amend EW-S14 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) to clarify that it does not relate to temporary and/or aboveground ground structures.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.381	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S14	Oppose	Opposes EW-S14. [See paragraphs 4.93 to 4.96 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes EW-S14 (Earthworks in the Airport Zone) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.382	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S14	Amend	<p>Opposes EW-S14.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.93 to 4.96 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend EW-S14 (Earthworks in the airport zone) as follows:</p> <p>1. In the Rongotai Ridge Precinct, or in relation to the Hillock at the south end of the Terminal precinct earthworks shall not:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Alter the existing ground level by more than 2.5 metres measured vertically. Disturb more than 250m² of ground surface. Be undertaken on slopes of more than 34° <u>in relation to the Hillock and 45° in relation to the Rongotai Ridge Precinct.</u> <p>2. In the Miramar South Precinct, earthworks must be undertaken in accordance with an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan prepared in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for the Wellington Region (or equivalent).</p> <p>2.3. In all areas, a structure used to retain or stabilize a slope must be no higher than 2.5m measured vertically.</p> <p>Except:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The construction, upgrade or maintenance of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Apron and taxiway surfaces. Road and accessway surfaces. <p>3. No earthwork shall create a dust nuisance.</p> <p>4. As soon practicable, but not later than three months after the completion of earthworks or stages earthworks, the earthworks area must be stabilised with vegetation or sealed, paved, metalled or built over.</p> <p><u>(Option A).</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.383	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S14	Amend	Opposes EW-S14. [See paragraphs 4.93 to 4.96 of original submission for full reason]	Amend EW-S14 (Earthworks in the airport zone) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is <u>not met infringed</u> : 1. Rongotai Ridge Precinct: a. Extent of cut faces; b. Enhancement of pedestrian and cycle networks; b. Impact on views of, through and within the site; and d. Connections to community and recreation resources. 2. Miramar South Precinct:- a. Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for the Wellington Region (or equivalent). 2.3. In all areas, any relevant aspect of: ... 3. <u>With respect to EW-S14(4):</u> <u>a. The effectiveness of temporary measures to avoid the creation of dust nuisance.</u> 4. <u>With respect to EW-S14(5):</u> <u>a. The effectiveness of permanent measures to avoid erosion, the creation of dust nuisance, to filter silt and sediment and reduce the volume and speed of runoff from the site.</u> 5.4. In all areas, any relevant aspect of: ... (Option A).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.384	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S14	Oppose	Opposes EW-S14. [See paragraphs 4.93 to 4.96 of original submission for full reason]	Delete EW-S14 (Earthworks in the airport zone) in its entirety. (Option B).
Rod Halliday	25.30	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S15	Not specified	Considers that it is not clear in EW-S15 what is defined as a Gas Transmission Pipeline corridor. It is presumed it is national bulk lines but there is no clear definition. Without one, the standard may capture minor residential supply pipes down to individual stubs to dwellings.	Clarify the definition of 'Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor' in EW-S15 (Earthworks in the national grid yard and gas transmission pipeline corridor).
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S15	Support	Firstgas supports this submission which seeks that the definition of 'Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor' is clarified to align with Firstgas' original submission seeking for the definition of 'Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor' to be added. The inclusion of this definition is required to help implement rules sought in the Plan which relate to the gas transmission pipeline corridor. The definition would allow buffer/setback areas to be determined and therefore appropriately managing potential reverse sensitivity effects. This definition would provide clarity to the plan user of the extent of the pipeline corridor.	Allow
Firstgas Limited	304.42	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S15	Support	EW-S15 is supported as it relates to the gas transmission pipeline corridor. The standards recognise the importance of the integrity and stability of the regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain EW-S15 (Earthworks in the national grid yard and gas transmission pipeline corridor) as notified.

General District-wide Matters - Light

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.177	General District wide Matters / Earthworks / EW-S15	Amend	<p>Related to EW-R22, seeks amendment to the standard EW-S15 for those provisions specific to the National Grid.</p> <p>Seeks an amendment to the depth standard to move the standard to the rule. Considers the depths should be amended to better reflect NZECP34 but with all support structures treated the same in respect of setbacks (thereby recognising the risks to the National Grid extend beyond those addressed by NZECP34). An additional clause is sought to ensure ongoing access is maintained to support structures. Seeks minor grammatical and wording refinements. Seeks the separating of the National Grid from the Gas Transmission pipeline to avoid confusion to plan users</p>	<p>Amend EW-S15 (Earthworks in the national grid yard and gas transmission pipeline corridor) as follows:</p> <p>EW-S15 Earthworks in the National Grid Yard and gas transmission pipeline corridor All Zones</p> <p>1. Earthworks or vertical holes in the National Grid Yard must comply with the following:</p> <p>a. Earthworks or vertical hole/s depth must be no greater than-</p> <p>i. 300 millimetres within 2.2 metres of any National Grid support poles or stay wires; or</p> <p>ii. 750 millimetres between 2.2 metres and 5 metres of the pole or stay wire.</p> <p>b. Earthworks or vertical hole depth must be no greater than-</p> <p>i. 300 millimetres within 6 metres of the outer visible edge of a foundation of any National Grid support tower (including any tubular steel tower that replaces a steel lattice tower); or</p> <p>ii. Between 6 metres and 12 metres from the outer visible edge of a foundation of any National Grid support tower (including any tubular steel tower that replaces a steel lattice tower).</p> <p>a. e. The earthworks must not result in a reduction in the ground to conductor clearance distances as required in Table 4 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Electrical Distances (NZECP 34:2001) ISSN 01140663.</p> <p>b. d. The earthworks must not result in vehicular access to a National Grid support structure being permanently obstructed.</p> <p><u>c. Not compromise the stability of a National Grid support structure.</u></p> <p>...</p>
Bruce Crothers	319.14	General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Not specified	<p>Supports standards on light pollution in Rural Areas.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Retain LIGHT standards and rules on light pollution in rural areas as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.33	General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Support	Retain LIGHT – Te Aho – Light as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.385	General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Considers that it is appropriate for aviation related lighting to be exempt from the rules and standards of the lighting chapter. Such matters are governed by Civil Aviation Regulations.	Retain Light chapter introduction as notified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.35	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.76	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.386	General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Supports the exemption of Aviation Lighting from the Lighting chapter.	Retain Lighting Chapter introduction as notified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.36	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.77	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.387	General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the LIGHT chapter is amended to add protection for aircraft from poorly managed lighting.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.37	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.78	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.388	General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Not specified	As currently drafted, if an applicant requires resource consent for lighting reasons, a restricted discretionary resource consent application is required. The objectives and policies within this chapter primarily relate to the management of amenity effects or lighting for the safety of people on the ground. Without any policy dissuasion for activities that could have an adverse effect on aircraft safety, it would be difficult for a resource consent to be declined even if the activity could have adverse safety effects on aircraft.	Not specified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.38	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.79	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Catharine Underwood	481.19	General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Amend	Considers that specific rules around lighting are missing from the plan. It is noted that only mentions of not having dark to light contrast and dangerous dark places have been found.	Seeks that more specific rules around lighting be present in the plan.
Catharine Underwood	481.20	General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Amend	Considers that Lighting plans should adhere to the International Dark Sky lighting rules before it is too late. It is noted these rules do not mean there is not light, but rather that there is appropriate light where needed. The added benefit is that it is good for the environment with the protection of biodiversity. It would also benefit Wellingtonians to potentially reside in the 'Second Dark Sky Capital in the world'	Seeks that the Light chapter provisions adhere to the lighting recommendations from the International Dark Sky Association.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.45	General District wide Matters / Light / General LIGHT	Support	Supports the intent of the LIGHT chapter with regard to providing good public lighting without causing dark sky issues and negatively affecting wildlife (including insects).	Retain LIGHT chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
Director-General of Conservation	385.76	General District wide Matters / Light / New LIGHT	Amend	Considers appropriate that an addition of a new rule similar to LIGHT-R2 that seeks to protect indigenous fauna residing within SNAs from adverse lighting effects.	Add an additional rule similar to LIGHT-R2 as a Restricted Discretionary activity for outdoor artificial lighting adjacent to or within a SNA.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.143	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / New LIGHT	Oppose	WIAL remains neutral with respect to this proposed new rule, however notes that the amendments it seeks to this rule (refer to WIAL's primary submission) would need to be carried through to any new provisions relating to SNA's, given the proximity of two nearby SNAs to Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
Director-General of Conservation	385.77	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-O2	Support in part	Supports proposed Objective LIGHT-O2, however would request a change to the wording to acknowledge the potential adverse effects that bright lights can have on indigenous fauna. For example, indigenous fauna within a SNA that is outside of the coastal environment.	Support in part objective LIGHT-O2 (Adverse effects of outdoor artificial lighting), but seeks amendments.
Director-General of Conservation	385.78	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-O2	Amend	Considers appropriate to request a change to the wording to acknowledge the potential adverse effects that bright lights can have on indigenous fauna. For example, indigenous fauna within a SNA that is outside of the coastal environment.	Amend LIGHT-O2 (Adverse effects of outdoor artificial lighting) as follows: The adverse effects of outdoor artificial lighting on sensitive activities, traffic safety, aviation safety, coastal wildlife, indigenous fauna, and the night sky are limited.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.76	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-O2	Support	Supports LIGHT-O2 as it limit the adverse effects of artificial lighting on educational facilities.	Retain LIGHT-O2 (Adverse effects of outdoor artificial lighting) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.79	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Support in part	Supports proposed policy LIGHT-P2, however would request a change to the wording to minimise the potential adverse effects from bright lights on indigenous fauna in any other location.	Supports in part policy LIGHT-P2 (Design and location of outdoor artificial lighting), but seeks amendments.
Director-General of Conservation	385.80	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Amend	Considers appropriate that a change to the wording to minimise the potential adverse effects from bright lights on indigenous fauna in any other location.	Amend LIGHT-P2 (Design and location of outdoor artificial lighting) as follows: Require outdoor artificial lighting to be designed, located and oriented to maintain amenity values, traffic safety, aviation safety and to minimise effects on wildlife in coastal margins <u>and indigenous fauna in any other location.</u>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.389	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Oppose	Opposes LIGHT-P2. Considers that the current provisions do not provide sufficient dissuasion of lighting activities that could give rise to potentially adverse effects of aviation safety. [See paragraphs 4.97 to 4.100 of original submission for further detail.]	Opposes LIGHT-P2 (Design and location of outdoor artificial lighting) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.39	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.80	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.390	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Amend	Opposes LIGHT-P2. Considers that the current provisions do not provide sufficient dissuasion of lighting activities that could give rise to potentially adverse effects of aviation safety. [See paragraphs 4.97 to 4.100 of original submission for further detail.]	Amend LIGHT-P2 (Design and location of outdoor artificial lighting) as follows: Require outdoor artificial lighting to be designed, located and oriented to maintain amenity values, traffic safety, aviation safety and to minimise effects on wildlife in coastal margins. <u>a. maintain amenity values;</u> <u>b. maintain traffic safety;</u> <u>c. avoid adverse effects on aviation safety; and</u> <u>d. to minimise effects on wildlife in coastal margins.</u> (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.40	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.81	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.391	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Oppose	Opposes LIGHT-P2. Considers that the current provisions do not provide sufficient dissuasion of lighting activities that could give rise to potentially adverse effects of aviation safety. [See paragraphs 4.97 to 4.100 of original submission for further detail.]	Delete LIGHT-P2 (Design and location of outdoor artificial lighting) in its entirety. (Option B).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.41	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.82	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-P2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.69	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R1	Oppose in part	Supports permitted activity status for outdoor lighting, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, the vertical illuminance levels in LIGHT-S2 may be difficult to comply with. In addition, considers that the standards are complex and likely to require extensive technical input.	Opposes LIGHT-R1 (Construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.70	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R1	Amend	Supports permitted activity status for outdoor lighting, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, the vertical illuminance levels in LIGHT-S2 may be difficult to comply with. In addition, considers that the standards are complex and likely to require extensive technical input.	Amend LIGHT-R1 (Construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures) to amended standards that provide for reasonable outdoor lighting as a permitted activity without overly onerous compliance requirements.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.392	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R1	Oppose in part	Opposes LIGHT-R1. [See paragraph 4.97 to 4.102 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes LIGHT-R1 (Outdoor artificial lighting) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.42	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R1	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.83	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R1	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.393	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R1	Amend	Opposes LIGHT-R1. [See paragraph 4.97 to 4.102 in original submission for full reason]	Amend LIGHT-R1 (Outdoor artificial lighting) as follows: ... <u>Notification status: For a resource consent application made in respect of Rule LIGHT R2 2 where there is a risk to aviation safety, WIAL must be considered to be an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.43	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R1	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.19	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R1	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.84	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R1	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.394	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Oppose in part	Opposes LIGHT-R2. [See paragraph 4.97 to 4.102 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes LIGHT-R2 (Outdoor artificial lighting in a coastal margin) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.44	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.85	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.395	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Amend	Opposes LIGHT-R2. [See paragraph 4.97 to 4.102 in original submission for full reason]	Amend LIGHT-R2 (Outdoor artificial lighting in a coastal margin) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... <u>7. The matters in LIGHT-P2</u> <u>8. Whether there is a risk to aviation safety.</u> Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LIGHT R2.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. For a resource consent application made in respect of Rule LIGHT R2.1 where there is a risk to aviation safety, WIAL must be considered to be an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.45	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.20	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.86	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.396	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Amend	Opposes LIGHT-R2. [See paragraph 4.97 to 4.102 in original submission for full reason]	Amend LIGHT-R2 (Outdoor artificial lighting in a coastal margin) as follows: All Zones 2. Matters of discretion are: ... Notification status: For a resource consent application made in respect of Rule LIGHT R2.2 where there is a risk to aviation safety, WIAL must be considered to be an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.46	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.87	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-R2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.71	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S2	Oppose in part	Supports permitted activity status for outdoor lighting, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, the vertical illuminance levels in LIGHT-S2 may be difficult to comply with. In addition, considers that the standards are complex and likely to require extensive technical input.	Opposes LIGHT-S2 (Light spill) and seeks amendment .
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.72	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S2	Amend	Supports permitted activity status for outdoor lighting, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, the vertical illuminance levels in LIGHT-S2 may be difficult to comply with. In addition, considers that the standards are complex and likely to require extensive technical input.	Amend LIGHT-S2 (Light spill) to provide for reasonable outdoor lighting as a permitted activity without overly onerous compliance requirements.
Ministry of Education	400.77	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S2	Support	Supports LIGHT-S2 as the submitter supports the management of light spill on sensitive activities (that include educational facilities) in these zones.	Retain LIGHT-S2 (Light spill) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.397	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S2	Support in part	Generally supports the lighting standards. Considers that the relevant assessment criteria with respect to aircraft safety should refer to “the effect” on aircraft rather than the “impact” as the former is more readily understood and applied in a RMA context. [See paragraphs 4.97 to 4.102 of original submission for full reason]	Retain LIGHT-S2 (Light spill) as notified with amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.47	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S2	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.88	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.398	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S2	Amend	Generally supports the lighting standards. Considers that the relevant assessment criteria with respect to aircraft safety should refer to “the effect” on aircraft rather than the “impact” as the former is more readily understood and applied in a RMA context. [See paragraphs 4.97 to 4.102 of original submission for full reason]	Amend LIGHT-S2 (Light spill) as follows: 1. ... <u>2. All exterior lighting shall be directed downward.</u> 1. ... <u>2. All exterior lighting shall be directed downward.</u> 1. ... <u>2. All exterior lighting shall be directed downward.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.48	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S2	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.89	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.73	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S3	Oppose in part	Supports permitted activity status for outdoor lighting, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, the vertical illuminance levels in LIGHT-S2 may be difficult to comply with. In addition, considers that the standards are complex and likely to require extensive technical input.	Opposes LIGHT-S3 (Glare) and seeks amendment .
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.74	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S3	Amend	Supports permitted activity status for outdoor lighting, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, the vertical illuminance levels in LIGHT-S2 may be difficult to comply with. In addition, considers that the standards are complex and likely to require extensive technical input.	Amend LIGHT-S3 (Glare) to provide for reasonable outdoor lighting as a permitted activity without overly onerous compliance requirements.
Ministry of Education	400.78	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S3	Support	Supports LIGHT-S3 as the submitter supports the management of glare effects on sensitive activities (including educational facilities) to reduce glare and maintain non-disruptive classroom environments.	Retain LIGHT-S3 (Glare) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.399	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S3	Not specified	Generally supports the lighting standards. Considers that the relevant assessment criteria with respect to aircraft safety should refer to “the effect” on aircraft rather than the “impact” as the former is more readily understood and applied in a RMA context. [See paragraphs 4.97 to 4.102 of original submission for full reason]	Retain LIGHT-S3 (Glare) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.49	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S3	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.90	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.400	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S3	Amend	Generally supports the lighting standards. Considers that the relevant assessment criteria with respect to aircraft safety should refer to “the effect” on aircraft rather than the “impact” as the former is more readily understood and applied in a RMA context. [See paragraphs 4.97 to 4.102 of original submission for full reason]	Amend LIGHT-S3 (Glare) as follows: <u>All exterior lighting shall be directed downward.</u> <u>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</u> 1. Safety of the transport network; 2. Effects on indoor amenity values and sleep quality of any nearby dwellings; 3. The number, placement, design, height, colour, orientation and screening of light fittings and light support structures; 4. Any positive effects generated from the use of artificial lighting; and 5. The impact effect of lighting on aircraft safety or the safe and efficient functioning of the Airport.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.50	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S3	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.21	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S3	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.91	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.401	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S3	Support	Supports assessment criteria within LIGHT-S3 that seek to ensure that when a standard is infringed "The impact of lighting on aircraft safety or the safe and efficient functioning of the Airport" is considered.	Retain assessment criteria within LIGHT-S3 (Glare) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.51	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S3	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.92	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.402	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S4	Support	Supports assessment criteria within LIGHT-S4 that seek to ensure that when a standard is infringed "The impact of lighting on aircraft safety or the safe and efficient functioning of the Airport" is considered.	Amend LIGHT-S4 (Effects on Road users) as follows: ... Assessment criteria: ... 4. The impact of lighting on aircraft safety or the safe and efficient functioning of the Airport. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.52	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S4	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.93	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.75	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S6	Oppose in part	Supports permitted activity status for outdoor lighting, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, the vertical illuminance levels in LIGHT-S2 may be difficult to comply with. In addition, considers that the standards are complex and likely to require extensive technical input.	Opposes LIGHT-S6 (Externally illuminated surfaces) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.76	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S6	Amend	Supports permitted activity status for outdoor lighting, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, the vertical illuminance levels in LIGHT-S2 may be difficult to comply with. In addition, considers that the standards are complex and likely to require extensive technical input.	Amend LIGHT-S6 (Externally illuminated surfaces) to provide for reasonable outdoor lighting as a permitted activity without overly onerous compliance requirements.
Ministry of Education	400.79	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S6	Support in part	Supports LIGHT-S6 in part.	Retain LIGHT-S6 (Externally illuminated surfaces) with amendment.

General District-wide Matters - Noise

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.80	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S6	Amend	Seeks LIGHT-S6 be amended. The submitter does not support the use of the word 'conflict' as it does not provide enough clarity to the decision maker on what effects to consider.	Amend LIGHT-S6 (Externally illuminated surfaces) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standards are infringed: 1. The safety of the transport network; 2. The number, placement, design, height, colour, orientation and screening of light fittings and light support structures; 3. Consider the effects on nearby Conflict with existing sensitive activities; 4. Effects on indoor amenity values and sleep quality of any nearby residential units; 5. Any positive effects generated from the use of artificial lighting; and 6. Effects on established uses and their operation. 7. The impact of lighting on aircraft safety or the safe and efficient functioning of the Airport.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.403	General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT-S6	Support	Supports assessment criteria within LIGHT-S6 that seek to ensure that when a standard is infringed "The impact of lighting on aircraft safety or the safe and efficient functioning of the Airport" is considered.	Retain assessment criteria within LIGHT-S6 (Externally illuminated surfaces) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.53	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S6	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated agrees with the proposed changes of Wellington Airport in relationship to all their submission points in relationship to light. Reducing and directing artificial light down will have positive benefits for the surrounding residential areas.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.94	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Light / LIGHT- S6	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.5	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	The NOISE chapter has no provisions for the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities.	Seeks that the NOISE chapter includes provisions for the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities as permitted activity.
Shailesh Kumar Patel	49.1	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	Considers that current restrictions on subdivision and infill housing in the Air Noise boundary are against the spirit of current government housing solutions and the housing crisis. It disadvantages house owners within the boundary who cannot add value to their property/section.	Seeks that council ease restrictions on subdivision and infill housing in the Air Noise Boundary so that these sites have the development potential available under the MDRS.
Yvonne Weeber	340.74	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the 'Noise' chapter should be amended to provide further information on the airport noise issues within the introduction. A major change is occurring with the development of the Outer Air Noise Overlay and it deserves being recognised in the introduction of this chapter.	Amend the Introduction to the 'Noise' chapter as follows: ... Some activities that generate noise are exempt from the noise rules set out in this chapter. This is because they are not controlled by the RMA, e.g. vehicles being driven on a road, or aircraft above 1,000 feet in flight over built up areas. In addition, the Civil Aviation Act 1990 imposes certain rules requiring noise abatement procedures for aircraft operating in the vicinity of Wellington International Airport. <u>The air noise boundary overlays (inner and outer) place development restrictions on properties affected by Wellington International Airport.</u> ...
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.144	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	WIAL is not opposed to the introduction of this text in principle, however does not support the drafting as set out in this submission.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Yvonne Weeber	340.75	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the 'Noise' chapter should be amended to recognise the 2018 World Health Organisation Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region in the introduction as these guidelines provide up to date research on adverse effects to aircraft noise on people over an extended period. The 2018 WHO Guidelines are a widely accepted contemporary and authoritative reference on the adverse effects of transportation noise on communities.	Amend the Introduction to the 'Noise' chapter to include a reference to the <u>2018 World Health Organisation Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.146	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	WIAL opposes this amendment to extent that it is not clear of the nature or scale of changes proposed to be introduced by the submitters by including this reference with the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.34	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support	Support	Retain NOISE – Te Oro – Noise as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.35	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support	Noise levels and standards are generally supported, especially the restricted discretionary activity status where noise standards cannot be complied with.	Retain the Noise chapter as notified.
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.1	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	Considers that a programme not less than the Quieter Homes requirement be also applied to existing homes which become located within the 60dB Outer Air Noise Overlay, and further that the programme be actioned in a much more timely manner than that to date homes within the ANB. The submitters experience to date with properties inside the ANB is that the "Quieter Homes" insulation and ventilation requirement for the defined existing homes within our Suburb has now been delayed for over 20 years since the recommendation became operative & now for 10 years since the detailed proposals and (the 650) house locations were publicly notified. To date the submitter understands that just over 100 existing houses have been treated & also up to 50 or so have been purchased & demolished. Accordingly the submitter requests that a time limit be imposed to provide Quieter Homes remediation from the time that they are formally identified to be within the 60dB contour.	Seeks the addition of rule(s) to require the Quieter Homes ventilation and/or insulation are for existing homes within the 60dB Outer Air Noise Overlay. And impose a time limit to provide the Quieter Homes package in a more timely manner once they are formally identified to be within the 60dB Outer Noise Overlay.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.148	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	As set out in WIAL's primary submission, it is inappropriate for the Noise chapter to duplicate aircraft noise management and mitigation measures imposed on WIAL through the recently settled Main Site and East Side Area Designations. Furthermore, the Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.160	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the request as this will enhance residential intensification outcomes and a well-functioning urban environment.	Allow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.99	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support	Supports the introduction to the Noise Chapter.	Retain the introduction to the Noise Chapter.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.100	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support	The Noise chapter is generally supported.	Retain the Noise Chapter, with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.284	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose in part	All rules in the Noise chapter are opposed due to the fact that the technical nature of these breaches requires technical and/or engineering assessments, and public participation by way of limited or public notification will unlikely add anything to the consideration of the effects of these breaches. Amendments sought.	Opposes all Rules in the Noise chapter and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.149	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	WIAL opposes the submission to the extent that it would provide for a more flexible land use management framework than WIAL has sought in its primary submission for noise sensitive activities to establish within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary at Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.14	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	Oppose the deletion of all rules in the Noise Chapter.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.114	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.114	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.285	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	Considers that all rules in the Noise chapter should have a notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities. The technical nature of these breaches requires technical and/or engineering assessments, and public participation by way of limited or public notification will unlikely add anything to the consideration of the effects of these breaches. Particularly, the notification statuses for SUB-R1 generally relate to the land use activity and associated standards, and the subdivision itself is not generating additional effects that should trigger notification.	Amend all Rules in the Noise chapter to include a notification preclusion statement for activities under Restricted Discretionary as follows: <u>Notification:</u> <u>Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A or section 95B of the RMA.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.66	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	Considers it necessary to be notified of activities that cannot comply with noise provisions when located near the rail corridor to ensure KiwiRail has the opportunity to be included in the planning assessment process. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.15	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	Oppose proposed amendment to preclude both public and limited notification for activities that would require resource consent as Restricted Discretionary Activity with respect to a rule in the Noise Chapter. Notification decisions should involve consideration of the proposal with respect to the subject site, surrounding environment, proposed effects, along with measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, in order to reach a conclusion on the overall level of effects in terms of Section 95 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.115	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.115	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.404	General District wide Matters / NOISE / General NOISE	Amend	Supports the specific recognition afforded to aircraft activities.	Retain NOISE chapter introduction as notified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.76	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / General NOISE	Support	Seeks recognition of aircraft noise in the General District Wide Matters for Noise. [Inferred reference to submission 406.404]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.95	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / General NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.405	General District wide Matters / NOISE / General NOISE	Amend	Considers that a new suite of policies is required to address the management of noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Add new Policy to NOISE chapter as follows: <u>NOISE-P7 Management of Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise:</u> <u>Within the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary:</u> <u>1. Avoid the establishment of new noise sensitive activities within the Open Space, Natural Open Space and General Industrial Zones;</u> <u>2. Discourage the establishment of new or the intensification of existing noise sensitive activities within all other zones unless the reverse sensitivity effects on Wellington International Airport can be appropriately avoided.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.77	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / General NOISE	Oppose	Seeks recognition that there may need to be more policies within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are concerned however that WIAL additions and amendments go too far in relationship to normal activities that occur within the zones of the Air Noise Boundary overlay. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are also concerned that WIAL proposed changes are based on 'anticipating' (forward forecasting) more noise in the next 30 years within these areas with no actual factual information. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise policies, within the plan but not 'restrict' normal development within these areas. [Inferred reference to submission 406.405]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60db l s.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.125	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the new policy which is a duplication of other policies in the NOISE chapter and specific zone chapters.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.96	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.406	General District wide Matters / NOISE / General NOISE	Amend	Considers that a new suite of policies is required to address the management of noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Add new Policy to NOISE chapter as follows: <u>NOISE-P8: Acoustic treatment of activities sensitive to aircraft noise</u> <u>Require, as necessary, sound insulation and/or mechanical ventilation within any new buildings or any additions or alterations to existing buildings that contain noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn noise contour.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.78	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / General NOISE	Oppose	<p>Seeks recognition that there may need to be more policies within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are concerned however that WIAL additions and amendments go to far in relationship to normal activities that occur within the zones of the Air Noise Boundary overlay. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are also concerned that WIAL proposed changes are based on 'anticipating' (forward forecasting) more noise in the next 30 years within these areas with no actual factual information. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise policies, within the plan but not 'restrict' normal development within these areas.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 406.406]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL s.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.126	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the new policy which is a duplication of other policies.</p> <p>It is noted that WIAL have not sought to add a definition for the 60dB Ldn noise contour although it is assumed this may be the same as the 60dB Ldn noise boundary.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora opposes any consequential amendments sought by WIAL which remove reference to the Inner and Outer Noise Overlays in favour of reference to the Air Noise Boundary which are clearer mechanisms.</p>	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.97	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support	<p>Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.</p>	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.407	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	<p>Submitter expresses concern about the approach to Aircraft noise and land use effects in the NOISE chapter.</p> <p>Considers that the PDP is more permissive than the NZ Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning recommendations, but less permissive than the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>Considers that the decision requested will recognise that aircraft noise is anticipated to increase over time, therefore the noise environment that is experienced now is not the noise environment that will be experienced, 10, 20 or 30 years into the future as aircraft operations increase within the authorised limits of the ANB and 60dB Ldn.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that all new noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn noise boundary should be subject to a resource consent requirement and WIAL being considered an affected party to any application under section 95E of the RMA.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.79	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / General NOISE	Oppose	<p>Seeks recognition that there may need to be more policies within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are concerned however that WIAL additions and amendments go to far in relationship to normal activities that occur within the zones of the Air Noise Boundary overlay. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are also concerned that WIAL proposed changes are based on 'anticipating' (forward forecasting) more noise in the next 30 years within these areas with no actual factual information. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise policies, within the plan but not 'restrict' normal development within these areas.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 406.407]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL s.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.127	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought which would result in a significant constraint to development within zones appropriately zoned for noise sensitive activities and where adverse effects can be adequately managed.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Strathmore Park Residents Association Incorporated	FS122.1	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	Considers WIAL is seeking to enforce Resource Consent rules on property owners for noise sensitive activities that are almost all community related. Also they wish their status to be as interested party. Considers this is giving an elevated status to the polluter.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.98	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.408	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Outer Air Noise Overlay is amended to establish a policy framework where resource consents can be declined within existing residential zones for noise sensitive activities on reverse sensitivity grounds;
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.80	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / General NOISE	Oppose	Seeks recognition that there may need to be more policies within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are concerned however that WIAL additions and amendments go to far in relationship to normal activities that occur within the zones of the Air Noise Boundary overlay. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are also concerned that WIAL proposed changes are based on 'anticipating' (forward forecasting) more noise in the next 30 years within these areas with no actual factual information. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise policies, within the plan but not 'restrict' normal development within these areas. [Inferred reference to submission 406.408]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbl s.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.128	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from noise can be appropriately managed and the concept of reverse sensitivity is not supported.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.99	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.104	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of noise controls, however, has proposed the standard noise control sought by KiwiRail which provides an alternative framework for developers to achieve a compliance pathway, thus providing greater flexibility. KiwiRail is also seeking vibration controls to ensure that vibration effects are appropriately addressed.	Supports the inclusion of noise controls, with amendments.
Save Our Venues	445.5	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Not specified	Considers that live music venues, which are an integral part of the cultural identity of Wellington, are confronted with the possibility of closure where residential urban densification has not coincided with adequate protections within the current WCC District Plan for their intrinsic need to produce sound. Considers that protecting established and new venues in the urban mixed-use areas is crucial and would significantly contribute to a sustainable future for live music in the city. Considers that there is a reality that a new neighbour has the right to complain about the sound output of a music venue and restrict their ability to operate at a reasonable volume is an existential threat to their continued viability.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Save Our Venues	445.6	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	<p>Considers that there are significant issues with current Noise Control enforcement processes.</p> <p>Considers that the current methodology of measuring sound is subjective and places the onus on the complainant.</p> <p>Considers that a model where measuring the sound at the boundary of the property from where the sound is emanating, as well as inside the complainant's property, would enable Council to ensure that both the venue and the residential property are compliant with noise standards and acoustic mitigation standards respectively. This will allow for mediation between both parties and ensure reasonable steps can be taken to mitigate noise before the venue is restricted in its ability to operate at all.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that a standardised objective model for Noise control should be incorporated into the new District Plan.
Guardians of the Bays	452.29	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	Considers amendments are required to the introduction to provide further information on the airport noise issues within the introduction. A major change is occurring with the development of the Outer Air Noise Overlay and it deserves being recognised in the introduction of this chapter.	Amend paragraph two of the introduction as follows: <u>The air noise boundary overlays (inner and outer) place development restrictions on properties affected by Wellington International Airport.</u>
Guardians of the Bays	452.30	General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Amend	Considers amendments are required to introduction to recognise the 2018 World Health Organisation Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region in the introduction as these guidelines provide up to date research on adverse effects to aircraft noise on people over an extended period. The 2018 WHO Guidelines are a widely accepted contemporary and authoritative reference on the adverse effects of transportation noise on communities.	Amend introduction to include the wording as follows: <u>2018 World Health Organisation Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.145	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	WIAL is not opposed to the introduction of this text in principle, however does not support the drafting as set out in this submission.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.147	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	WIAL opposes this amendment to extent that it is not clear of the nature or scale of changes proposed to be introduced by the submitters by including this reference with the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.6	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	Considers that the PDP should provide for the intermittent use of rural airstrips and helicopter landing areas by agricultural aircraft for the purposes of agricultural aviation including primary production and conservation purposes as a permitted activity.	<p>Add a new rule NOISE-R14 (General Rural Zone, Open Space Zone and Natural Open Space Zone) as follows:</p> <p><u>General Rural Zone, Open Space Zone and Natural Open Space Zone</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted:</u></p> <p><u>Agricultural aviation noise for the purposes of agricultural aviation activities for primary production and conservation purposes.</u></p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.157	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	<p>Considers that due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment.</p> <p>Noise will be produced on site by operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens. Training may take place anywhere between 7:00am and 10:00pm. Cleaning and maintenance will generally take place during the day; however, it can take place after a call out which can occur at any time. Generally, FENZ has assessed that a fire station will be capable of meeting the standards set out in NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits), with the exemption of noise created by emergency sirens (discussed later).</p>	<p>Add new NOISE objective:</p> <p><u>NOISE-OX</u> <u>Where the locational, functional or operational needs are such that activities of importance to the community could not otherwise meet noise and vibration standards, enable these activities by allowing a whole or partial exemption, or relaxation, from those noise standards.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
				<p>Some of the noise limits within residential zones in the district plan are more restrictive than those provided for in NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits). In order to ensure that fire stations and associated training activities can take place in residential areas in compliance with the District Plan, it is necessary that a new or amended rule makes an allowance for such essential activities within both urban and rural environments, within reasonable limits. It is considered that the standards within NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3) set reasonable limits for the protection of residential amenity in accordance with NOISEP1.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is not possible for emergency sirens to comply with NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3). Sirens play a crucial role in facilitating a prompt emergency response and can be the most effect means of communication in alerting volunteers who generally live and work in close proximity to fire stations. Sirens also provide assurance to the people who have made the call and the general public that help is on its way.</p> <p>Allowing noise associated with the operation of emergency services provides for the operational requirements of FENZ and enables it to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the ongoing health and safety of people and communities.</p> <p>As such, FENZ has a locational, functional, and operational need to be exempt from noise generated by emergency sirens.</p> <p>FENZ therefore also seeks the addition of an exemption for noise activity under new rule NOISE-R16 to ensure that emergency service operations are enabled to meet its obligations in a manner that provides for the ongoing health and safety of people and communities.</p>	
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.158	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	<p>Considers that due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment.</p> <p>Noise will be produced on site by operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens. Training may take place anywhere between 7:00am and 10:00pm. Cleaning and maintenance will generally take place during the day; however, it can take place after a call out which can occur at any time. Generally, FENZ has assessed that a fire station will be capable of meeting the standards set out in NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits), with the exemption of noise created by emergency sirens (discussed later).</p>	<p>Add new NOISE policy:</p> <p><u>NOISE-PX</u> <u>To allow a marginal relaxation of noise standards, but not exceeding National Standards, where the noise generating activity is of importance to the safety of the community, such as the operation of emergency services.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
				<p>Some of the noise limits within residential zones in the district plan are more restrictive than those provided for in NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits). In order to ensure that fire stations and associated training activities can take place in residential areas in compliance with the District Plan, it is necessary that a new or amended rule makes an allowance for such essential activities within both urban and rural environments, within reasonable limits. It is considered that the standards within NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3) set reasonable limits for the protection of residential amenity in accordance with NOISEEPP1.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is not possible for emergency sirens to comply with NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3). Sirens play a crucial role in facilitating a prompt emergency response and can be the most effect means of communication in alerting volunteers who generally live and work in close proximity to fire stations. Sirens also provide assurance to the people who have made the call and the general public that help is on its way. Allowing noise associated with the operation of emergency services provides for the operational requirements of FENZ and enables it to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the ongoing health and safety of people and communities.</p> <p>As such, FENZ has a locational, functional, and operational need to be exempt from noise generated by emergency sirens.</p> <p>FENZ therefore also seeks the addition of an exemption for noise activity under new rule NOISE-R16 to ensure that emergency service operations are enabled to meet its obligations in a manner that provides for the ongoing health and safety of people and communities.</p>	
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.159	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	<p>Considers that due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment.</p> <p>Noise will be produced on site by operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens. Training may take place anywhere between 7:00am and 10:00pm. Cleaning and maintenance will generally take place during the day; however, it can take place after a call out which can occur at any time. Generally, FENZ has assessed that a fire station will be capable of meeting the standards set out in NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits), with the exemption of noise created by emergency sirens (discussed later).</p>	<p>Add new NOISE policy:</p> <p><u>NOISE-PX</u> <u>To allow noisy activities of limited duration and frequency which are of importance to the community, such as noise associated with the operation of emergency services and temporary military training activities, subject to appropriate controls.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
				<p>Some of the noise limits within residential zones in the district plan are more restrictive than those provided for in NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits). In order to ensure that fire stations and associated training activities can take place in residential areas in compliance with the District Plan, it is necessary that a new or amended rule makes an allowance for such essential activities within both urban and rural environments, within reasonable limits. It is considered that the standards within NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3) set reasonable limits for the protection of residential amenity in accordance with NOISEBP1.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is not possible for emergency sirens to comply with NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3). Sirens play a crucial role in facilitating a prompt emergency response and can be the most effect means of communication in alerting volunteers who generally live and work in close proximity to fire stations. Sirens also provide assurance to the people who have made the call and the general public that help is on its way. Allowing noise associated with the operation of emergency services provides for the operational requirements of FENZ and enables it to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the ongoing health and safety of people and communities.</p> <p>As such, FENZ has a locational, functional, and operational need to be exempt from noise generated by emergency sirens.</p> <p>FENZ therefore also seeks the addition of an exemption for noise activity under new rule NOISE-R16 to ensure that emergency service operations are enabled to meet its obligations in a manner that provides for the ongoing health and safety of people and communities.</p>	
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.12	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	<p>Support the intent of including a new Noise Policy on the basis that noise generating activities that are of importance to the community, such as temporary military training activities (TMTA), should be provided for in the Proposed Plan, subject to appropriate controls. However, if the submitters relief is accepted, a new definition of "activities of importance to the community" should be included in Part 1 – Introduction and General Provisions – Definitions, of the Plan. NZDF also seeks to clarify that the majority of TMTA are not typically "noisy activities". Higher noise generating TMTA is limited to noise resulting from discharge of ammunition or explosives, which is subject to specific management through the District Plan. Such activities are much less likely to take place than the essential activities outlined in Section 2 of NZDF's original submission.</p>	<p>Amend / Seeks that the submission be allowed in part to include the proposed new Noise Policy.</p> <p>If the submitter's relief is accepted, then define "Activities of Importance to the Community" in Part 1 of the Proposed Plan.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.160	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	<p>Notes that due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment. Noise will be produced on site by operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens. Training may take place anywhere between 7:00am and 10:00pm. Cleaning and maintenance will generally take place during the day; however, it can take place after a call out which can occur at any time. Generally, FENZ has assessed that a fire station will be capable of meeting the standards set out in NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits), with the exemption of noise created by emergency sirens.</p> <p>Some of the noise limits within residential zones in the district plan are more restrictive than those provided for in NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits). In order to ensure that fire stations and associated training activities can take place in residential areas in compliance with the District Plan, it is necessary that a new or amended rule makes an allowance for such essential activities within both urban and rural environments. For reasons set out above for new objective NOISE -O3 and policy NOISE -P5, FENZ also has a locational, functional, and operational need to be exempt from noise generated by emergency sirens. FENZ therefore also seeks the addition of an exemption for noise activity under new rule NOISE -R16 to ensure that emergency service operations are enabled to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the on-going health and safety of people and communities</p>	<p>Add new NOISE rule:</p> <p><u>NOISE -RX:</u> Noise from Emergency Services Facilities and Temporary Emergency Services Training Activity (All zones) 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with the following standards: i. NOISE -S1 or ii. NOISE -S13. b. The noise source is a warning device or siren (including their routine testing and maintenance), associated with an Emergency Service Activity or Temporary Emergency Services Training Activity when measured within the site boundary of a receiving site, or within the notional boundary of rural dwellings or habitable buildings.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.161	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	As noted in the previous submission point, FENZ proposes a new standard that has a partial relaxation on some of the DP's residential noise standards to allow for the operational needs of fire stations in residential areas.	Add new NOISE standard: <u>NOISE-SX</u> <u>Noise emitted from Emergency Services Facilities and Temporary Emergency Services Training Activity within All Zones as received in other areas (All Zones) must not exceed the guideline residential upper noise limits set out at NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits), as identified below, unless otherwise permitted in accordance with NOISE-S1.</u> <u>Table X – Guideline residential upper noise limits</u> <u>Daytime: 55dB LAeq (15min)</u> <u>Evening: 50dB LAeq (15min)</u> <u>Night-time: 45dB LAeq (15min)</u> <u>Night-time Lmax: 75dB LAFmax</u>
Bruce Crothers	319.15	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	Considers that there should be stronger noise restrictions for aircraft and stricter limits on the number of flights unless they are electrically powered and much quieter.	Seeks stronger noise restrictions for aircrafts, including limits on the number of flights allowed.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.150	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	As set out in WIAL's primary submission, it is inappropriate for the Noise chapter to duplicate aircraft noise management and mitigation measures imposed on WIAL through the recently settled Main Site and East Side Area Designations. Furthermore, the Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.409	General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Amend	[See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Add new Objective to NOISE chapter as follows: <u>NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity effects on Wellington International Airport</u> <u>Wellington International Airport is protected from reverse sensitivity effects.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.81	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Seeks recognition that there may need to be more policies within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are concerned however that WIAL additions and amendments go too far in relationship to normal activities that occur within the zones of the Air Noise Boundary overlay. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are also concerned that WIAL proposed changes are based on 'anticipating' (forward forecasting) more noise in the next 30 years within these areas with no actual factual information. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise policies, within the plan but not 'restrict' normal development within these areas. [Inferred reference to submission 406.409]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL s.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.83	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise reverse sensitivity issues but are concerned the changes are too onerous on residential property owners to 'remedy and mitigate' against all Wellington Airports noise which is 'protected'. [Inferred reference to submission 406.409]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL s.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.85	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more objectives, Standards, within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. However, these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions. [Inferred reference to submission 406.409]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.129	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed objective which has the potential to unnecessarily constrain urban development where adverse effects from existing noise generating activities such as the airport can be appropriately managed.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.100	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.410	General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Amend	[See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Add new Objective to NOISE chapter as follows: <u>NOISE-O4: Noise Management at Wellington International Airport</u> <u>The adverse effects of noise from Wellington International Airport on noise sensitive activities are appropriately remedied or mitigated.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.84	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise reverse sensitivity issues but are concerned the changes are too onerous on residential property owners to 'remedy and mitigate' against all Wellington Airports noise which is 'protected'. [Inferred reference to submission 406.410]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbl s.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.86	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more objectives, Standards, within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. However, these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions. [Inferred reference to submission 406.410]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbl.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.101	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.411	General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Amend	[See paragraphs 4.65 to 4.72 of original submission for full reason] [Submitter is seeking independent expert advice on the specific ventilation requirements. NOISE-S17 is drafted based on the general structure of NOISE-S6, with the starting assumption being that the Council has undertaken technical assessments to confirm the standard is fit for purpose. Accordingly submitter reserves its position on this matter in the context of this submission]	Add new Standard to NOISE chapter as follows: <u>NOISE-S16 Acoustic Treatment – Noise Sensitive Activities within the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary</u> <u>All Zones</u> <u>1. Any new habitable room within the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary must be designed and constructed to achieve an internal level of Ldn 40dB with doors and windows closed.</u> <u>The certification of an approved acoustical engineer will be accepted as evidence that the design meets the insulation standard.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.82	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Seeks recognition that there may need to be more policies within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are concerned however that WIAL additions and amendments go too far in relationship to normal activities that occur within the zones of the Air Noise Boundary overlay. Guardians of the Bays Incorporated are also concerned that WIAL proposed changes are based on 'anticipating' (forward forecasting) more noise in the next 30 years within these areas with no actual factual information. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise policies, within the plan but not 'restrict' normal development within these areas. [Inferred reference to submission 406.411]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL s.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.87	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more objectives, Standards, within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. However, these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions. [Inferred reference to submission 406.411]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.130	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the new standard which is a duplication of standards NOISE-S4 and NOISE-S5.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.102	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.412	General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Amend	[See paragraphs 4.65 to 4.72 of original submission for full reason] [Submitter is seeking independent expert advice on the specific ventilation requirements. NOISE-S17 is drafted based on the general structure of NOISE-S6, with the starting assumption being that the Council has undertaken technical assessments to confirm the standard is fit for purpose. Accordingly submitter reserves its position on this matter in the context of this submission]	Add new Standard to NOISE chapter as follows: <u>NOISE-S17 Acoustic Treatment – Noise Sensitive Activities within the Air Noise Boundary or 60B Ldn Noise Boundary</u> <u>All Zones</u> <u>1. The internal design level in NOISE-S16 must be achieved at the same time as the ventilation requirements of the New Zealand Building Code. An alternative means of ventilation must be provided unless compliance with the above acoustic insulation standards can be met with ventilating windows open.</u> <u>2. Where a habitable room relies on openable windows to meet the ventilation requirements of the New Zealand Building Code, and where these windows must remain closed to achieve compliance with NOISE-S4, a positive supplementary source of fresh air ducted from outside is required at the time of fit-out. For the purposes of this requirement, a bedroom is any room intended to be used for sleeping. The supplementary source of air is to achieve a minimum of 7.5 litres per second per person; and</u> <u>3. Confirmation of compliance with this standard will be required by a qualified professional.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.88	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more objectives, Standards, within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. However, these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions. [Inferred reference to submission 406.412]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.131	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the new standard which is a duplication of standard NOISE-S6.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.103	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.413	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks a requirement that acoustic treatment and/or mechanical ventilation for new, or additions or alterations to existing buildings containing noise sensitive activities.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.89	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more objectives, Standards, within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. However, these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions. [Inferred reference to submission 406.413]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.67	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	Supports provisions requiring noise sensitive activities to have appropriate acoustic treatment and mechanical ventilation. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.132	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the new standard would be duplication of standards NOISE-S4 and NOISE-S5. These standards already apply to alterations and additions to existing buildings.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.104	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.414	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that standalone reverse sensitivity requirements are added for noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Boundary and Outer Air Noise Overlay.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.90	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more objectives, Standards, within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. However, these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions. [Inferred reference to submission 406.414]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.133	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought as it is unclear what the additional requirements would achieve, however, the requirements would unnecessarily constrain urban development where effects can be appropriately mitigated.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.105	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.415	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that military aircraft operations are given their own provisions within the NOISE chapter, where WIAL does not have control over the military aircraft operations.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.91	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / New NOISE	Support	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated support military aircraft being subject to their own rules and standards where WIAL does not have control over military aircraft operations at Wellington International Airport. [Inferred reference to submission 406.415]	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	Amend the Noise Chapter as set out in NZDF's original submission (referenced by Council in the summary of submissions as 'NZDF Submission Point 423.20'). NZDF would be happy to undertake further discussion with WIAL on this matter.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.106	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.105	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	Supports an alternative rule and standard framework. Seeks a new standard NOISE-SX to provide options for developers in achieving an appropriate level of amenity for residents who live within 100m of the rail corridor. KiwiRail seeks that this standard be considered under the Part One Schedule 1 process of the RMA.	<p>Add NOISE-SX as follows: [Refer to original submission for full detail of new NOISE-SX including a table detailing building type, occupancy/activity, and maximum railway noise level LAeq(1h)].</p> <p><u>Within 100m of a Railway Corridor</u></p> <p><u>Indoor railway noise</u></p> <p><u>1. Any new building or alteration to an existing building that contains an activity sensitive to noise where the building or alteration:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Shall be designed, constructed and maintained to achieve indoor design noise levels resulting from the railway not exceeding the maximum values in the following table; or</u></p> <p><u>(b) is at least 50 metres from any railway network, and is designed so that a noise barrier completely blocks line-of-sight from all parts of doors and windows, to all points 3.8 metres above railway tracks</u></p> <p><u>Indoor railway vibration</u></p> <p><u>2. Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to noise, closer than 60 metres from the boundary of a railway network:</u></p> <p><u>(a) is designed, constructed and maintained to achieve rail vibration levels not exceeding 0.3 mm/s_{vw} 95 or</u></p> <p><u>(b) is a single-storey framed residential building with:</u></p> <p><u>i. a constant level floor slab on a full-surface vibration isolation bearing with natural frequency not exceeding 10 Hz, installed in accordance with the supplier's instructions and recommendations; and</u></p> <p><u>ii. vibration isolation separating the sides of the floor slab from the ground; and</u></p> <p><u>iii. no rigid connections between the building and the ground.</u></p> <p><u>3. A report is submitted to the council demonstrating compliance with clauses (1) to (2) above (as relevant) prior to the construction or alteration of any building containing an activity sensitive to noise. In the design:</u></p> <p><u>(a) railway noise is assumed to be 70 LAeq(1h) at a distance of 12 metres from the track, and must be deemed to reduce at a rate of 3 dB per doubling of distance up to 40 metres and 6 dB per doubling of distance beyond 40 metres.</u></p> <p><u>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</u></p> <p><u>1. Whether the activity sensitive to noise could be located further from the railway network.</u></p> <p><u>2. The extent to which the noise and vibration criteria are achieved and the effects of any non-compliance.</u></p> <p><u>3. The character of, and degree of, amenity provided by the existing environment and proposed activity.</u></p> <p><u>4. The reverse sensitivity effects on the rail network, and the extent to which mitigation measures can enable their ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade.</u></p> <p><u>5. Special topographical, building features or ground conditions which will mitigate vibration impacts;</u></p> <p><u>6. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u></p> <p><u>Notification: Application for resource consent under this rule will be decided without public notification. KiwiRail are likely to be the only affected person determined in accordance with section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991.</u></p>
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.44	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	Supports noise and vibration requirements for developments near the railway corridor.	Allow / Seeks to incorporate changes as outlined by the submitter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.31	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / New Noise	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Kāinga Ora considers that effects should only be mitigated by noise sensitive activities in the receiving environment following adopting of the Best Practicable Option (“BPO”) to minimise and mitigate at source and in the vicinity of the corridor the off-site effects as far as possible. Restrictions on neighbouring noise sensitive activities should be no more stringent than necessary. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.21	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	Stride is opposed to the insertion of a new noise standard within 100m of the rail corridor. It is inappropriate to apply these requirements to such a great distance from the railway corridor, especially in the case of Johnsonville where there are no through trains or freight.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.21	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	Investore is opposed to the insertion of a new noise standard within 100m of the rail corridor. It is inappropriate to apply these requirements to such a great distance from the railway corridor, especially in the case of Johnsonville where there are no through trains or freight.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.170	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation for noise and vibration may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.170	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Oppose	Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation for noise and vibration may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.31	General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Amend	Considers an amendment to Rule four as Wellington Airport International Airport Limited Designation for the East Side Area does not allow take off or landing within the designation as per condition 34	Add new category of activity in NOISE-R4 as follows: <u>Activity Status: Prohibited activity</u> <u>Where no activity for the landing and take off of helicopter will be granted within the East Side Area designation.</u>
Wellington Helicopters	FS5.2	Part 2/General District Wide Matters / Noise / New Noise	Oppose	There is already provisions in the airport noise plan to mitigate this.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.151	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / General NOISE	Oppose	As set out in WIAL’s primary submission, it is inappropriate for the Noise chapter to duplicate aircraft noise management and mitigation measures imposed on WIAL through the recently settled Main Site and East Side Area Designations. Furthermore, the Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.92	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / New NOISE	Support	Wellington Airport International Airport Limited Designation for the East Side Area does not allow take off or landing within the designation as per condition 34.	Allow / Seeks that the submission point and addition of wording be allowed to add a new category of activity in NOISE-R4 as follows: <u>Activity Status: Prohibited activity</u> <u>Where no activity for the landing and take off of helicopter will be granted within the East Side Area designation.</u>
Yvonne Weeber	340.76	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Support	NOISE-O1 is supported. The management of noise generating activities such as the airport and consideration of the effects it has on peoples health and wellbeing are supported.	Retain Objective NOISE-O1 (Managing noise generation and effects) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.211	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Support	Supports the inclusion of this objective to protect the health and amenity of occupants from noise. Waka Kotahi promotes the protection of noise sensitive activities from adverse noise and effects in the existing environment	Retain NOISE-O1 (Managing noise generation and effects) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.68	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Support	Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.286	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Support in part	Objective NOISE-O1 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective NOISE-O1 (Managing noise generation and effects) with amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.116	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.116	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.287	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Amend	Considers that Objective NOISE-O1 should be amended to articulate the balance more clearly between providing for noise generating activities, whilst appropriately managing effects on the community. Amendments sought.	Amend Objective NOISE-O1 (Managing noise generation and effects) as follows: Amenity values and peoples' health and well-being are not compromised protected from adverse noise generating activities levels , consistent with the anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.16	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Oppose	The original wording is considered to be better for ensuring a healthy noise environment for residents.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.117	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.117	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.416	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-O1	Oppose	[See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason] Opposes NOISE-O1 (Managing noise generation effects).	Not specified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.107	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-O1	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.32	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O1	Support	Supports the management of noise generating activities such as the airport and consideration of the effects it has on peoples health and wellbeing.	Retain NOISE-O1 (Managing noise generation and effects) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.162	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Support	Supports the objective as it seeks to protect existing and authorised noise generating activities from reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain NOISE-O2 (Reverse sensitivity) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.77	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Not specified	Considers that authorised activities that generate high levels of noise should be constantly reducing their noise levels through different technology and management therefore, reducing the need to be 'protected from reverse sensitivity effects'.	Not specified

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.152	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Oppose	Considers that reverse sensitivity is a significant issue for WIAL. While WIAL continues to explore opportunities to reduce the noise generated from its activities at Wellington International Airport, this is separate management function to that of requiring adjacent land use activities establishing that give rise to reverse sensitivity effects.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.212	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Support	Supports the inclusion of this objective to protect existing and authorised activities that generate high levels of noise. This will enable the continued operation of existing state highway operations.	Retain NOISE-O2 (Reverse sensitivity) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.288	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Oppose	Objective NOISE-O2 is opposed, as noise generating activities should not compromise health and wellbeing. Deletion is sought.	Delete Objective NOISE-O2 (Reverse sensitivity) in its entirety.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.69	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of the objective to protect rail activities from reverse sensitivity effects. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.17	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Oppose	It is appropriate that the plan recognise the listed noise emitters and acknowledge the contribution they make to the 4 well-beings.	Disallow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.11	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Oppose	Oppose the deletion of objective NOISE-O2. It is appropriate for the policy direction of the Proposed Plan to protect existing and authorised activities that generate high levels of noise from reverse sensitivity effects.	Disallow / Reject submitter's relief and retain Objective NOISE-O2 as notified.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.118	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.118	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.417	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-O2	Oppose	[See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]. Opposes NOISE-O2 (Reverse Sensitivity).	Not specified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.108	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-O2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.106	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Support	Supports the recognition of the value and function of existing rail activities, and the aim to protect these activities from reverse sensitivity effects. The Wellington yard, ferry terminal, Johnsonville Line, Wairapara Line and North Island Main Trunk are existing assets which extend through Wellington City.	Retain NOISE-O2 (Reverse sensitivity) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.13	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Support	Considers that protecting existing and authorised activities that generate high levels of noise from reverse sensitivity effects, such as the Point Jerningham Saluting Battery Site and operations at the Rongotai Air Movement Terminal, is important and appropriate.	Retain NOISE-O2 (Reverse sensitivity) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.33	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Not specified	The submitter considers authorised activities that generate high levels of noise should be constantly reducing their noise levels through different technology and management therefore, reducing the need to be 'protected from reverse sensitivity effects'.	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.153	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-O2	Oppose	Considers that reverse sensitivity is a significant issue for WIAL. While WIAL continues to explore opportunities to reduce the noise generated from its activities at Wellington International Airport, this is separate management function to that of requiring adjacent land use activities establishing that give rise to reverse sensitivity effects.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.163	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Support	Supports the policy as it permits noise generation within reasonable limits. For reasons set out above for new objective NOISE-OX and policy NOISE-PX, FENZ has a locational, functional, and operational need to be exempt from noise generated by emergency sirens, whilst also having more flexible noise limits in residential areas to allow for day-to-day operational activities. FENZ therefore seeks the addition of a new rule to allow for more permissible noise activity in association with emergency service operations to ensure that FENZ is able to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the on-going health and safety of people and communities	Retain NOISE-P1 (General management of noise) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.78	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Support	NOISE-P1 is supported. The provision seeks to maintain amenity values of the receiving environment in a way that does not compromise the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities.	Retain NOISE-P1 (General management of noise) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.289	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Support in part	NOISE-P1 is supported as it enables the generation of noise where appropriate, but an amendment is sought.	Retain NOISE-P1 (General management of noise) with amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.119	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.119	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.290	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Amend	Considers that NOISE-P1 should be amended to not require amenity values to be maintained. The District Plan should recognise that amenity values change over time.	Amend NOISE-P1 (General management of noise) as follows: Enable the generation of noise from activities that: 1. Maintain Are compatible with the anticipated amenity values of the receiving environment; and 2. Does not compromise the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.70	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Oppose	Rejects the amendment sought as it fails to protect rail activities from reverse sensitivity effects. It is possible to maintain neighbouring amenity and enable noise generating activities with appropriate controls and KiwiRail considers that the policy, as notified, recognises this. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.18	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Support	Amenity values are anticipated to change over time. As more intensive development occurs in the city, that may include rising levels of background noise (but should remain consistent with accepted levels of indoor noise).	Allow / That the submission in relation to changing over time be allowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.120	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.120	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.418	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P1	Support in part	Supports this policy insofar as it relates to the management of land based noise emanating from the Airport Zone.	Supports NOISE-P1 (General management of noise) and seeks amendment.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.109	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P1	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.419	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P1	Amend	Supports this policy insofar as it relates to the management of land based noise emanating from the Airport Zone.	Amend NOISE-P1 (general management of noise) as follows: NOISE-P1 General Management of noise Enable the generation of <u>land based</u> noise from activities that: ... (Option A).
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.110	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P1	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.420	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P1	Oppose	Supports this policy insofar as it relates to the management of land based noise emanating from the Airport Zone.	Delete NOISE-P1 (General management of noise) in its entirety. (Option B).
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.111	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P1	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	423.14	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Support	Considers that providing for noise generating activities that maintain the amenity values of the receiving environment and do not compromise the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities is appropriate.	Retain NOISE-P1 (General management of noise) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.34	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P1	Support	Supports the general management of noise to maintain amenity values of the receiving environment in a way that does not compromise the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities.	Retain NOISE-P1 (General management of noise) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.79	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P2	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Waka Kotahi	370.213	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P2	Support	Supports the proposed policy which enables construction activity subject to appropriate management of effects. Construction is an essential activity in relation to the state highway network and it is not always practicable to achieve specific noise limits, so the approach should be to focus on managing effects.	Retain NOISE-P2 (Construction noise) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.291	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P2	Support	NOISE-P2 is generally supported.	Retain NOISE-P2 (Construction noise) as notified.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.121	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P2	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.121	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P2	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.421	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P2	Support	Supports NOISE-P2	Retain NOISE-P2 (Construction noise) as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.112	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.35	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P2	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.80	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Waka Kotahi	370.214	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Support	Supports the proposed policy which provides for higher noise levels to be generated within State Highway networks. This protects the continued operation of the existing state highway operations and the associated noise effects	Retain NOISE-P3 (Higher noise areas) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.292	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Oppose in part	NOISE-P3 is partially opposed, despite the support of the provision of a higher noise level to be able to be generated in the identified zones. The policy as notified reads overly ambiguous with no clear direction or outcome.	Opposes NOISE-P3 (Higher noise areas) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.19	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Oppose	The policy in the proposed plan (appropriately) recognises that there are places where there is a need to provide for higher noise levels due to functional or operational needs of activities in those locations.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.122	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.122	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.293	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Amend	Considers that NOISE-P3 should be amended to clarify what direction and outcomes are sought.	Clarify NOISE-P3 (Higher noise areas) to more clearly specify the direction and outcomes sought from allowing higher noise levels in the identified zones.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.123	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.123	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.133	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain NOISE-P3 (Higher noise areas) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.422	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P3	Support	Supports this policy insofar as it relates to the management of land based noise emanating from the Airport Zone.	Retain NOISE-P3 (Higher noise areas) as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.113	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.107	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Support	Supports recognition that railway network activities generate higher noise levels	Retain NOISE-P3 (Higher noise areas) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.15	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Support	Considers that it is important and appropriate to allow for higher level of noises to be generated within the Airport Zone and associated airspace, in order to enable military aircraft operations associated with the operation of NZDF's Rongotai Air Movement Terminal at WIA.	Retain NOISE-P3 (Higher noise areas) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.36	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P3	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.81	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Amend	Considers that NOISE-P4 should be amended to describe the Airport Noise Overlay with both the Inner and Outer Noise Overlay.	Amend NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as follows: Require sound insulation and / or mechanical ventilation for new noise sensitive activities within: ... 6. The Air Noise Overlay (<u>Inner Air Noise Overlay and Outer Air Noise Overlay</u>); and 7. Identified corridors adjacent to the State Highways and railway networks. ...
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.154	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support	WIAL supports this submission in principle, however notes that WIAL is proposing to replace the reference to overlays with the commonly used and understood terms "Air Noise Boundary" and "60dB Ldn Noise Boundary".	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.
Waka Kotahi	370.215	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support	Support this policy with the inclusion of the identified state highway corridor mapped.	Retain NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as notified.
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.2	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Amend	Considers that the policy is not clear whether the Air Noise Boundary refers to both the Inner Air Noise Overlay and the Outer Air Noise Overlay.	Amend NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as follows: Require sound insulation and / or mechanical ventilation for new noise sensitive activities within: 1. The City Centre Zone; 2. The Waterfront Zone; 3. The Centres Zones; 4. The Mixed Use Zones; 5. Outer Port Noise Overlay; 6. The Air Noise Overlay (<u>Inner & Outer</u>); and 7. Identified corridors adjacent to the State Highways and railway networks. Two standards of acoustic insulation are prescribed to achieve acceptable indoor acoustic amenity in habitable rooms.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.155	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support	WIAL supports this submission in principle, however notes that WIAL is proposing to replace the reference to overlays with the commonly used and understood terms "Air Noise Boundary" and "60dB Ldn Noise Boundary".	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.101	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support in part	NOISE-P4 is supported as it encourages acoustic treatment for new Noise Sensitive Activities within specific zones and overlays. However, it is considered that this policy should also extend to new noise sensitive activities that share a common boundary with the specified zones and overlays to ensure adequate acoustic treatment is encouraged to minimise reverse sensitive effects from existing lawfully established activities.	Retain NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) with amendment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.102	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Amend	Considers that this policy should also extend to new noise sensitive activities that share a common boundary with the specified zones and overlays to ensure adequate acoustic treatment is encouraged to minimise reverse sensitive effects from existing lawfully established activities. This could be achieved by the following amendment to NOISE-P4 which would be consistent with the intent of APP4- Permitted Noise Standards which contains separate noise limits for different receiving environments.	Amend NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as follows: Require sound insulation and / or mechanical ventilation for new noise sensitive activities <u>within_or on a site which shares a common boundary with:</u> 1. The City Centre Zone; 2. The Waterfront Zone; 3. The Centres Zones; 4. The Mixed Use Zones; 5. Outer Port Noise Overlay; 6. The Air Noise Overlay; and 7. Identified corridors adjacent to the State Highways and railway networks. Two standards of acoustic insulation are prescribed to achieve acceptable indoor acoustic amenity in habitable rooms.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.71	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support	Supports the amendment to ensure noise sensitive activities adjacent to the specified zones, overlays and corridors require sound insulation and/or mechanical ventilation. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.294	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose in part	NOISE-P4 is partially opposed and an amendment is sought.	Opposes NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.124	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.124	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.295	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Amend	Considers that NOISE-4 should be amended.	Amend NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as follows: Require <u>Encourage and promote</u> sound insulation and / or mechanical ventilation for new noise sensitive activities within: 1. The City Centre Zone; 2. The Waterfront Zone; 3. The Centres Zones; 4. The Mixed Use Zones; 5. Outer Port Noise Overlay; 6. The Air Noise Overlay; and 7. Identified corridors adjacent to the State Highways and railway networks. Two standards of acoustic insulation are prescribed to achieve acceptable indoor acoustic amenity in habitable rooms.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.157	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	WIAL has a submission filed that seeks to introduce new policies with respect to the management of noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary at Wellington International Airport. However, in the instance that this submission is not successful, WIAL submits that it is inappropriate for acoustic treatment to be “encouraged”, rather it should be a mandatory requirement where new activities are located within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary at Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.72	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Rejects the softening of this policy from ‘require’ to ‘encourage and promote’ for sound insulation and mechanical ventilation for new noise sensitive activities. KiwiRail also rejects the deletion of rail corridors from this policy. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.20	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	It is appropriate that existing sources of noise are protected from new noise-sensitive activities moving to the nuisance effect.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.125	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA’s primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA’s primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.125	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman’s primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman’s primary submission.
Ministry of Education	400.81	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Amend	Seeks NOISE-P4 be amended to exclude educational facilities. The submitter seeks an amendment to this proposed rule to exclude educational facilities as these facilities have their own acoustic treatment requirements specific to school uses.	Amend NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as follows: Require sound insulation and / or mechanical ventilation for new noise sensitive activities <u>excluding educational facilities</u> within: ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.158	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Considers that education facilities comprise a noise sensitive activity as they include areas that comprise critical listening environments. It is therefore inappropriate to provide a flexible framework for such activities where located within the Air Noise Boundary of 60dB Ldn at Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.134	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.423	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P4	Oppose in part	Considers that it is the buildings that contain a noise sensitive activities rather than the noise sensitive activity itself that can be acoustically treated. Amendments are therefore required to the chapeau of the policy to make this matter clear.	Opposes NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.93	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more information in Noise P4 and within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Considers that these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.114	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.424	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P4	Amend	Considers that it is the buildings that contain noise sensitive activities rather than the noise sensitive activity itself that can be acoustically treated. Amendments are therefore required to the chapeau of the policy to make this matter clear. [Note that submitter has recommended replacing the definition "Air Noise Overlay", as set out earlier in the submission].	Amend NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as follows: Require sound insulation and / or mechanical ventilation <u>of new buildings or additions or alterations to existing buildings that contain for new</u> noise sensitive activities within: 1. The City Centre Zone; 2. The Waterfront Zone; 3. The Centres Zones; 4. The Mixed Use Zones; 5. Outer Port Noise Overlay; 6. The Air Noise Overlay <u>The Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary</u> ; and 7. Identified corridors adjacent to the State Highways and railway networks. Two standards of acoustic insulation are prescribed to achieve acceptable indoor acoustic amenity in habitable rooms. (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.94	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more information in Noise P4 and within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Considers that these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.134	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.115	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.425	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P4	Oppose in part	Considers that it is the buildings that contain noise sensitive activities rather than the noise sensitive activity itself that can be acoustically treated. Amendments are therefore required to the chapeau of the policy to make this matter clear. [Note that submitter has recommended replacing the definition "Air Noise Overlay", as set out earlier in the submission].	Delete NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.95	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more information in Noise P4 and within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Considers that these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.135	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks that the policy is amended in accordance with their original submission noting that the policy relates to rules and standards.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.116	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.108	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Amend	The rail network is a 24 hour a day, seven day a week operation, and the frequency, length and weight of trains can change without community consultation. Noise and vibration can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Appropriate mitigation, installed to ensure that the health and wellbeing of those living and working near to the rail network are not adversely affected, is pivotal to ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the rail network. Rail activities not only generate noise, but also vibration effects. KiwiRail seek amendment to require acoustic and vibration treatment for sensitive activities within identified corridors adjacent to the railway networks to ensure an appropriate level of internal amenity is achieved in buildings adjacent to the rail corridor.	Amend NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as follows: Acoustic <u>and vibration</u> treatment for noise sensitive activities Require sound <u>and vibration</u> insulation and / or mechanical ventilation for new noise sensitive activities within: <u>All residential zones</u> 1. The City Centre Zone; 2. The Waterfront Zone; 3. The Centres Zones; 4. The Mixed Use Zones; 5. Outer Port Noise Overlay; 6. The Air Noise Overlay; and Identified corridors adjacent to the State Highways and railway networks. Two standards of acoustic insulation are prescribed to achieve acceptable indoor acoustic amenity in habitable rooms.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.22	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Stride is opposed to imposing additional requirements in relation to rail network vibration. This is unnecessary and inappropriate.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.22	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	Investore is opposed to imposing additional requirements in relation to rail network vibration. This is unnecessary and inappropriate.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.37	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Amend	Considers an amendment appropriate to describe the Airport Noise Overlay with both the Inner and Outer Noise Overlay.	Amend NOISE-P4 (Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities) as follows: ... 6. The Air Noise Overlay (<u>Inner Air Noise Overlay and Outer Air Noise Overlay</u>)...
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.156	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Support	WIAL supports this submission in principle, however notes that WIAL is proposing to replace the reference to overlays with the commonly used and understood terms "Air Noise Boundary" and "60dB Ldn Noise Boundary".	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.
Yvonne Weeber	340.82	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Amend	Considers that NOISE-P6 should be amended to describe the Airport Noise Overlay with both the Inner and Outer Noise Overlay.	Amend NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as follows: Restrict the development of noise sensitive activities within: 1. The Inner Air Noise Overlay (<u>Inner Air Noise Overlay and Outer Air Noise Overlay</u>); and 2. Other locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met.
Waka Kotahi	370.216	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Support	Support policy wording that restricts development of noise sensitive activities where noise and acoustic insulation standards are not met.	Retain NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as notified.
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.3	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Amend	Considers that the policy needs to refer to both the inner and outer ANB.	Amend NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as follows: Restrict the development of noise sensitive activities within: 1. The Inner <u>and Outer</u> Air Noise Overlay; and 2. Other locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.296	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Oppose in part	NOISE-P6 is partially opposed and an amendment is sought.	Opposes NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.126	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.126	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.297	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Amend	Considers that NOISE-P6 should be amended to enable noise sensitive activities within the Inner Air Noise Overlay where appropriate ventilation and acoustic insulation can be achieved.	Amend NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as follows: Restrict the development of noise sensitive activities within: 1. The Inner Air Noise Overlay <u>where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met</u> ; and 2. Other locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.127	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.127	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Ministry of Education	400.82	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Amend	Seeks NOISE-P6 be amended to exclude educational facilities. The submitter seeks that educational facilities are excluded as the policy restricts the development of noise sensitive activities in the Inner Air Overlay.	Amend NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as follows: Restrict the development of noise sensitive activities (<u>excluding educational facilities</u>) within: 1. The Inner Air Noise Overlay; and 2. Other locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.159	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Oppose	Considers that education facilities comprise a noise sensitive activity as they include areas that comprise critical listening environments. It is therefore inappropriate to provide a flexible framework for such activities where located within the Air Noise Boundary of 60dB Ldn at Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.135	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.426	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P6	Oppose	Considers that a new suite of policies is required to address the management of noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.96	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more information in Noise P4 and within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Considers that these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.117	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P6	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.427	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P6	Amend	Considers that a new suite of policies is required to address the management of noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Amend NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as follows: Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities Restrict the development of noise sensitive activities within: 1. The Inner Air Noise Overlay, and 1.2. Other locations <u>Where</u> ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.97	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P6	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more information in Noise P4 and within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. Considers that these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. Considers that WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.118	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-P6	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.109	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Support	Supports policy which restricts development of noise sensitive activities in certain locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met.	Retain NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
New Zealand Defence Force	423.16	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Support	Considers that restricting the development of noise sensitive activities within the Inner Air Noise Overlay is appropriate in the management of reserve sensitivity effects on activities undertaken within the Airport Zone and associated airspace, including military aircraft operations.	Retain NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.38	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P6	Amend	Considers an amendment appropriate to describe the Airport Noise Overlay with both the Inner and Outer Noise Overlay.	Amend NOISE-P6 (Development restrictions on noise sensitive activities) as follows: Restrict the development of noise sensitive activities within: 1. The Inner Air Noise Overlay (<u>Inner Air Noise Overlay and Outer Air Noise Overlay</u>); and 2. Other locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met.
Yvonne Weeber	340.83	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R1	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.428	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R1	Support	Supports the default activity status, subject to compliance with NOISE-S1.	Retain NOISE-R1 (Noise not otherwise provided for in this chapter) as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.119	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R1	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.39	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R1	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.84	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain NOISE-R2 (Noise from construction, maintenance, earthworks, and demolition activities) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.217	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R2	Support	Support permitted hours and thresholds for construction, maintenance, earthworks, and demolition works, and RD activity status where not met.	Retain NOISE-R2 (Noise from construction, maintenance, earthworks, and demolition activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.429	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R2	Support	Supports the retention of a construction specific noise rule within the Proposed Plan.	Retain NOISE-R2 (Noise from construction, maintenance, earthworks, and demolition activities) as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.120	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R2	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.40	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R2	Support	Supports NOISE-R2 (Noise from construction, maintenance, earthworks, and demolition activities).	Retain NOISE-R2 (Noise from construction, maintenance, earthworks, and demolition activities) as notified.
Shailesh Kumar Patel	49.2	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Amend	Considers that sites in the Air Noise Boundary should have the same development rights as sites outside this (i.e. be able to build in accordance with the MDRS).	Seeks that Council amends NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) to allow increased development potential in line with the MDRS, subject to noise attenuation measures described at NOISE-S4.
Yvonne Weeber	340.85	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.77	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose in part	Considers the standards referred to in NOISE-R3 should be amended to integrate consideration of noise matters on a case-by-case basis for new buildings, and in alterations / additions to existing buildings.	Amend NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) by integrating consideration of noise matters on a case-by-case basis for new buildings, or in alterations/additions to an existing building.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.43	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Stride supports integrating consideration of individual site characteristics to activities, as this would enable a flexible approach to noise management.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	FS108.43	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Investore supports integrating consideration of individual site characteristics to activities, as this would enable a flexible approach to noise management.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.218	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support in part	NOISE-R3.1 is supported.	Retain NOISE-R3.1(Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building), subject to amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.219	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Amend	Considers amendments to have immediate legal effect and to require compliance with ventilation standards. In lieu of the provision having immediate legal effect, Waka Kotahi seeks that this rule be included as a qualifying matter for development in the Medium- and High-Density Zones	Amend NOISE-R3.1 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) to require compliance with NOISE-S6 (Ventilation Requirements) and amend rule so that it has immediate legal effect.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.75	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Agrees that compliance with ventilation standards should be a requirement and noise provisions should have immediate legal effect. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.220	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support in part	Support the inclusion of NOISE-R3.2, with default distance from State Highway to be extended to 100m or otherwise incorporate the Waka Kotahi noise contours along state highways so that the provisions only apply as needed.	Retain NOISE-R3.2 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building), subject to amendments.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.76	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Seeks that noise provisions for noise sensitive activities also apply within 100m of the rail corridor as sought in our primary submission. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include 100m from rail corridor
Waka Kotahi	370.221	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Amend	In relation to NOISE-R3.2 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building), the submitter would prefer that the noise contours are included rather than a blanket rule of 100m. As above, Waka Kotahi also support this with amendment to have immediate legal effect and condition to comply with ventilation standard. In lieu of the provision having immediate legal effect, Waka Kotahi seeks that this rule be included as a qualifying matter for development in the Medium and High-Density Zones. It is noted that the submitter would generally define distances from edge of traffic lane (as that where is the source of noise is).	Amend NOISE-R3.2 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as follows (or amend to adopt Waka Kotahi noise contours) and amend rule so that it has immediate legal effect: 2. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with <u>NOISE-S5 (Moderate Noise Areas)</u> and <u>NOISE-S6 (Ventilation Requirements)</u> is achieved within: i. The area between 40m and 80m - 100m of a State Highway;...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.77	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	<p>Seeks that noise provisions for noise sensitive activities also apply within 100m of the rail corridor as sought in our primary submission. KiwiRail supports compliance with ventilation requirements.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include 100m from rail corridor
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.30	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Stride is opposed to extending the area where R3 applies to within 100m of a state highway and to including this rule as a qualifying matter. For the reasons given above, this is inappropriate and unnecessary.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.30	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Investore is opposed to extending the area where R3 applies to within 100m of a state highway and to including this rule as a qualifying matter. For the reasons given above, this is inappropriate and unnecessary.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.222	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support in part	Support NOISE-R3.3 restricted discretionary activity status where NOISE-S4 or NOISE-S5 cannot be achieved.	Retain NOISE-R3.3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building), subject to amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.223	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Amend	<p>Considers the wording of NOISE-R3.3b is confusing and seems to contradict with R3.1, Would interpret that this is intended to apply to those activities that do not comply with the requirements of NOISE-S4 and NOISE-S5, AND are within land subject to R3.2. This should be amended to be made more clear.</p> <p>The rule should also be amended to include noncompliance with the ventilation standards.</p>	<p>Amend NOISE-R3.3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as follows:</p> <p>3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of NOISE-S4, or NOISE-S5, or NOISE-S6 cannot be achieved; <u>and</u> b. Any the noise sensitive activity is proposed on a site within land subject to NOISE-R3.2; or c. Two residential units are proposed on a site within the Inner Air Noise Overlay; and d. Four or more residential units are proposed on a site within the Outer Air Noise Overlay.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters of assessment in <u>NOISE-S4 and NOISE-S5</u>; and 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard</p> <p>Note: This rule does not oblige Wellington International Airport Limited (WIAL) to provide or upgrade mechanical ventilation or noise insulation in a residential unit which has already received such treatment.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.78	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Supports clarification on what standards apply to this provision. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.224	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Amend	The submitter does not understand the intent of this rule and requests that the wording is amended to clarify that any noise sensitive activity within the areas in NOISE-R3.1.a (including within 40m of the state highway) is a discretionary activity. If this is the intention, this conflicts with the permitted activity status for noise sensitive activities in these areas that comply with the stated standards.	Amend NOISE-R3.4 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as follows: 4. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Any noise sensitive activity is proposed on a site within land subject to NOISE-R3.1 <u>where NOISE-S4 and NOISE-S6 cannot be achieved</u> ; and...
Ministry of Education	400.83	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Supports NOISE-R3.1 as the submitter supports the requirement for acoustic insulation in high noise areas to reduce any reverse sensitivity effects and to enable productive classroom environments for educational facilities.	Retain NOISE-R3.1 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.84	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Supports NOISE-R3.2 as the submitter supports the requirement for acoustic insulation in high noise areas to reduce any reverse sensitivity effects and to enable productive classroom environments for educational facilities.	Retain NOISE-R3.2 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.85	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support in part	Supports NOISE-R3.3 in part.	Retain NOISE-R3.3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) with amendments.
Ministry of Education	400.86	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Amend	Seeks that NOISE-R3.3 be amended. The submitter seeks clarity on NOISE-R3.3.b as the submitter considers that it currently reads that any noise sensitive activity on land subject to NOISE-R3.2 is automatically a restricted discretionary activity, despite compliance with the permitted activity standards.	Amend NOISE-R3.3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as follows: 3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NOISE-S4 or NOISE-S5 cannot be achieved; b. Any noise sensitive activity <u>that does not comply with proposed on a site within land subject to NOISE-R3.2</u> ;
Ministry of Education	400.87	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Supports NOISE-R3.4 as the submitter supports the management of noise sensitive activities in NOISE-R3.	Retain NOISE-R3.3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as proposed.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.430	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Opposes NOISE-R3. [See paragraphs 4.65 to 4.72 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.98	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more information in Noise R3 and within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. However, these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.121	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.431	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R3	Amend	Opposes NOISE-R3. [See paragraphs 4.65 to 4.72 of original submission for full reason]	(Option A). Amend NOISE R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: b. Compliance with NOISE-S4 (High Noise Areas) is achieved within: i. 40m of a State Highway; ii. 40m of a Railway corridor; iii. General Industrial Zone; or iv. Inner Air Noise Overlay. Note: Distances from a state highway or railway corridor shall be measured from the closest habitable room to the closest point of a state highway or railway designation. 2. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. ... ix. Outer Air Noise Overlay. ... 3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NOISE-S4 or NOISE-S5 cannot be achieved <u>and</u> .

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p>...</p> <p>e. Two residential units are proposed on a site within the Inner Air Noise Overlay. d. Four or more residential units are proposed on a site within the Outer Air Noise Overlay.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Note: This rule does not obligate Wellington International Airport Limited (WIAL) to provide or upgrade mechanical ventilation or noise insulation in a residential unit which has already received such treatment.</p> <p><u>4. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: <u>a. Located within the Air Noise Boundary or 60 dB Ldn Noise Boundary; and</u> <u>b. Compliance with the requirements of NOISE-S16 and NOISE-S17 achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>1. The matters in NOISE-P7;</u> <u>2. The ability to achieve acceptable outdoor acoustic amenity;</u> <u>3. Any proposed mitigation of aircraft noise, in accordance with a best practicable option approach (e.g. site layout and design, design and location of structures and buildings and outdoor amenity areas.</u> <u>4. The extent to which effects, as a result of the sensitivity of activities to current and future noise generation from aircraft, are proposed to be managed, including avoidance of any effect that may limit the operation, maintenance or upgrade of Wellington International Airport.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: For a resource consent application made in respect of Rule NOISE R3.5 where a noise sensitive activity is proposed within the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary, WIAL must be considered to be an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA.</u></p>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.99	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more information in Noise R3 and within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. However, these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.136	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments which would require all new sensitive activities in the Air Noise Boundary areas to obtain a resource consent even where acoustic insulation and ventilation is proposed. The requirement would result in a significant constraint to development within zones appropriately zoned for noise sensitive activities and where adverse effects can be adequately managed.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.137	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes deletion of this rule.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.122	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.432	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Opposes NOISE-R3. [See paragraphs 4.65 to 4.72 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.100	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated recognise that there may need to be more information in Noise R3 and within the plan regarding the Air Noise Boundaries. However, these are major changes to the plan that will create major hardship in the additional burden of acoustic treatments that need to be resolved in some way between the property owner and the noise producer Wellington International Airport. WIAL should be working with WCC, the community and Guardians of the Bays to improve the noise objectives and standards in the plan but not put undue financial burden on the homeowners in these properties to undertake modifications and additions.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point be disallowed or amended in a way to stop undue burden on normal activities in zones within the Air Noise Boundary overlay as called by the WIAL Air Noise Boundary and 60dbL.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.79	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Opposes the deletion of this rule which is required to protect the rail corridor from noise sensitive activities. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.123	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.110	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Amend	Supports the inclusion of noise and vibration controls requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor. However, KiwiRail provide an alternative rule and standard framework which includes compliance pathways to mitigate noise impacts, including building setbacks and noise barriers. This approach is intended to assist developers and the Council in achieving compliance without requiring expert noise input into design. The standards seek to provide options for developers to protect future noise sensitive activities from noise associated with the rail corridor. KiwiRail also seeks controls within 60m of the railway corridor, for buildings containing new (or altered) sensitive uses to be constructed to manage the impacts of vibration. These controls are important to ensure new development is undertaken in a way that achieves a healthy living environment for people locating within proximity to the railway corridor, minimising the potential for complaints about the effects of the railway network.	Amend NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with NOISE-S4 (High Noise Areas) and NOISE-SX is achieved within: i. 40m of a State Highway; ii. 100 40m of a Railway corridor; iii. General Industrial Zone; or iv. Inner Air Noise Overlay. ... 2. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with NOISE-S5 (Moderate Noise Areas) is achieved within: i. The area between 40m and 80m of a State Highway; ii. The area between 40m and 100m of a Railway corridor; iii. City Centre Zone; iv. ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.23	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Stride is opposed to the requested amendment to NOISE-R3 and any consequential amendments as this would increase the area covered by the "high noise area" from within 40m of a railway corridor to within 100m. It is inappropriate to apply the more onerous requirements of the "high noise area" to such a great distance from the railway corridor, especially in the case of Johnsonville where there are no through trains or freight.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.23	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Investore is opposed to the requested amendment to NOISE-R3 and any consequential amendments as this would increase the area covered by the "high noise area" from within 40m of a railway corridor to within 100m. It is inappropriate to apply the more onerous requirements of the "high noise area" to such a great distance from the railway corridor, especially in the case of Johnsonville where there are no through trains or freight.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.171	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation for noise and vibration may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.171	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Oppose	Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation for noise and vibration may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Disallow
Save Our Venues	445.7	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Amend	<p>Considers that new residential developments in the immediate vicinity of existing live music venues currently have a low acoustic insulation standard. This creates an issue of reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>Considers that venues, otherwise compliant with DP noise guidelines, may still face enforcement action in response to noise complaints from new residents, severely restricting their ability to operate.</p> <p>Considers that in other high-noise locations - such as near the airport, or close to motorways - it has been amply demonstrated that it is possible to build dwellings to an acoustic standard that adequately mitigates potential noise issues when required by planning rules, and the modest cost of doing so has not been a disincentive to residential development in those areas. However, in a highly competitive residential market, developers have little incentive to take mitigation action above and beyond the minimum required.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with NOISE-S4 (High Noise Areas) is achieved within:</p> <p>i. 40m of a State Highway;</p> <p>ii. 40m of a Railway corridor;</p> <p>iii. General Industrial Zone; or</p> <p>iv. Inner Air Noise Overlay;</p> <p><u>v. Within 40m of a lawfully established established live music venue;</u></p> <p><u>vi. Central Area.</u></p> <p>...</p>
Save Our Venues	445.8	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Amend	<p>Considers that as currently proposed, NOISE-R3 does not take effect until the new plan is fully ratified (which could take years), whereas the new permitted residential development rules would take immediate legal effect</p> <p>Considers that this is likely to result in a rush on development, meaning that by the time the new noise rules would come into effect, it would be too late for any affected venues.</p>	Seeks that the WCC give immediate effect to NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) alongside densification provisions.
Guardians of the Bays	452.41	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R3	Support	Supports the NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building).	Retain NOISE-R3 (Noise sensitive activity in a new building, or in alterations / additions to an existing building) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.7	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Amend	Considers that the PDP should provide for the intermittent use of helicopter landing areas by agricultural aircraft for the purposes of agricultural aviation including primary production purposes and conservation purposes as a permitted activity.	Amend NOISE-R4.2 (Helicopter landing noise) as follows: ... 2. a. Compliance with the recommended limits and noise management provisions as set out in NZS6807:1994 Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas is achieved; <u>or</u> <u>b. The activity is for the purposes of agricultural aviation activities for primary production and conservation purposes.</u>
Paul Van Houtte	92.2	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Amend	Considers that helicopter landing noise from commercial activity should not be permitted at the waterfront, as this compromises amenity values and the enjoyment of pedestrians.	Seeks that NOISE-R4 (Helicopter Landing Areas) is amended so that helicopter landing noise from commercial activity is not permitted at the waterfront.
Wellington Helicopters	FS5.5	Part 2/General District Wide Matters/ Noise/ NOISE-R4	Oppose	Helicopters have operated at the Queens Wharf waterfront helipad in excess of 30 years. Any restriction on operation and or noise would have a severely negative affect on our business and lead to closure. Wellington Helicopters believe that the helicopter operation adds to the diversity of businesses in the CBD and is also an essential asset for the Wellington Regional Emergency Management Office.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.86	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Amend	Considers that NOISE-R4 should be amended to have a prohibited activity status where no activity for the landing and take off of helicopter will be granted within the East Side Area designation. Wellington Airport International Airport Limited Designation for the East Side Area does not allow take off or landing within the designation as per condition 34 which states: There shall be no aircraft engine testing, take-off or landing on land within the ESA Designation.	Amend NOISE-R4 to add a 'Non-compliant' activity status for the landing and take off of helicopters within the East Side Area designation.
Wellington Helicopters	FS5.7	Part 2/General District Wide Matters/ Noise/ NOISE-R4	Oppose	Wellington Helicopters believe that helicopter activities should be permitted within the airport zone.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.161	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate for the Noise chapter to duplicate or introduce aircraft noise management and mitigation measures imposed on WIAL through the recently settled Main Site and East Side Area Designations. Furthermore, the Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review.	Disallow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.78	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Oppose in part	Considers that acoustic insulation standards referred to in NOISE-R4 should be amended to allow noise matters to be considered on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Amend NOISE-R4 (Acoustic insulation - high noise areas) to integrate consideration of individual site characteristics/circumstances, and the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.160	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Oppose	WIAL has sought, via its primary submission, the inclusion of new rules within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary at Wellington International Airport. This includes acoustic insulation requirements that reflects the nature of the noise received within these aircraft noise boundaries.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.44	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Support	Stride supports integrating consideration of individual site characteristics to activities, as this would enable a flexible approach to noise management.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.44	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Support	Investore supports integrating consideration of individual site characteristics to activities, as this would enable a flexible approach to noise management.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.433	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R4	Support	Supports the permitted activity status for helicopter operations within the Airport Zone.	Retain NOISE-R4 (Helicopter landing noise) as notified.
Wellington Helicopters	FS5.6	Part 2/General District Wide Matters/ Noise/ NOISE-R4	Support	Wellington Helicopters support that helicopter activity be allowed within the airport zone.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.124	Part 2/General District Wide Matters/ Noise/ NOISE-R4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	423.17	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to provide for noise associated with helicopter landings in the Airport Zone as a permitted activity with no permitted activity criteria.	Retain NOISE-R4.1 (Helicopter landing noise) as notified.
Wellington Helicopters	FS5.3	Part 2/General District Wide Matters/ Noise/ NOISE-R4	Support	It is appropriate that helicopters be able to operate within the airport zone.	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	423.18	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R4	Support	It is appropriate to provide for helicopter landings in all other zones as a permitted activity subject to compliance with the recommended limits and noise management provisions as set out in NZS6807:1994 Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas is achieved. This is consistent with NZDF's bespoke noise standards for TMTA provided in Attachment 3. [See original submission for attachment 3]	Retain NOISE-R4.2 (Helicopter landing noise) as notified.
Wellington Helicopters	FS5.4	Part 2/General District Wide Matters/ Noise/ NOISE-R4	Support	It is appropriate that helicopters be able to operate within the airport zone.	Allow
Ministry of Education	400.88	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R5	Support	Supports NOISE-R5 as Wellington Girls College and Thorndon School are located within approximately 300m of the Wellington Stadium. The submitter supports the matter of discretion to consider noise effects on these noise sensitive activities.	Retain NOISE-R5 (Noise from Wellington Regional Stadium and the Basin Reserve) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.58	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R6	Support	Supports NOISE-R6 noting the standard NOISE-S7 defers to the noise limits set out in APP5 – Fixed Plant Standards.	Retain NOISE-R6 (Fixed plant noise) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.434	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R8	Oppose	Submitter is required to undertake wildlife management activities at the Airport. Submitter seeks to ensure that its activities, while not comparable to a shooting range, are not inadvertently captured by this rule.	Opposes NOISE-R8 (Shooting range and firearm noise) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.101	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R8	Not specified	While Guardians of the Bays Incorporated understands the changes being proposed by Wellington International Airport, they also suggest that all due restraint and other methods of bird removal from the airport be considered as the local community do feel as though they are in the middle of a shooting range when bird control activities take place.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.125	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R8	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.435	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R8	Amend	Submitter is required to undertake wildlife management activities at the Airport. Submitter seeks to ensure that its activities, while not comparable to a shooting range, are not inadvertently captured by this rule.	Amend NOISE-R8 (Shooting range and firearm noise) as follows: NOISE-R8 <u>Airport Zone</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u> All Zones (except the Airport Zone) 2. Activity Status: Discretionary (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.102	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R8	Not specified	While Guardians of the Bays Incorporated understands the changes being proposed by Wellington International Airport, they also suggest that all due restraint and other methods of bird removal from the airport be considered as the local community do feel as though they are in the middle of a shooting range when bird control activities take place.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.126	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R8	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.436	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R8	Oppose	Submitter is required to undertake wildlife management activities at the Airport. Submitter seeks to ensure that its activities, while not comparable to a shooting range, are not inadvertently captured by this rule.	Delete NOISE-R8 (Shooting range and firearm noise) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.103	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R8	Not specified	While Guardians of the Bays Incorporated understands the changes being proposed by Wellington International Airport, they also suggest that all due restraint and other methods of bird removal from the airport be considered as the local community do feel as though they are in the middle of a shooting range when bird control activities take place.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.127	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R8	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.59	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R9	Support	Considers that given the importance and necessity of blasting to quarry activities, Horokiwi supports the recognition of blasting associated with quarry activities (clause 2.b), and the permitted activity status.	Retain NOISE-R9 (Blasting noise) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.136	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R12	Support in part	Support the intent of this rule subject to amendments in relation to Table 20 which are required to comply with the methodology in NZS 6809:1999 (Port Noise Standard).	Retain NOISE-R12 (Port noise), subject to amendments sought in relation to Table 20 in APP4 Permitted Noise Standards.
Yvonne Weeber	340.87	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain NOISE-R13 (Airport noise) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.437	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R13	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOISE-R13 (Airport noise) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.128	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R13	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.438	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R13	Amend	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	(Option A). Amend NOISE-R13 (Airport noise) as follows: NOISE-R13 Airport Noise All Zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with the following standards: i. NOISE-S1; ii. NOISE-S8; iii. NOISE-S9; iv. NOISE-S10; v. NOISE-S11; vi. NOISE-S12; vii. NOISE-S14; and viii. NOISE-S15. 2. 3. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with- i. NOISE-S9; ii. NOISE-S10; and b. Noise from any land based activity in the Airport Zone exceeds the limits in NOIS-S14 by more than 5dB. Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of this rule must be publicly notified.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.104	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R13	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.129	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R13	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.439	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R13	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-R13 (Airport Noise) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.105	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R13	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.130	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-R13	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.42	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-R13	Support	Supports NOISE-R13 (Airport noise).	Retain NOISE-R13 (Airport noise) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.88	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain NOISE-S1 (Maximum permitted activity noise levels by zone) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.103	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S1	Support	NOISE-S1 is supported, as well as its proposed limits set out in 'APP4 – Permitted Noise standards' which includes noise limits for activities contained within a single zone and separate standards for activities generated in one zone but received in another.	Retain NOISE-S1 (Maximum permitted activity noise levels by zone) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.43	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S1	Support	Supports NOISE-S1 (Maximum permitted activity noise levels by zone).	Retain NOISE-S1 (Maximum permitted activity noise levels by zone) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.89	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain NOISE-S2 (Maximum permitted noise levels by activity) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.225	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S2	Support	Considers that the use of NZS 6803 for construction noise is appropriate	Retain NOISE-S2 (Maximum permitted noise levels by activity) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.89	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S2	Support	Supports NOISE-S2.2 as it limits the noise effects of blasting on any nearby sensitive activity, including educational facilities.	Retain NOISE-S2.2 (Maximum permitted noise levels by activity: 2. Blasting) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.44	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S2	Support	Supports NOISE-S2 (Maximum permitted noise levels by activity).	Retain NOISE-S2 (Maximum permitted noise levels by activity) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.90	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S3	Support in part	NOISE-S3 is supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain NOISE-S3 (Noise management plans) with amendment.
Yvonne Weeber	340.91	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S3	Amend	Considers that NOISE-S3 should be amended to have an additional bullet 2.g to include a timeframe to increase the speed of completion in the "Methods necessary for the Airport to complete implementation of the Quieter Homes Programme".	Amend NOISE-S3 (Noise management plans) as follows: Airport Activities 1. The Airport must at all times maintain and implement an Airport Noise Management Plan (ANMP). Any alteration or update to the ANMP is subject to certification by the Council. 2. The ANMP must include, as a minimum: ... g. Methods necessary for the Airport to complete implementation of the Quieter Homes Programme <u>within an identified timeframe once the properties within the 60dbh contour have been identified</u> ;
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.162	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S3	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate for the Noise chapter to duplicate or introduce aircraft noise management and mitigation measures imposed on WIAL through the recently settled Main Site and East Side Area Designations. Furthermore, the Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.137	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S3	Support in part	Support the intent of this standard subject to amendments in relation to Table 20 which are required to comply with the methodology in NZS 6809:1999 (Port Noise Standard).	Retain NOISE-S3 (Noise management plans), subject to amendments sought in relation to Table 20 in APP4 Permitted Noise Standards.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.440	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S3	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-S3 (Noise management plans) in it's entirety.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.106	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S3	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.138	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes deletion of this standard which serves the purpose to requiring WIAL to manage their noise through a management plan through Plan rules as opposed to solely through the Designation conditions.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.131	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S3	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.45	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S3	Support in part	Supports the NOISE S3 (Noise management plans) standards as proposed.	Retain NOISE-S3 (Airport activities) subject to amendments.
Guardians of the Bays	452.46	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S3	Amend	Considers the need to amend bullet 2.g to include a timeframe to increase the speed of completion in the "Methods necessary for the Airport to complete implementation of the Quieter Homes Programme".	Amend NOISE-S3 (Airport Activities) as follows: ... 2.g. Methods necessary for the Airport to complete implementation of the Quieter Homes Programme within an identified timeframe once the properties within the 60dbh contour have been identified...
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.163	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S3	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate for the Noise chapter to duplicate or introduce aircraft noise management and mitigation measures imposed on WIAL through the recently settled Main Site and East Side Area Designations. Furthermore, the Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review.	Disallow
Wellington City Council	266.124	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Amend	Considers the 'exemption' from insulation standards in S.4(4) (Acoustic insulation - high noise areas) and S.5(4) (Acoustic insulation - moderate noise areas) doesn't adopt the correct noise units when setting out those exemption levels and needs amending. Considers it would be counter to the National Planning Standards to use 1 hour LAeq when NZ Standards NZS6809 (port) and NZS6806(traffic) specify 24 hour units for those two types of noise. Considers there are no NZ Stds dealing with rail noise. Kiwirail have developed guidance based on worst case 1hr rail noise, so that seems appropriate for rail.	Amend NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) as follows: not exceed the following noise limits at all points 1.5m above ground level, and any part of the floor levels above ground: a. Less than 55 dB LAeq (1hr) for rail noise; or b. Less than 57 dB LAeq (24hr) for road noise; or c. Less than 57 dB LAeq (24hr) for port noise.
Yvonne Weeber	340.92	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Support	NOISE-S4 is supported. Supports the standard for acoustic insulation in the high noise area of the Inner Air Noise Overlay.	Retain NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) with amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.79	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Amend	Acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. However, considers that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Amend NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) to integrate consideration of individual site characteristics / circumstances, and the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.45	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	Stride supports integrating consideration of individual site characteristics to activities, as this would enable a flexible approach to noise management.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.45	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	Investore supports integrating consideration of individual site characteristics to activities, as this would enable a flexible approach to noise management.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.226	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Support in part	Supports, with amendments.	Supports , with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.227	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Amend	Considers that for noise sensitive activities within 20m of State Highway, buildings should also be constructed to mitigate for road vibration – to avoid adverse effects to human health and property as a result of vibration in the environment. Note should be added for clarity on how to calculate state highway noise levels for the design.	Amend NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) as follows: <u>5. For noise sensitive activities within 20m of a state highway, buildings must be designed, constructed and maintained to achieve road vibration levels not exceeding 0.3 mm/s vv.95;</u> <u>Note: for activities within 40m of a State Highway, the design should be based on the measured or predicted road traffic noise levels plus 3 dB;</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.80	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Support	Supports the inclusion of a vibration standard for noise sensitive activities however, seeks that this provision applies within 60m of the rail corridor as well as within 20m of a State Highway. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include 60m from rail corridor
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.31	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Oppose	Stride is opposed to imposing additional requirements around vibration and considers that this unfairly imposes the costs of mitigation on private landowners rather than seeking to manage these effects at the source.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.31	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Oppose	Investore is opposed to imposing additional requirements around vibration and considers that this unfairly imposes the costs of mitigation on private landowners rather than seeking to manage these effects at the source.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.228	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Oppose	[The submitter comments on the assessment criteria only in this submission point.] Considers the assessment criteria for activities that do not meet the permitted standards for NOISE-S4 to be inappropriate as it invites re-litigation of the bottom line which is that internal conditions need to be healthy to protect the amenity, wellbeing, and health of occupants. Assessment criteria should instead consider the extent of the exceedance or noncompliance, and the effects on occupants and noise generating activities as a result.	Amend the assessment criteria under NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: <u>1. Extent of the exceedance.</u> <u>2. Human health effects on occupants and their ability to achieve an acceptable level of amenity as a result of the exceedance.</u> <u>3. Reverse sensitivity effects to existing noise generating activities.</u> <u>4. Where within 100m of a state highway or railway corridor, extent of consultation with infrastructure providers who are generating the noise.</u> 5. Background noise levels and any special character of noise from any existing activities, the nature and character of any changes to the sound received at any receiving site and the degree to which such sounds are compatible with the surrounding activities; 6. The ability to achieve acceptable outdoor acoustic amenity; 7. Any mitigation of the noise proposed, in accordance with a best practicable option approach (e.g. site layout and design, design and location of structures, buildings and equipment and the timing of operations); 8. The ability to mitigate adverse effects through the imposition of conditions such as noise attenuation; and 9. In relation to a heritage building or a contributing building within a heritage area, the extent to which it is practicable to insulate to the required standard without detracting from identified heritage values
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.32	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Oppose	Stride is opposed amending the standard as requested as this would impose inappropriately onerous requirements on development and fails to provide flexibility.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	FS108.32	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Oppose	Investore is opposed amending the standard as requested as this would impose inappropriately onerous requirements on development and fails to provide flexibility.	Disallow
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.4	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Amend	Considers that Council has proposed that this overlay area will be determined by modelling based on the existing 65dB ANB. While the submitter has no issue with the accuracy or methods to achieve this, the submitter believes that the operative 60dB boundary should be established from time to time by modelling form the actual 90 day rolling average noise being experienced at the defined 65dB ANB rather than based on the 65dB limit itself. This would allow the WIAL to more actively manage noise beyond the 65dB boundary rather than just working towards filling the available "noise bucket" as has been WIAL's approach to the Inner Noise Overlay. Building requirement triggers will not be imposed on a wide area of owners until the defined noise level has been established. The implementation of the Outer Noise Overlay in the above manner will, in the submitters view, more acceptably cater for uncertainty to the future of Airline travel, climate change regulations, introduction of Wide bodied jet aircraft in Wellington and move toward quieter and/or electric engine aircraft.	Seeks that NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation - moderate noise areas) is amended to change the means to establish the 60dB Outer Air Noise Overlay area to use actual 90 day rolling average noise as measured at the defined 65dB ANB.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.164	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Oppose	WIAL has sought the inclusion of a new standard that applies to the acoustic treatment of buildings containing noise sensitive activities within the aircraft noise boundaries at Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.298	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Oppose in part	NOISE-S4 is opposed and a review of the different insulation requirements is sought for the inner and outer air noise overlay and to understand why these levels vary from the level required by the Quieter Homes Programme which is part of the Airport Noise Management Plan and Designation conditions. Clarification is also sought on the extent of the Quieter Homes Programme which appears to only cover the inner air noise overlay. Amendments may be necessary once further clarification and understanding is considered.	Opposes NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) and seeks amendments.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.124	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Support	Seeks clarification of the Air Noise requirements and the Quieter Homes Programme.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.128	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.128	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.299	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Amend	Considers that NOISE-S4 should be amended so that any mitigation measures and/or Quieter Homes Programme applies to properties under both the inner and outer air noise overlay. The submitter seeks a review of the different insulation requirements for the inner and outer air noise overlay and to understand why these levels vary from the level required by the Quieter Homes Programme which is part of the Airport Noise Management Plan and Designation conditions. Clarification is also sought on the extent of the Quieter Homes Programme which appears to only cover the inner air noise overlay. The requirements proposed by the Plan in respect of acoustic insulation and ventilation are potentially onerous for landowners.	Amend NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) so that any mitigation measures and/or Quieter Homes Programme applies to properties under both the inner and outer air noise overlay, and clarify the Standard after having reviewed the different insulation requirements for the inner and outer air noise overlay between the Plan and the Quieter Homes Programme.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.165	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Oppose	WIAL has sought the inclusion of a new standard that applies to the acoustic treatment (including ventilation) of buildings containing noise sensitive activities within the aircraft noise boundaries at Wellington International Airport. As set out in WIAL's primary submission, it is inappropriate for the Noise chapter to duplicate or introduce aircraft noise management and mitigation measures imposed on WIAL through the recently settled Main Site and East Side Area Designations. Furthermore, the Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.125	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Support	Seeks clarification of the Air Noise requirements and the Quieter Homes Programme.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.129	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.129	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Ministry of Education	400.90	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Support	Supports NOISE-S4 as the submitter supports the requirements for acoustic insulation for sensitive activities. The submitter also supports the assessment criteria which will help manage the effects of reverse sensitivity.	Retain NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.441	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S4	Oppose in part	Opposes standard in part. [See paragraph 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) and seeks amendment.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.132	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.442	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S4	Amend	Opposes standard in part. [See paragraph 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Amend NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) as follows: NOISE-S4 Acoustic insulation – high noise areas Within 40m of a State Highway/ Within 40m of a Railway Corridor/ Courtenay Place Noise Area/ Inner Air Noise Overlay (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.107	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S4	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.133	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.443	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S4	Oppose in part	Opposes standard in part. [See paragraph 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.108	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S4	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.81	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of the acoustic insulation standard for high noise areas. This standard helps to achieve the objectives of the PDP relating to reverse sensitivity. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.134	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.111	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Amend	Supports an alternative rule and standard framework. Seeks consequential amendment to NOISE-S4 to remove 'Within 40m of a Railway Corridor'.	Amend NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) as follows: Within 40m of a State Highway Within 40m of a Railway Corridor Courtenay Place Noise Area Inner Air Noise Overlay
Guardians of the Bays	452.47	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Support	Supports NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas).	Retain NOISE-S4 (Acoustic insulation – high noise areas) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.48	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S4	Support	Supports table ii of NOISE-S4	TABLE II - Minimum construction requirements necessary to achieve an advanced external sound insulation level of DnT,w + Ctr > 35 dB as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.125	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Amend	Considers the 'exemption' from insulation standards in S.4(4) (Acoustic insulation - high noise areas) and S.5(4) (Acoustic insulation - moderate noise areas) doesn't adopt the correct noise units when setting out those exemption levels and needs amending. Considers it would be counter to the National Planning Standards to use 1 hour LAeq when NZ Standards NZS6809 (port) and NZS6806(traffic) specify 24 hour units for those two types of noise. Considers there are no NZ Stds dealing with rail noise. Kiwirail have developed guidance based on worst case 1hr rail noise, so that seems appropriate for rail.	Amend NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) as follows: not exceed the following noise limits at all points 1.5m above ground level, and any part of the floor levels above ground: a. Less than 55 dB LAeq (1hr) for rail noise; or b. Less than 57 dB LAeq (24hr) for road noise; or c. Less than 57 dB LAeq (24hr) for port noise.
Yvonne Weeber	340.93	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	NOISE-S5 is supported. Supports the standard for acoustic insulation in the moderate noise area for the Outer Noise Overlay.	Retain NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.229	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support in part	Support the inclusion of NOISE-S5, with default distance from State Highway to be extended to 100m or otherwise incorporate the Waka Kotahi noise contours along state highways so that the provisions only apply as needed.	Retain NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.230	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Amend	<p>The submitter states to refer to comments on NOISE-R3.2 regarding the distance from the State Highway.</p> <p>Note should be added for clarity on how to calculate State Highway noise levels for the design.</p> <p>Submitter considers that there is a need to correct the noise metric for road noise to be consistent with the requirements of the National Planning Standards</p>	<p>Amend NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. The requirements of (a) above do not apply where an acoustic design certificate signed by a suitably qualified acoustic engineer, confirms the level of noise incident on the most exposed part of the exterior of any habitable room can be shown, under a reasonable maximum use scenario, to not exceed the following noise limits at all points 1.5m above ground level, and any part of the floor levels above ground:</p> <p>a. Less than 55 dB LAeq (1h) for rail noise; or</p> <p>b. Less than 57 dB LAeq (24h) for road noise; or</p> <p>c. Less than 57 dB LAeq (1 hr) for port noise.</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>Note: for activities within 100m of a State Highway, the design should be based on the measured or predicted roadtraffic noise levels plus 3 dB.</u></p>
Waka Kotahi	370.231	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Oppose	<p>[The submitter comments on the assessment criteria only in this submission point]</p> <p>Considers the assessment criteria for activities that do not meet the permitted standards for NOISE-S5 to be inappropriate as it invites re-litigation of the bottom line which is that internal conditions need to be healthy to protect the amenity, wellbeing, and health of occupants. Assessment criteria should instead consider the extent of the exceedance or noncompliance, and the effects on occupants and noise generating activities as a result.</p>	<p>Amend the assessment criteria under NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) as follows:</p> <p>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Extent of the exceedance.</u> 2. <u>Human health effects on occupants and their ability to achieve an acceptable level of amenity as a result of the exceedance.</u> 3. <u>Reverse sensitivity effects to existing noisegenerating activities.</u> 4. <u>Where within 100m of a state highway or railway corridor, extent of consultation with infrastructure providers who are generating the noise.</u> 5. Background noise levels and any special character of noise from any existing activities, the nature and character of any changes to the sound received at any receiving site and the degree to which such sounds are compatible with the surrounding activities; 6. The ability to achieve acceptable outdoor acoustic amenity; 7. Any mitigation of the noise proposed, in accordance with a best practicable option approach (e.g. site layout and design, design and location of structures, buildings and equipment and the timing of operations); 8. The ability to mitigate adverse effects through the imposition of conditions such as noise attenuation; and 9. In relation to a heritage building or a contributing building within a heritage area, the extent to which it is practicable to insulate to the required standard without detracting from identified heritage values
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.33	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Oppose	Stride is opposed amending the standard as requested as this would impose inappropriately onerous requirements on development, as noted above.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.33	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the standard as requested as this would impose inappropriately onerous requirements on development, as noted above.	Disallow
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.5	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Amend	<p>Considers that Council has proposed that this overlay area will be determined by modelling based on the existing 65dB ANB. While the submitter has no issue with the accuracy or methods to achieve this, the submitter believes that the operative 60dB boundary should be established from time to time by modelling from the actual 90 day rolling average noise being experienced at the defined 65dB ANB rather than based on the 65dB limit itself. This would allow the WIAL to more actively manage noise beyond the 65dB boundary rather than just working towards filling the available "noise bucket" as has been WIAL's approach to the Inner Noise Overlay. Building requirement triggers will not be imposed on a wide area of owners until the defined noise level has been established. The implementation of the Outer Noise Overlay in the above manner will, in the submitters view, more acceptably cater for uncertainty to the future of Airline travel, climate change regulations, introduction of Wide bodied jet aircraft in Wellington and move toward quieter and/or electric engined aircraft.</p>	<p>Seeks that NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation - moderate noise areas) is amended to change the means to establish the 60dB Outer Air Noise Overlay area to use actual 90day rolling average noise as measured at the defined 65dB ANB.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.166	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Oppose	WIAL has sought the inclusion of a new standard that applies to the acoustic treatment of buildings containing noise sensitive activities within the aircraft noise boundaries at Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.300	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Oppose in part	NOISE-S5 is opposed and a review of the different insulation requirements is sought for the inner and outer air noise overlay and to understand why these levels vary from the level required by the Quieter Homes Programme which is part of the Airport Noise Management Plan and Designation conditions. Clarification is also sought on the extent of the Quieter Homes Programme which appears to only cover the inner air noise overlay. Amendments may be necessary once further clarification and understanding is considered.	Opposes NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) and seeks amendments.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.126	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	Seeks clarification of the Air Noise requirements and the Quieter Homes Programme.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.130	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.130	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.301	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Amend	<p>Considers that NOISE-S5 should be amended so that any mitigation measures and/or Quieter Homes Programme applies to properties under both the inner and outer air noise overlay.</p> <p>The submitter seeks a review of the different insulation requirements for the inner and outer air noise overlay and to understand why these levels vary from the level required by the Quieter Homes Programme which is part of the Airport Noise Management Plan and Designation conditions.</p> <p>Clarification is also sought on the extent of the Quieter Homes Programme which appears to only cover the inner air noise overlay. The requirements proposed by the Plan in respect of acoustic insulation and ventilation are potentially onerous for landowners.</p>	Amend NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) so that any mitigation measures and/or Quieter Homes Programme applies to properties under both the inner and outer air noise overlay, and clarify the Standard after having reviewed the different insulation requirements for the inner and outer air noise overlay between the Plan and the Quieter Homes Programme.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.167	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Oppose	WIAL has sought the inclusion of a new standard that applies to the acoustic treatment (including ventilation) of buildings containing noise sensitive activities within the aircraft noise boundaries at Wellington International Airport. As set out in WIAL's primary submission, it is inappropriate for the Noise chapter to duplicate or introduce aircraft noise management and mitigation measures imposed on WIAL through the recently settled Main Site and East Side Area Designations. Furthermore, the Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.127	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	Seeks clarification of the Air Noise requirements and the Quieter Homes Programme.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.131	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.131	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Ministry of Education	400.91	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	<p>Supports NOISE-S5 as the submitter supports the requirements for acoustic insulation for sensitive activities.</p> <p>The submitter also supports the assessment criteria which will help manage the effects of reverse sensitivity.</p>	Retain NOISE-S (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.138	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	Support the intent of this standard.	Retain NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.444	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S5	Oppose in part	Opposes standard in part. [See paragraph 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.109	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S5	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.135	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S5	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.445	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S5	Amend	Opposes standard in part. [See paragraph 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Amend NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) as follows: NOISE-S5 Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas City Centre Zone/ Mixed Use Zone/General Industrial Zone/ Neighbourhood Centre Zone/ Local Centre Zone/ Metropolitan Centre Zone/Waterfront Zone/ The area between 40m and 100m of a railway corridor/ The area between 40m and 80m of a State Highway/ Outer Port Noise Overlay/ Outer Air Noise Overlay (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.110	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S5	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.136	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S5	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.446	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S5	Oppose in part	Opposes standard in part. [See paragraph 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete Amend NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.111	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S5	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.82	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of the acoustic insulation standard for moderate noise areas. This standard helps to achieve the objectives of the PDP relating to reverse sensitivity. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.137	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.112	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Amend	Supports an alternative rule and standard framework. Seeks consequential amendment to NOISE-S5 to remove 'The area between 40m and 100m of a railway corridor'.	Amend NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) as follows: City Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone General Industrial Zone Neighbourhood Centre Zone Local Centre Zone Metropolitan Centre Zone Waterfront Zone The area between 40m and 100m of a railway corridor The area between 40m and 80m of a State Highway Outer Port Noise Overlay Outer Air Noise Overlay
Guardians of the Bays	452.49	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	Supports NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas).	Retain NOISE-S5 (Acoustic insulation – moderate noise areas) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.50	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S5	Support	Supports table i of NOISE-S5	Retain TABLE I - Minimum construction requirements necessary to achieve a moderate external sound insulation level of DnT,w + Ctr > 30 dB as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.94	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Support	NOISE-S6 is supported. Supports the standard for ventilation requirements.	Retain NOISE-S6 (Ventilation requirements) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.232	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Amend	The ventilation system must be adequate to provide thermal comfort so that residents have a free choice not to open windows.	Amend NOISE-S6 (Ventilation requirements) as follows: 1. The minimum external to internal noise reduction levels in NOISE-S4 and NOISE-S5 must be achieved at the same time as the ventilation requirements of the New Zealand Building Code. An alternative means of ventilation must be provided unless compliance with the above acoustic insulation standards can be met with ventilating windows open <u>An alternative ventilation system must be adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least six air changes per hour, with relief for equivalent volumes of spill air. The system must not generate more than 35 dB LAeq(30s) when measured 1 metre away from any grille or diffuser.</u> 2. Where bedrooms rely on openable windows to meet the ventilation requirements of the New Zealand Building Code, and where these windows must remain closed to achieve compliance with NOISES4 and NOISE-S5 acoustic insulation standards, a positive supplementary source of fresh air ducted from outside an alternative ventilation system is required at the time of fitout. For the purposes of this requirement, a bedroom is any room intended to be used for sleeping. The supplementary source of air is to achieve a minimum of 7.5 litres per second per person. An alternative ventilation system must be adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least six air changes per hour, with relief for equivalent volumes of spill air. The system must not generate more than 35 dB LAeq(30s) when measured 1 metre away from any grille or diffuser; and 3. Confirmation of compliance with this standard will be required by a qualified professional...
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.6	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Amend	Considers that Council has proposed that this overlay area will be determined by modelling based on the existing 65dB ANB. While the submitter has no issue with the accuracy or methods to achieve this, the submitter believes that the operative 60dB boundary should be established from time to time by modelling from the actual 90 day rolling average noise being experienced at the defined 65dB ANB rather than based on the 65dB limit itself. This would allow the WIAL to more actively manage noise beyond the 65dB boundary rather than just working towards filling the available "noise bucket" as has been WIAL's approach to the Inner Noise Overlay. Building requirement triggers will not be imposed on a wide area of owners until the defined noise level has been established. The implementation of the Outer Noise Overlay in the above manner will, in the submitters view, more acceptably cater for uncertainty to the future of Airline travel, climate change regulations, introduction of Wide bodied jet aircraft in Wellington and move toward quieter and/or electric engine aircraft.	Seeks that NOISE-S6 (Acoustic insulation - moderate noise areas) is amended to change the means to establish the 60dB Outer Air Noise Overlay area to use actual 90day rolling average noise as measured at the defined 65dB ANB.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.168	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Oppose	WIAL has sought the inclusion of a new standard that applies to the acoustic treatment of buildings containing noise sensitive activities within the aircraft noise boundaries at Wellington International Airport.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.447	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that ventilation standards in NOISE-S6 (Ventilation requirements) do not create an untenable internal living environment for occupants of noise sensitive activities and that any requisite ventilation is affordable for residents to operate.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.116	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.128	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Support	Seeks that a ventilation system operation and maintenance should be affordable to the residents.	Allow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.138	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.113	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Amend	The ventilation requirements as proposed, rely on the requirements of New Zealand Building Code. KiwiRail seeks amendment to this standard to ensure habitable rooms achieve an appropriate level of comfort and amenity for occupants.	Amend NOISE-S6 (Ventilation requirements) as follows: 1. The minimum external to internal noise reduction levels in NOISE-S4 and NOISE-S5 must be achieved at the same time as the <u>following</u> ventilation requirements. of the New Zealand Building Code. An alternative means of ventilation must be provided unless compliance with the above acoustic insulation standards can be met with ventilating windows open. <u>2. If windows must be closed to achieve minimum external to internal noise reduction levels in NOISE-S4 and NOISE-S5, the building is designed, constructed and maintained with a mechanical ventilation system that</u> <u>a. For habitable rooms for a residential activity, achieves the following requirements:</u> <u>i. provides mechanical ventilation to satisfy clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code; and</u> <u>ii. is adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least 6 air changes per hour; and</u> <u>iii. provides relief for equivalent volumes of spill air;</u> <u>iv. provides cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and can maintain the inside temperature between 18°C and 25°C; and</u> <u>v. does not generate more than 35 dB LAeq(30s) when measured 1 metre away from any grille or diffuser.</u> <u>b. For other spaces, is as determined by a suitably qualified and experienced person.</u> 2. Where bedrooms rely on openable windows to meet the ventilation requirements of the New Zealand Building Code, and where these windows must remain closed to achieve compliance with NOISE S4 and NOISE S5 acoustic insulation standards, a positive supplementary source of fresh air ducted from outside is required at the time of fit out. For the purposes of this requirement, a bedroom is any room intended to be used for sleeping. The supplementary source of air is to achieve a minimum of 7.5 litres per second per person; and 3. Confirmation of compliance with this standard will be required by a qualified professional.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.169	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Support	WIAL has sought the inclusion of a new standard that applies to the acoustic treatment (including ventilation) of buildings containing noise sensitive activities within the aircraft noise boundaries at Wellington International Airport. WIAL therefore supports this relief to the extent that it no longer applies within the aircraft noise boundaries for Wellington International Airport.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.172	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Oppose	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation for noise and vibration may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.172	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Oppose	Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation for noise and vibration may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.51	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S6	Support	Supports NOISE-S6 (Ventilation requirements).	Retain NOISE-S6 (Ventilation requirements) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.95	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain NOISE-S7 (Fixed plant noise) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.52	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S7	Support	Supports NOISE-S7 (Fixed Plant Noise).	Retain NOISE-S7 (Fixed Plant Noise) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.96	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S8	Support	NOISE-S8 is supported. Supports the standard for hours of aircraft operation and the assessment criteria.	Retain NOISE-S8 (Hours of aircraft operation) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.448	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S8	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-S8 (Hours of aircraft operation) in it's entirety.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.112	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S8	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.141	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S8	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that these standards should remain to ensure sufficient control over aircraft and airport noise and to provide clarity for Plan users.	Disallow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.16	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S8	Oppose	Oppose the deletion of NOISE-S8 (Hours of aircraft operation), in particular, Clause 11, which exempts aircraft carrying heads of state and/or senior dignitaries acting in their official capacity or other military aircraft operations from this activity standard. While this Standard is included in Condition 27 of the Airport Main Purposes Designation – Main Site Area (Designation WIAL4), if wholly contained in the designation conditions, this would not provide certainty for NZDF military aircraft operations given the Minister of Defence is not the Requiring Authority for this designation. NZDF would be happy to undertake further discussion with WIAL on this matter.	Disallow / Reject submitter's relief and retain NOISE-S8 as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.139	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S8	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	423.19	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S8	Support	Activity standard NOISE-S8 sets out restrictions on the hours of aircraft operation within the Airport Zone. NZDF supports clause 11 of this standard, which exempts aircraft carrying heads of state and/or senior dignitaries acting in their official capacity or other military aircraft operations from this activity standard.	Retain NOISE-S8 (Hours of aircraft operation) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.53	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S8	Support	Supports NOISE-S8 (Hours of aircraft operations).	Retain NOISE-S8 (Hours of aircraft operations) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.97	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S9	Support	NOISE-S9 is supported. Supports the standard for calculations and management of aircraft noise, assessment criteria and the position of a permanent noise monitoring equipment as proposed in Figure 6.	Retain NOISE-S9 (Calculation and management of aircraft noise) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.449	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S9	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-S9 (Calculation and management of aircraft noise) in it's entirety.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.142	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S9	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that these standards should remain to ensure sufficient control over aircraft and airport noise and to provide clarity for Plan users.	Disallow
New Zealand Defence Force	FS104.17	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S9	Oppose	Oppose the deletion of NOISE-S9 (Calculation and management of aircraft noise) to provide certainty for NZDF military aircraft operations and amend Noise Standard NOISE-S9 as set out in NZDF's original submission (referenced by Council in the summary of submissions as 'NZDF Submission Point 423.20'). NZDF would be happy to undertake further discussion with WIAL on this matter.	Disallow / Reject submitter's relief and amend NOISE-S9 as set out in NSDFs original submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.140	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S9	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
New Zealand Defence Force	423.20	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S9	Amend	<p>Considers that Activity Standard NOISE-S9.2 relates to the calculation and management of aircraft noise with Standard NOISE-S9.2 setting out the 90 day rolling average sound exposure level that all aircraft operations shall meet. The standard is drafted such that Wellington International Airport Limited (WIAL) shall be responsible for the management of all aircraft operations within the Airport Zone to meet the 90 day rolling average sound exposure level set.</p> <p>the standard as notified does not exempt military aircraft operations from compliance with the 90 day rolling average sound exposure level, and thus NZDF related Aircraft Operations would need to comply (although this is not explicitly stated in the wording of this standard NOISE-S9 as notified).</p> <p>Seeks an amendment to the activity standard NOISE-S9.2 to apply to all aircraft operations (including NZDF) as opposed to just WIAL.</p> <p>NZDF would be happy to undertake further discussion with WIAL.</p>	<p>Amend NOISE-S9.2 (Calculation and management of aircraft noise) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. The Airport company (WIAL) shall ensure that all Aircraft Operations shall be managed so that the rolling day 90 day average 24 hour night-weighted sound exposure level does not exceed a Day/night Level (Ldn) of 65dBA outside the Air Noise Boundary shown within the District Plan Maps.</p>
Guardians of the Bays	452.54	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S9	Support	Supports NOISE-S9 (Calculations and management of aircraft noise).	Retain NOISE-S9 (Calculations and management of aircraft noise) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.98	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S10	Support	NOISE-S10 is supported. Supports the standard and assessment criteria for engine testing noise.	Retain NOISE-S10 (Engine testing noise) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.450	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S10	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete NOISE-S10 (Engine testing noise) in it's entirety.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.113	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S10	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.143	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S10	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that these standards should remain to ensure sufficient control over aircraft and airport noise and to provide clarity for Plan users.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.141	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S10	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.55	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S10	Support	Supports NOISE-S10 (Engine testing noise)	Retain NOISE-S10 (Engine testing noise) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.126	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S11	Amend	Considers there is a typo on "LAFmaxli>" and the correction (LAF(Max)) should link to a definition pop-up.	<p>Amend NOISE-S11 (Noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (Main site)) to fix typo as follows and LAF(max) should link to a definition:</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p>c. All days 10pm to 7am 75 dB LAFmaxli> LAF(max)</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Yvonne Weeber	340.99	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S11	Support	NOISE-S11 is supported. Supports the standard and assessment criteria for noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (Main site)	Retain NOISE-S11 (Noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (Main site)) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.451	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S11	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-S11 (Noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (Main site)) in it's entirety.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.114	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S11	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.144	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S11	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that these standards should remain to ensure sufficient control over aircraft and airport noise and to provide clarity for Plan users.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.142	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S11	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.56	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S11	Support	Supports NOISE-S11 (Noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (Main site)).	Retain NOISE-S11 (Noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (Main site)) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.100	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S12	Support	NOISE-S12 is supported. Supports the standard and assessment criteria for Noise from ground power unites and auxiliary power units (East Side).	Retain NOISE-S12 (Noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (East Side)) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.452	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S12	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-S12 (Noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (East Side)) in it's entirety.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.115	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S12	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.145	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S12	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that these standards should remain to ensure sufficient control over aircraft and airport noise and to provide clarity for Plan users.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.143	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S12	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.57	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S12	Support	Supports NOISE-S12 (Noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (East Side)).	Retain NOISE-S12 (Noise from ground power units and auxiliary power units (East Side)) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.101	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Support	NOISE-S13 is supported. Supports the standard for Airport East Side Precinct residential noise mitigation.	Retain NOISE-S13 (Airport East Side Precinct residential noise mitigation) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.302	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Oppose in part	NOISE-S13 is opposed as dwellings identified in Attachment 2 of designation WIAL5 are not provided with acoustic insulation in accordance with NOISE-S4, despite being eligible for mechanical ventilation prior to construction activity in the East Precinct. Amendments may be necessary once further clarification and understanding is considered.	Opposes NOISE-S13 (Airport East Side Precinct residential noise mitigation) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.129	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Support	Guardians of the Bays Inc agree that dwellings identified in NOISE-S13 (Airport East Side Precinct residential noise mitigation) should be eligible for mechanical ventilation prior to construction activity in the East Precinct are also provided with acoustic insulation in accordance with the standards identified in NOISES4.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.132	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.132	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.303	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Amend	Considers that NOISE-S13 should be amended so that the dwellings identified in Attachment 2 of designation WIAL5 which are eligible for mechanical ventilation prior to construction activity in the East Precinct are also provided with acoustic insulation in accordance with the standards identified in NOISE-S4. The Quieter Homes Programme has a lesser standard of acoustic insulation, requiring they are designed to achieve an indoor design sound Level of 45 dB Ldn or less, whereas NOISE-S4 and NOISE-S5 require acoustic insulation to achieve a minimum external to internal noise reduction for habitable rooms of not less than 30 or 35 dB.	Amend NOISE-S13 (Airport East Side Precinct residential noise mitigation) so that the dwellings identified in Attachment 2 of designation WIAL5 which are eligible for mechanical ventilation prior to construction activity in the East Precinct are also provided with acoustic insulation in accordance with the standards identified in NOISE-S4.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.170	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate for the Noise chapter to duplicate or introduce aircraft noise management and mitigation measures imposed on WIAL through the recently settled Main Site and East Side Area Designations. Furthermore, the Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.130	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Support	Guardians of the Bays Inc agree that dwellings identified in NOISE-S13 (Airport East Side Precinct residential noise mitigation) should be eligible for mechanical ventilation prior to construction activity in the East Precinct are also provided with acoustic insulation in accordance with the standards identified in NOISES4. [Inferred reference to submission 391.303]	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.133	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with The RVA's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.133	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the various amendments and deletions sought in this submission where these align with Ryman's primary submission and reduce restrictions on residential activities, which aligns with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.453	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S13	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-S13 (Airport East Side Precinct residential noise mitigation) in its entirety.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.117	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S13	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.146	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that these standards should remain to ensure sufficient control over aircraft and airport noise and to provide clarity for Plan users.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.144	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S13	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.58	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S13	Support	Supports NOISE-S13 (Airport East Side Precinct residential noise mitigation).	Retain NOISE-S13 (Airport East Side Precinct residential noise mitigation) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.102	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S14	Support	NOISE-S14 is supported. Supports the standard and assessment criteria for Land based noise in the Airport Zone.	Retain NOISE-S14 (Land based noise) with amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.454	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S14	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. Furthermore, there are a range of methods available which can demonstrate where standards are infringed. It is therefore inappropriate for the statement at the end of the assessment criteria, to include the level of specificity stated. It is also not clear what status (if any) this statement has. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOISE-S14 (Land based noise) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.118	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S14	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.145	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S14	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.455	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S14	Amend	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. Furthermore, there are a range of methods available which can demonstrate where standards are infringed. It is therefore inappropriate for the statement at the end of the assessment criteria, to include the level of specificity stated. It is also not clear what status (if any) this statement has. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	(Option A). Amend NOISE-S14 (Land based noise) as follows: 1. Noise emission levels from any activity within the Airport Zone designations , other than aircraft operations, engine testing and the operation of GPUs and APUs, when measured at any adjoining residential zone, shall not exceed the following limits: a. Monday to Saturday <u>Sunday</u> 7am to 10pm 55 dB LAeq(15min) b. At all other times 45 dB LAeq(15min) c. All days 10pm to 7am 75 dB LAFmax 2. In the East Side Precinct, for the purposes of calculating compliance with this limit, account shall be taken of the cumulative effect of all land based activities undertaken within the Airport <u>Zone</u> , other than aircraft operations, the operation of APUs and any engine testing. Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Type, intensity and duration of the noise; 2. Number of annual occurrences; 3. Mitigation or management measures; 4. Health and safety; 5. Effects on internal and external noise amenity for dwellings outside the Airport zone; <u>and</u> 6. The requirements of NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise.; <u>and</u> 7. The Airport Noise Management Plan. In assessing noise effects, data may be used from a continuous noise monitoring station established to confirm compliance and may also be obtained from other locations.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.119	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S14	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.139	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S14	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes any subsequent amendments sought by WIAL to remove reference to the Airport Noise Management Plan	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.147	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S14	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments which would allow for higher noise levels on Sundays.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.146	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S14	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.456	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S14	Oppose in part	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. Furthermore, there are a range of methods available which can demonstrate where standards are infringed. It is therefore inappropriate for the statement at the end of the assessment criteria, to include the level of specificity stated. It is also not clear what status (if any) this statement has. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-S14 (Land based noise) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.120	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S14	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.148	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S14	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks retention of NOISE-S14 as notified.	Disallow / Kāinga Ora seeks retention of NOISE-S14 as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.147	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S14	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.59	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S14	Support	Supports NOISE-S14 (Land based noise).	Retain NOISE-S14 (Land based noise) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.103	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S15	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.457	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S15	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. Furthermore, many of the conditions here have already been achieved by existing development undertaken by WIAL on site and it is therefore unnecessary for those matters to be dealt with here (as well as in the Designation). [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOISE-S15 (Miramar South Precinct) and seeks amendment.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.121	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S15	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.148	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S15	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.458	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S15	Amend	<p>Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter.</p> <p>Furthermore, many of the conditions here have already been achieved by existing development undertaken by WIAL on site and it is therefore unnecessary for those matters to be dealt with here (as well as in the Designation).</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>(Option A). Amend NOISE-S15 (Miramar South Precinct) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. Noise during construction activities shall comply with the requirements of NZS 6803:1999 – Acoustics – Construction Noise.</p> <p>4. A close boarded fence (or other acoustically effective barrier) with a density of at least 10 kg/m² and a height of two metres shall be installed around the perimeter of the site excluding site access points. This shall be inspected regularly and maintained to ensure its continued acoustic effectiveness.</p> <p>5. Entry / egress for trucks shall not be located opposite residential zoned areas. Trucks shall not drive along the Residential zoned parts of Miro Street, Kedah Street, or Kauri Street except where there are specific circumstances where this is necessary.</p> <p>6. Truck engines shall not be left to idle on the Site and signage shall be placed in appropriate locations within the Site to advise drivers of this requirement. The Airport or its agents shall actively monitor this requirement.</p> <p>7.3. Building services shall be designed such that noise levels from this source at the Site boundary are at least 10 dB lower than the limits set out in 1 above.</p> <p>8. All warehouse doors shall be fast closing and shall remain closed at night time unless in use.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. Effects on internal and external noise amenity for dwellings outside the Miramar South Precinct; <u>and</u></p> <p>5. The requirements of NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise,</p> <p>6. The Airport Miramar South Construction Noise Management Plan;</p> <p>7. The acoustic assessment report prepared by the Airport for development of the Site; and</p> <p>8. The Airport Noise Management Plan.</p>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.122	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S15	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.140	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S15	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes any subsequent amendments sought by WIAL to remove reference to the Airport Noise Management Plan	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.149	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S15	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments which would not provide sufficient control over noise from airport activities.	Disallow

General District-wide Matters - Signs

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.149	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S15	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.459	General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S15	Oppose in part	Considers that it is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations inherent in Designation WIAL4 and WIAL5 in the Noise Chapter. Furthermore, many of the conditions here have already been achieved by existing development undertaken by WIAL on site and it is therefore unnecessary for those matters to be dealt with here (as well as in the Designation). [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 of original submission for full reason]	Delete NOISE-S15 (Miramar South Precinct) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.123	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / NOISE / NOISE-S15	Oppose	Seeks that the noise management obligations of Wellington Airport should form part of the District Plan- Noise S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14,S15 Noise-R13.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.150	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S15	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks retention of NOISE-S15 as notified.	Disallow / Kāinga Ora seeks retention of NOISE-S15 as notified.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.150	Part 2 / General District Wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S15	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.60	General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-S15	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Paul Van Houtte	92.3	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Considers that digitally internally illuminated signs for commercial purposes should not be permitted in Wellington or at least not visible from any road. They are distracting, compromise amenity values and are highly imposing as they are difficult to ignore.	Seeks that the SIGN (Signs) chapter be amended so that digitally internally illuminated signs for commercial purposes are not permitted in Wellington or at least not visible from any road.
Paul Van Houtte	92.4	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Considers that commercial advertising and signs should be restricted from being located on any public transport, at any public transport infrastructure, because it is imposing due to necessary duration of exposure, compromising amenity values.	Seeks that the SIGN (Signs) chapter be amended to restrict commercial advertising/signs on public transport and public transport infrastructure.
Go Media Ltd	236.3	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Considers that billboard advertising contributes to the commercial vitality of a community through supporting business, infrastructure and community activities, Considers that billboard advertising can enhance the character or areas, buildings and structures and provides a focal point, and adds vibrancy and interest. Considers that digital signage is now a widely acceptable form of advertising throughout New Zealand. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the objectives, policies and rules applying to signage are based on evidence, effects and best practice.
Go Media Ltd	236.4	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Not specified	Considers that the PDP treats static and digital billboards differently in provisions where they should be the same. Considers that there is insufficient evidence to differentiate between digital and static billboards.	Seeks that the objectives, policies and rules applying to signage treat digital and static signs the same. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Go Media Ltd	236.5	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the PDP expressly recognise the positive effects of billboards, including digital advertising, and enable signage.
Go Media Ltd	236.6	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Not specified	Considers that the current standards are excessively strict and are not commensurate with the safety and amenity effects of billboards.	Not specified.
Go Media Ltd	236.7	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Considers that "Not compromised" and "Not detract" throughout the SIGNs chapter are not explained.	Seeks that wording used in provisions should be based on effects.
Go Media Ltd	236.8	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Considers that "Visual Clutter" is not explained.	Seeks that the words "Visual Clutter" should be qualified by "Unacceptable" or "Adverse".
Go Media Ltd	236.9	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Considers that the layout of the rules is difficult to use.	Seeks that formatting is amended to reduce moving backwards and forwards throughout the chapter and reduce table sizes.
Go Media Ltd	236.10	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Oppose	Considers the provisions relating to signs visible from the state highway network are unreasonable and should be deleted. Refers to evidence set out in the Carriageway Letter (Attached to original submission).	Seeks that provisions relating to signage visibility from State Highways in the SIGN chapter are deleted.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.39	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Oppose	Waka Kotahi seeks to maintain the safe and efficient function of the state highway network, and is supportive of including specific mention of the state highway network within this chapter. It is important, especially on the state highways, to limit driver distraction & ensure a safe road environment as much as possible.	Disallow
Go Media Ltd	236.11	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Considers that the protection of heritage must be appropriately balanced against contemporary activities and that it has been demonstrated that billboard signage can integrate with heritage buildings and environments. Supports restricted discretionary activity status for signs that do not meet the permitted activity standards in heritage areas.	Not specified.
Go Media Ltd	236.12	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Not specified	Considers that the PDP fails to meet the requirements of s32 of the Resource Management Act by failing to adequately consider the costs of provisions relating to billboards. Providing more adequately for billboards will ensure that the PDP achieves the integrated management of the effects of use and development of land and associated natural and physical resources of Wellington City as required by section 31 of the RMA, assists the Council to carry out its statutory functions in order to achieve the purpose of the RMA, and promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, and is therefore in accordance with Part 2 of the RMA.	Not specified.
Wellington City Council	266.127	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Considers amendment to introduction is necessary to cover signage for local body election hoarding.	Amend the last sentence paragraph 1 of the introduction to the Signs chapter as follows: <u>Hoarding signs for local or central government elections</u> Electoral signs are exempt from these rules and are managed under the Electoral Act 1993, the Local Electoral Act 2001 and the Council's <u>Election Hoarding Guideline</u> .
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.1	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the recognition of the importance of signage and third party signs (billboards) for their role in providing information, messaging and advertising. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks to retain provisions that support the importance of signage and third party signs (billboards) for their role in providing information, messaging and advertising. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.2	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the provision of a single chapter within the Proposed Plan which contains the provisions for signs (as opposed to incorporating provisions for signs within each zone chapter). The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks to retain the use of a standalone Signs chapter within the Proposed District Plan. [Inferred decision requested]
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.3	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the recognition of the nature of effects of signs that need to be addressed by objectives and policies. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks to retain objectives within the Signs chapter that address and recognise the nature of effects of signs. [Inferred decision requested]
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.4	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the recognition of the nature of effects of signs that need to be addressed by objectives and policies. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks to retain policies within the Signs chapter that address and recognise the nature of effects of signs [Inferred decision requested]
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.5	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the incorporation of those 'standards' which generally reflect current industry practice. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Not specified.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.6	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the incorporation of appropriate matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities which limit consideration to visual amenity, the integration of signs with buildings, traffic, pedestrian and cyclist safety, functional and operational requirements of activities and signs, and positive effects of signs. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Retain matters of discretion within the Signs chapter restricted discretionary activity rules that limit consideration to visual amenity, the integration of signs with buildings, traffic, pedestrian and cyclist safety, functional and operational requirements of activities and signs, and positive effects of signs. [inferred decision requested]
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.7	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Oppose	Opposes the onerous nature of certain standards that apply to third party signs and digital signs. The submitter opposes these provisions because the submitter considers that they will not: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.8	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Opposes inclusion of the Signs Design Guide and requests that where necessary appropriate matters of discretion and assessment criteria are developed to provide a clear framework for the assessment of signs which require a resource consent.	Seeks that appropriate matters of discretion and assessment criteria are developed and included in the SIGNS chapter to provide a clear framework for the assessment of signs which require a resource consent.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.1	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the recognition of the importance of signage and third party signs (billboards) for their role in providing information, messaging and advertising. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks to retain provisions that support the importance of signage and third party signs (billboards) for their role in providing information, messaging and advertising. [inferred decision requested]
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.2	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the provision of a single chapter within the Proposed Plan which contains the provisions for signs (as opposed to incorporating provisions for signs within each zone chapter). The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks to retain the use of a standalone Signs chapter within the Proposed District Plan. [Inferred decision requested]
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.3	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the recognition of the nature of effects of signs that need to be addressed by objectives and policies. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks to retain objectives within the Signs chapter that address and recognise the nature of effects of signs. [Inferred decision requested]
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.4	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the recognition of the nature of effects of signs that need to be addressed by objectives and policies. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks to retain policies within the Signs chapter that address and recognise the nature of effects of signs. [Inferred decision requested]
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.5	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	Supports the incorporation of those 'standards' which generally reflect current industry practice. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.6	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support	<p>Supports the incorporation of appropriate matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities which limit consideration to visual amenity, the integration of signs with buildings, traffic, pedestrian and cyclist safety, functional and operational requirements of activities and signs, and positive effects of signs.</p> <p>The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means. 	<p>Retain matters of discretion within the Signs chapter restricted discretionary activity rules that limit consideration to visual amenity, the integration of signs with buildings, traffic, pedestrian and cyclist safety, functional and operational requirements of activities and signs, and positive effects of signs.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.7	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Oppose	<p>Opposes the onerous nature of certain standards that apply to third party signs and digital signs. The submitter opposes these provisions because the submitter considers that they will not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means. 	Not specified.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.8	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	<p>Opposes inclusion of the Signs Design Guide and requests that where necessary appropriate matters of discretion and assessment criteria are developed to provide a clear framework for the assessment of signs which require a resource consent.</p>	<p>Seeks that appropriate matters of discretion and assessment criteria are developed and included in the SIGNS chapter to provide a clear framework for the assessment of signs which require a resource consent.</p>
oOh!Media Street Furniture New Zealand Limited	316.3	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that the introduction of the Signs chapter should be amended to reference the Public Places Bylaw 2022 and to confirm that the Council's approval is required in all instances for signs in the road reserve. The Introduction refers to the Wellington Consolidated Bylaw 2008, which was replaced on 25 August 2022 by the Public Places Bylaw 2022. It is submitted that the Introduction needs to be amended to correct this discrepancy, and to confirm that the Council's approval is required for all signs in the road reserve (regardless of the provisions of the Proposed Plan).</p>	<p>Amend the Introduction to the Signs chapter as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>If not managed appropriately, signs have the potential to result in adverse environmental effects including visual clutter, degradation of heritage features, and erosion of the amenity of the local and wider environment.</p> <p>The definition of a sign in this plan is limited to signs that are projected onto, or fixed or attached to, any structure or natural object such as buildings. Portable signs in the form of a board on Council-owned land are managed under the Wellington Consolidated Bylaw 2008. Under this bylaw, written approval is required for signage in public places. Some signs are subject to the Public Places Bylaw 2022. Notwithstanding any rules for signs in public places or within the road reserve, all signs placed in the road reserve will require the prior approval of Wellington City Council, or the approval or Waka Kotahi in respect of signs placed in the state highway network.</p>
Woolworths New Zealand	359.36	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support in part	<p>The general approach to signage in the PDP is supported, including an appropriate restricted discretionary activity status where standards are infringed. Signage is an important component of commercial activity, to raise brand awareness, consistency and legibility in an urban environment. The restricted discretionary activity status where signage is proposed that infringes the limits in any zone is supported, so long as the matters of discretion that apply are relevant and truly restricted in nature.</p>	Retain the Sign chapter, with amendment.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.37	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that the permitted area and thresholds for signage in certain commercial zones should be amended, specifically in respect to free-standing signage which is more restrictive than the Operative Plan in terms of height. Signage should be considered acceptable in commercial zones in principle, with some limitation on size and location where it may adversely affect sensitive areas, including heritage, character or residential areas. Specific amendments are requested in this submission.</p>	<p>Amend the Sign chapter to be less restrictive in respect to free-standing signage in certain commercial zones.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.38	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Considers that assessment of signage in commercial zones needs to consider the importance of corporate branding for consistency and coherence and ensure that consideration sits alongside the urban design aspirations of the PDP. It is critical for their success that businesses are able to be instantly recognisable for customers and not "watered down" to achieve an identified character or palettes.	Seeks that signage assessments consider the importance of corporate branding for consistency and coherence and ensure that consideration sits alongside the urban design aspirations of the PDP
Waka Kotahi	370.233	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Support in part	The submitter is generally happy with the direction of the chapter, particularly with specific provisions on digital billboards, and the consideration of effects (including cumulative) on road safety in general. This chapter as notified will encourage signs in suitable and safe locations, while restricting those that are inappropriate or may have adverse safety effects. Waka Kotahi interprets the rule table such that a third-party advertising digital sign will require consent (or to comply with) SIGN-R4 and SIGN-R5, but would suggest that the links are made more clear.	Retain the Signs chapter, subject to amendments.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.1	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Oppose	In general terms, Lumo considers that the amendments sought by the submitter are inappropriate and will result in unnecessary and onerous provisions for signs, billboards and digital signs/billboards that are visible from a state highway. Lumo opposes the amendments that are sought by the submitter, except where otherwise specified in further submissions.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.1	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Oppose	In general terms, OOHMAA considers that the amendments sought by the submitter are inappropriate and will result in unnecessary and onerous provisions for signs, billboards and digital signs/billboards that are visible from a state highway. OOHMAA opposes the amendments that are sought by the submitter, except where otherwise specified in further submissions.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.234	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	It is considered that links between the Rule table and Sign Rules could be made clearer. The rule table is interpreted such that a third-party advertising digital sign will require consent (or to comply with) SIGN-R4 and SIGN-R5, but it is suggested that the links are made more clear.	Seeks to amend the Rule table in the Signs chapter to ensure the links between the table and Rules are clear.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.87	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that within the 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' that Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter is included.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.460	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / General SIGN	Amend	Signage is an important and commonly found feature within any airport environment. It assists with both airside and landside airport operations, and assists with the safe and efficient movement of people, aircraft and traffic through the airport's airside and landside facilities. Signage also provides an opportunity to showcase the activities or services on offer within the district and region, which has both social and economic benefits for the wider community. Considers that it is important that the Proposed Plan recognises and provides for signage within the airport environment.	Seeks that the SIGN chapter recognises and provides for signage in the Airport Environment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.461	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / General SIGN	Support	Supports provisions within the SIGN chapter that require consideration of potential effects of signage on the safety of aircraft.	Retain, insofar as it relates to effects of signage on aircraft safety, SIGN chapter as notified.
Kay Larsen	447.8	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	Considers that digital billboards can be consented to change their image every 9 - 90 seconds, never turned off and there are many in central city area. These use fossil fuels to generate electricity for their power which warms the planet. There is no justification for them. Revenue from Billboards does not outweigh negative impacts. Considers that it was good that Prime Property Group were denied 2 Billboards. Supports more regulation for billboards. [See original submission for full reason]	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kay Larsen	447.9	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that digital billboards can be consented to change their image every 9 - 90 seconds, never turned off and there are many in central city area. These use fossil fuels to generate electricity for their power which warms the planet. There is no justification for them.</p> <p>Revenue from Billboards does not outweigh negative impacts.</p> <p>Considers that it was good that Prime Property Group were denied 2 Billboards.</p> <p>Supports more regulationfor billboards.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the PDP is amended to account for saving electricity with LED Billboards.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Kay Larsen	447.10	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that digital billboards can be consented to change their image every 9 - 90 seconds, never turned off and there are many in central city area. These use fossil fuels to generate electricity for their power which warms the planet. There is no justification for them.</p> <p>Revenue from Billboards does not outweigh negative impacts.</p> <p>Considers that it was good that Prime Property Group were denied 2 Billboards.</p> <p>Supports more regulation for billboards.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the PDP is amended to ensure that LED Billboards cannot be put near Residential Properties or Hotels.</p>
Kay Larsen	447.11	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that digital billboards can be consented to change their image every 9 - 90 seconds, never turned off and there are many in central city area. These use fossil fuels to generate electricity for their power which warms the planet. There is no justification for them.</p> <p>Revenue from Billboards does not outweigh negative impacts.</p> <p>Considers that it was good that Prime Property Group were denied 2 Billboards.</p> <p>Supports more regulation for billboards.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the PDP is amended to ensure that LED Billboards cannot be put near Roads, to proactively in prevent any hazards to motorists from LED Billboards.</p>
Kay Larsen	447.12	General District wide Matters / Signs / General SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that digital billboards can be consented to change their image every 9 - 90 seconds, never turned off and there are many in central city area. These use fossil fuels to generate electricity for their power which warms the planet. There is no justification for them.</p> <p>Revenue from Billboards does not outweigh negative impacts.</p> <p>Considers that it was good that Prime Property Group were denied 2 Billboards.</p> <p>Supports more regulation for billboards.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the PDP is amended to include more regulations limiting use of LED Digital Billboards.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.9	General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Amend	<p>Opposes the lack of a permitted activity status for digital signs which are designed and operated to comply with relevant standards. The submitter opposes these provisions because the submitter considers that they will not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means. 	<p>Seeks that a Permitted activity rule be added to SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) to enable digital signs which are design and operated to comply with relevant standards to be a permitted activity.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.9	General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Amend	<p>Opposes the lack of a permitted activity status for digital signs which are designed and operated to comply with relevant standards. The submitter opposes these provisions because the submitter considers that they will not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means. 	<p>Seeks that a Permitted activity rule be added to SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) to enable digital signs which are design and operated to comply with relevant standards to be a permitted activity.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
oOh!Media Street Furniture New Zealand Limited	316.4	General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that a new policy should be added to the Signs chapter new policy for 'signs integrated with buildings and structures in the road reserve'. Advertising signs in transport shelters and other buildings and structures in the road reserve are subject to the same provisions as signs on private properties, which is considered impractical. A number of these standards are not readily relevant or practicable for the design and operation of signs within the road reserve.</p> <p>It is considered more practical, efficient and cost-effective to have specific provisions for signs which are integrated with buildings and structures within the road reserve (including a specific set of policies, rules and standards). As with the shelter infrastructure, the design and operation of signs within the road reserve is most effectively managed by the Council (as the road controlling authority) in conjunction with its commercial partners and contractors.</p> <p>This approach would be consistent with the manner in which road based infrastructure and advertising signs are managed in Auckland, under the Unitary Plan. The plan classifies billboards on street furniture as a permitted activity, with this status being subject to compliance with a particular set of standards. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new Policy in the Signs chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>SIGN-PX Signs that are integrated with buildings and structures in the road reserve, except signs on building verandahs</u></p> <p><u>Enable signs where they are an integrated component of buildings and structures in the road reserve, including ancillary road network infrastructure.</u></p>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.40	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Oppose	<p>Waka Kotahi seeks to maintain the safe and efficient function of the state highway network, and considers it appropriate that digital billboards require consent due to the potential for driver distraction and effects on road safety.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
oOh!Media Street Furniture New Zealand Limited	316.5	General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that a new rule should be added to the Signs chapter for 'signs that are integrated with buildings and structures in the road reserve'. Advertising signs in transport shelters and other buildings and structures in the road reserve are subject to the same provisions as signs on private properties, which is considered impractical. A number of these standards are not readily relevant or practicable for the design and operation of signs within the road reserve.</p> <p>It is considered more practical, efficient and cost-effective to have specific provisions for signs which are integrated with buildings and structures within the road reserve (including a specific set of policies, rules and standards). As with the shelter infrastructure, the design and operation of signs within the road reserve is most effectively managed by the Council (as the road controlling authority) in conjunction with its commercial partners and contractors.</p> <p>This approach would be consistent with consistent with the manner in which road based infrastructure and advertising signs are managed in Auckland, under the Unitary Plan. The plan classifies billboards on street furniture as a permitted activity, with this status being subject to compliance with a particular set of standards. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new Rule in the Signs chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>SIGN-RX Signs that are integrated with ancillary road network infrastructure, except signs on building verandahs</u></p> <p><u>All Zones</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u> <u>i. SIGN-SX</u></p> <p><u>All Zones</u> <u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with the Requirements of SIGN-RX.1 cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters in SIGN-PX; and</u> <u>2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards.</u></p>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.41	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Oppose	<p>Waka Kotahi seeks to maintain the safe and efficient function of the state highway network, and considers it appropriate that digital billboards require consent due to the potential for driver distraction and effects on road safety.</p>	Disallow
oOh!Media Street Furniture New Zealand Limited	316.6	General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that a new standard should be added to the Signs chapter to relate to signs that are integrated with buildings and structures that are within the road reserve. Advertising signs in transport shelters and other buildings and structures in the road reserve are subject to the same provisions as signs on private properties, which is considered impractical. A number of these standards are not readily relevant or practicable for the design and operation of signs within the road reserve.</p> <p>It is considered more practical, efficient and cost-effective to have specific provisions for signs which are integrated with buildings and structures within the road reserve (including a specific set of policies, rules and standards). As with the shelter infrastructure, the design and operation of signs within the road reserve is most effectively managed by the Council (as the road controlling authority) in conjunction with its commercial partners and contractors.</p> <p>This approach would be consistent with consistent with the manner in which road based infrastructure and advertising signs are managed in Auckland, under the Unitary Plan. The plan classifies billboards on street furniture as a permitted activity, with this status being subject to compliance with a particular set of standards. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new Standard in the Signs chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>SIGN-SX Signs that are integrated with buildings and structures in the road reserve, except building verandahs</u></p> <p><u>Road Reserve (All Zones)</u> <u>For the avoidance of doubt, the standards in SIGN-S1 to SIGN-S14 do not apply to signs that are integrated with ancillary road network infrastructure, except where specifically stated otherwise below. These standards do not apply to signs on building verandahs, which are subject to the standards in SIGN-S1 to SIGN-S14.</u></p> <p><u>1. Signs must not be located within 30m of a scheduled Historic Heritage Place.</u> <u>2. Signs must be no larger than the street furniture it is attached to.</u> <u>3. Signs which are lit internally or by external means (but excluding digital signs) must comply with Standard SIGN-S9.</u> <u>4. The illumination of digital signs must comply with Standard SIGN-S8.4.</u> <u>5. The sign must not contain any flashing or moving lights.</u> <u>6. Signs must not be shaped or use images or colours, including changeable messages, that could be mistaken for a traffic control device in colour, shape or appearance.</u> <u>7. Signs must not obstruct, obscure or impair the view of any traffic or railway sign or signal.</u> <u>8. Digital signs must not provide advertising over multiple messages which are displayed across transitioning screens.</u> <u>9. In the event of a malfunction, a digital sign shall default to a blank screen.</u> <u>10. Each image on a digital sign must:</u> <u>a. Be displayed for a minimum of 8 seconds;</u> <u>b. Transition to another image within 0.1 to 0.5 seconds;</u> <u>c. Transition to another image without flashing, blinking, fading or scrolling.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.42	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Oppose	Waka Kotahi seeks to maintain the safe and efficient function of the state highway network, and considers it appropriate that digital billboards require consent due to the potential for driver distraction and effects on road safety.	Disallow
oOh!Media Street Furniture New Zealand Limited	316.7	General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Amend	<p>Considers that a new assessment criteria should be added to the new standard in the Signs chapter to relate to signs that are integrated with buildings and structures that are within the road reserve. Advertising signs in transport shelters and other buildings and structures in the road reserve are subject to the same provisions as signs on private properties, which is considered impractical. A number of these standards are not readily relevant or practicable for the design and operation of signs within the road reserve.</p> <p>It is considered more practical, efficient and cost-effective to have specific provisions for signs which are integrated with buildings and structures within the road reserve (including a specific set of policies, rules and standards). As with the shelter infrastructure, the design and operation of signs within the road reserve is most effectively managed by the Council (as the road controlling authority) in conjunction with its commercial partners and contractors.</p> <p>This approach would be consistent with consistent with the manner in which road based infrastructure and advertising signs are managed in Auckland, under the Unitary Plan. The plan classifies billboards on street furniture as a permitted activity, with this status being subject to compliance with a particular set of standards. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new Assessment Criteria for the new Standard in the Signs chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>Assessment criteria where Standard SIGN-SX.1. is infringed:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. The extent to which the sign adversely affects the visual amenity or detracts from the visual qualities that are fundamental to the historic heritage values of the scheduled historic heritage place; and</u> <u>2. The extent to which the location of the sign is necessary to provide for functional or operational needs, including the relationship of the sign to road network features such as bus stops or pedestrian thoroughfares or waiting areas;</u> <p><u>Assessment criteria where Standard SIGN-SX.2 to SIGN-SX.8 are infringed:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Visual amenity effects;</u> <p><u>Add a new Standard in the Signs chapter as follows:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>2. The impact of the sign on traffic, pedestrian and cycling safety;</u> <u>3. The extent to which any infringement is necessary to provide for functional needs or operational needs; and</u> <u>4. Any positive effects of the sign.</u>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.43	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Oppose	Waka Kotahi seeks to maintain the safe and efficient function of the state highway network, and considers it appropriate that digital billboards require consent due to the potential for driver distraction and effects on road safety.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.235	General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Amend	The direction to avoid any digital billboards that are oriented to be read from state highway is supported. The submitter considers that a new NC rule should be added for any digital billboard oriented to be read from state highway, or within 100m of a state highway intersection, is included to support this. To ensure that the public are aware of their consent requirements, it is recommended that a note is added to clarify that digital signage also needs to comply with all other relevant SIGN rules	<p>Add a new Activity status to SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) as follows:</p> <p><u>SIGN-R5.4</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: Non-complying</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. A digital billboard is oriented to be read from state highway, including on-ramps and off-ramps, or 100m from any intersection with state highway .</u></p> <p><u>Note: Digital signs must also comply with or apply for consent under any other relevant rule in the activity table – e.g R4 and R5 apply to digital third party signs.</u></p>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.2	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Oppose	As set out in Lumo’s primary submission, Lumo does not support a ‘blanket’ approach to digital or illuminated signs which are visible from a state highway. Such an approach is unnecessarily onerous, as there are no inherent differences between local roads and state highways which would otherwise result in digital or illuminated signs being unacceptable. Rather, consistent with the “management” approach of the proposed objective, it is appropriate that the policy seeks to ensure that digital and illuminated signs do not compromise the safety of the transport network.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.2	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / New SIGN	Oppose	As set out in OOHMAA’s primary submission, OOHMAA does not support a ‘blanket’ approach to digital or illuminated signs which are visible from a state highway. Such an approach is unnecessarily onerous, as there are no inherent differences between local roads and state highways which would otherwise result in digital or illuminated signs being unacceptable. Rather, consistent with the “management” approach of the proposed objective, it is appropriate that the policy seeks to ensure that digital and illuminated signs do not compromise the safety of the transport network.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.462	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / New SIGN	Amend	Seeks a new SIGNS Rule to add to SIGN-R4.	Insert a new Rule SIGN-R4(2), as follows: <u>Airport Zone</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance is achieved with:</u> <u>i. SIGN-S7;</u> <u>ii. SIGN-S9; and</u> <u>iii. SIGN-S14 [as amended by submission point below]</u> <u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance cannot be achieved with the requirements of SIGN-R4.1.</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters in SIGN-P1, SIGN P2, SIGN-P3 and SIGN-P6;</u> <u>2. The Signs Design Guide; and 3. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards.</u>
Go Media Ltd	236.13	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-O1	Support in part	Supports Signs-O1, but considers that the use of the word "Effectively" is superfluous.	Amend the wording of SIGN-O1 (Role of signage) as follows: Signs support the needs of the community to advertise and inform while the effects on local amenity are effectively managed. [Inferred decision requested]
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.10	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-O1	Support in part	Supports SIGN-O1 in part. Supports the intent of the SIGN-O1 which provides for signs that support the needs of the community to advertise and inform, while managing effects of signage.	Retain SIGN-O1 (Role of signage) with amendment.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.11	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-O1	Amend	Considers that SIGN-O1 focusses on effects on local amenity, which does not address all of the relevant matters which the subsequent policies relate to.	Amend SIGN-O1 (Role of signage) as follows: Signs support the needs of the community to advertise and inform while the effects on local amenity, <u>historic heritage, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Māori, and the efficiency and safety of transport networks</u> are effectively managed.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.44	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-O1	Oppose	Waka Kotahi seeks to maintain the safe and efficient function of the state highway network, and can support the proposed amendment to SIGN-O1 insofar as this relates to maintaining the efficiency and safety of the transport network.	Allow
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.10	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-O1	Support in part	Supports SIGN-O1 in part. Supports the intent of the SIGN-O1 which provides for signs that support the needs of the community to advertise and inform, while managing effects of signage.	Retain SIGN-O1 (Role of signage) with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.11	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-O1	Amend	Considers that SIGN-O1 focusses on effects on local amenity, which does not address all of the relevant matters which the subsequent policies relate to.	Amend SIGN-O1 (Role of signage) as follows: Role of signage Signs support the needs of the community to advertise and inform while the effects on local amenity, <u>historic heritage, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Māori, and the efficiency and safety of transport networks</u> are effectively managed.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.35	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-O1	Support	Support	Retain SIGN-O1 (Role of signage) as notified.
Paul Van Houtte	92.5	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Amend	Considers that digitally internally illuminated signs for commercial purposes should not be permitted in Wellington or at least not visible from any road. They are distracting, compromise amenity values and are highly imposing as they are difficult to ignore.	Not specified

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Go Media Ltd	236.14	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Amend	SIGN-P1 allows appropriate static signage where standards are met, where as SIGN-P2 would provide digital signage where it is compatible with zones and overlays.	Seeks that SIGN-P1 (Appropriate signs) more appropriately refers to "Enable".
Go Media Ltd	236.15	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Amend	SIGN-P1 allows appropriate static signage where standards are met, where as SIGN-P2 would provide digital signage where it is compatible with zones and overlays.	Seeks that SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs) more appropriately refers to "Enable".
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.12	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Support in part	Supports SIGN-P1 in part. Supports the intent of SIGN-P1, which is to allow for signs where they are appropriately designed and operated to manage adverse effects.	Retain SIGN-P1 (Appropriate signs), with amendment.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.13	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Amend	Supports the intent of the proposed policy. Considers, however, the RMA is not a "nil effect" statute and it is necessary to include a qualifier to the management of 'visual clutter' effects to better reflect the intent of the policy to manage unacceptable adverse effects (as opposed to avoiding all adverse effects).	Amend SIGN-P1 (Appropriate signs) as follows: Appropriate signs Allow signs where: 1. They are of an appropriate size, design and location; and 2. They do not result in <u>unacceptable</u> visual clutter; and 3. Any potential cumulative effects are managed; and 4. They are required to meet regulatory or statutory requirements; and 5. They do not compromise the efficiency of the transport network or the safety of its users, including cyclists and pedestrians; and 6. In the Residential, Rural and Open Space Zones, they relate to an activity on the site on which they are located; and 7. They maintain the character and amenity values of the site and the surrounding area.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.12	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Support in part	Supports SIGN-P1 in part. Supports the intent of SIGN-P1, which is to allow for signs where they are appropriately designed and operated to manage adverse effects.	Retain SIGN-P1 (Appropriate signs), with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.13	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Amend	Supports the intent of the proposed policy. Considers, however, the RMA is not a "nil effect" statute and it is necessary to include a qualifier to the management of 'visual clutter' effects to better reflect the intent of the policy to manage unacceptable adverse effects (as opposed to avoiding all adverse effects).	Amend SIGN-P1 (Appropriate signs) as follows: Appropriate signs Allow signs where: 1. They are of an appropriate size, design and location; and 2. They do not result in <u>unacceptable</u> visual clutter; and 3. Any potential cumulative effects are managed; and 4. They are required to meet regulatory or statutory requirements; and 5. They do not compromise the efficiency of the transport network or the safety of its users, including cyclists and pedestrians; and 6. In the Residential, Rural and Open Space Zones, they relate to an activity on the site on which they are located; and 7. They maintain the character and amenity values of the site and the surrounding area.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.36	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Support	Support	Retain SIGN-P1 (Appropriate Signs)as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.236	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Support	Support the wording in SIGN-P1 as notified, signs have a number of effects to consider, which the policy covers.	Retain SIGN-P1 (Appropriate signs) as notified.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.3	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Oppose	Lumo opposes the submission point on the basis that it is inconsistent with the relief sought in its primary submission to amend Policy SIGN-P1.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.3	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P1	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes the submission point on the basis that it is inconsistent with the relief sought in its primary submission to amend Policy SIGN-P1.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.463	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-P1	Oppose	As drafted, the use of the term "and" between each paragraph sets an unduly onerous and high bar for signage to be considered "appropriate". For example, if a sign must be required to meet regulatory or statutory requirements due to use, a very narrow scope of signage would only be permitted (i.e. "official" signage such as road signs, health and safety signs etc).	Opposes SIGN-P1 (Appropriate Signs) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.464	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-P1	Amend	As drafted, the use of the term "and" between each paragraph sets an unduly onerous and high bar for signage to be considered "appropriate". For example, if a sign must be required to meet regulatory or statutory requirements due to use, a very narrow scope of signage would only be permitted (i.e. "official" signage such as road signs, health and safety signs etc).	Amend SIGN-P1 (Appropriate Signs) as follows: Allow signs where: 1. They are of an appropriate size, design and location; and or 2. They do not result in visual clutter; and or 3. Any potential cumulative effects are managed; and 4.3. They are required to meet regulatory or statutory requirements; and 5.4. Any potential cumulative effects are managed; and 6.5. They do not compromise the efficiency of the transport network or the safety of its users, including cyclists and pedestrians; and 7.6. In the Residential, Rural and Open Space Zones, they relate to an activity on the site on which they are located; and 8.7. They maintain the character and amenity values of the site and <u>do not significant detract from the surrounding area.</u>
Paul Van Houtte	92.6	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Amend	Considers that digitally internally illuminated signs for commercial purposes should not be permitted in Wellington or at least not visible from any road. They are distracting, compromise amenity values and are highly imposing as they are difficult to ignore.	Seeks that digital signs are not provided for within SIGN-P2 (Digital and Illuminated Signs). [inferred decision requested]
Go Media Ltd	236.16	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Not specified	Considers that Policy SIGN-P2(5) creates a blanket policy against signs visible from a State Highway. State Highway 1 runs through urban areas with 50mk/h speed limits, such as along Vivian Street. There is no evidence base as to why billboards should not be situated in such areas when there are no policies against billboards along other 50km/h roads.	Not specified.
Go Media Ltd	236.17	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Oppose	Opposes that the term "Visible" is not defined in SIGN-P2 and is open to interpretation.	Clarify the meaning of "Not visible" in SIGN-P2.5 (Digital and Illuminated Signs).
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.14	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Support in part	Supports SIGN-P2 in part. Supports the intent of SIGN-P2 which is to provide for digital and illuminated signs where the particular effects of such signs are appropriately managed.	Retain SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs), with amendment.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.15	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Oppose in part	Opposes the proposed 'blanket' approach to digital or illuminated signs that are visible from a state highway. Considers that as currently worded, SIGN-P2 has the outcome of not allowing digital and illuminated signs where they are visible from the State Highway. In the context of Wellington, the submitter considers that this will preclude a significant amount of business-zoned land from establishing digital and illuminated signs. The submitter considers that such an approach is unnecessarily onerous. The submitter considers that there are no inherent differences between local roads and state highways which would otherwise result in digital or illuminated signs being unacceptable. Rather, consistent with the "management" approach of the proposed objective, the submitter considers that it is appropriate that the policy seeks to ensure that digital and illuminated signs do not compromise the safety of the transport network.	Retain SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.16	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Amend	<p>Submitter does not support the proposed 'blanket' approach to digital or illuminated signs which are visible from a state highway. Submitter considers that as currently worded, SIGN-P2 has the outcome of not allowing digital and illuminated signs where they are visible from the State Highway. In the context of Wellington, the submitter considers that this will preclude a significant amount of business-zoned land from establishing digital and illuminated signs.</p> <p>The submitter considers that such an approach is unnecessarily onerous.</p> <p>The submitter considers that there are no inherent differences between local roads and state highways which would otherwise result in digital or illuminated signs being unacceptable.</p> <p>Rather, consistent with the "management" approach of the proposed objective, the submitter considers that it is appropriate that the policy seeks to ensure that digital and illuminated signs do not compromise the safety of the transport network.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs) as follows:</p> <p>Digital and illuminated signs</p> <p>Provide for digital and illuminated signs where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sign is compatible with the zone and any overlay; and 2. The sign does not compromise aircraft safety or the safe and efficient functioning of the Airport; and 3. The sign does not compromise traffic, pedestrian, or cycling safety; and 4. Any light spill or glare effects are managed so they do not compromise amenity values; and 5. The sign is not visible from a state highway.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.45	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Oppose	<p>Waka Kotahi seeks to maintain the safe and efficient function of the state highway network and for that reason considers it appropriate to maintain SIGN-P2 as originally drafted.</p>	Disallow
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.14	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Support in part	<p>Supports SIGN-P2 in part. Supports the intent of SIGN-P2 which is to provide for digital and illuminated signs where the particular effects of such signs are appropriately managed.</p>	Retain SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs), with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.15	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes the proposed 'blanket' approach to digital or illuminated signs that are visible from a state highway.</p> <p>Considers that as currently worded, SIGN-P2 has the outcome of not allowing digital and illuminated signs where they are visible from the State Highway. In the context of Wellington, the submitter considers that this will preclude a significant amount of business-zoned land from establishing digital and illuminated signs. The submitter considers that such an approach is unnecessarily onerous.</p> <p>The submitter considers that there are no inherent differences between local roads and state highways which would otherwise result in digital or illuminated signs being unacceptable.</p> <p>Rather, consistent with the "management" approach of the proposed objective, the submitter considers that it is appropriate that the policy seeks to ensure that digital and illuminated signs do not compromise the safety of the transport network.</p>	Retain SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs), with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.16	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Amend	<p>Submitter does not support the proposed 'blanket' approach to digital or illuminated signs which are visible from a state highway. Submitter considers that as currently worded, SIGN-P2 has the outcome of not allowing digital and illuminated signs where they are visible from the State Highway. In the context of Wellington, the submitter considers that this will preclude a significant amount of business-zoned land from establishing digital and illuminated signs.</p> <p>The submitter considers that such an approach is unnecessarily onerous.</p> <p>The submitter considers that there are no inherent differences between local roads and state highways which would otherwise result in digital or illuminated signs being unacceptable.</p> <p>Rather, consistent with the "management" approach of the proposed objective, the submitter considers that it is appropriate that the policy seeks to ensure that digital and illuminated signs do not compromise the safety of the transport network.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for digital and illuminated signs where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sign is compatible with the zone and any overlay; and 2. The sign does not compromise aircraft safety or the safe and efficient functioning of the Airport; and 3. The sign does not compromise traffic, pedestrian, or cycling safety; and 4. Any light spill or glare effects are managed so they do not compromise amenity values; and 5. The sign is not visible from a state highway.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.37	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Support	Support	Retain SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.171	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Oppose	WIAL opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with WIAL's primary submission.	Disallow
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.2	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Support	Supports the policy on Digital and illuminated signs that provides for the sign not to "compromise traffic, pedestrian or cycle safety", not include "any light spill or glare effects...(or) compromise amenity values" and "The sign is not visible from a state highway". As State Highway 1 through Vivian Street appears to be a prime location for such signage, with a principal audience of drivers, the policy appears to be consistent with their immediate removal.	Retain SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.237	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Amend	Considers that the wording be amended to consider effects that are particularly significant with the nature of digital billboards – being the cumulative effects of multiple digital billboards in proximity to each other and Waka Kotahi suggests they are not provided for in any high speed environments (70km/h or higher) as overseas research has found a statistically significant increase in injury crashes in high speed areas.	Amend SIGN-P2 (Digital and illuminated signs) as follows: ... 6. The sign is not visible from a state highway or any road with a speed limit of 70km/h or higher; and 7. Cumulative effects of digital billboards are managed.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.4	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Oppose	Lumo opposes the blanket approach to applying different and more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway or roads with a speed limit of 70km/h or higher. Lumo also does not agree that SIGN-P2 needs to be amended to address cumulative effects, as such effects are addressed by Policy SIGN-P1 (subject to the amendments sought by Lumo in its primary submission).	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.4	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P2	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes the blanket approach to applying different and more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway or roads with a speed limit of 70km/h or higher. OOHMAA also does not agree that SIGN-P2 needs to be amended to address cumulative effects, as such effects are addressed by Policy SIGN-P1 (subject to the amendments sought by OOHMAA in its primary submission).	Disallow
Go Media Ltd	236.18	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P3	Support	Supports the recognition of the benefits of allowing additional signage to support sustainable long-term use of heritage sites.	Retain SIGN-P3.2 (Signs and Historic Heritage) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.128	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P3	Amend	Considers the wording between SIGN-P3 (Signs and historic heritage) and SIGN-R3 (does not match). Considers SIGN-P3 should be amended to state the full name of the Heritage Design Guide. Refer to SIGN-R6 which is for signs on heritage buildings and refers to the Heritage Design Guide.	Amend SIGN-P3.1.f as follows: ... f. The sign fulfils the intent of the Heritage <u>Design Guide</u> and Signs Design Guides.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.38	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P3	Oppose	Oppose Restaurant Brands is opposed to the cross reference to the Signs Design Guide within the Policy. The Design Guide does not appropriately recognise or provide for the requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide imposes certain outcomes that are required to be achieved in every circumstances and results in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Amend SIGN-P3 (signs and historic heritage) as follows: ... 1. The extent to which: ... f. The sign fulfils the intent of the Heritage and Signs Design Guides. ...
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.465	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-P3	Oppose in part	Opposes policy. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SIGN-P3 (Digital and illuminated signs) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.466	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-P3	Amend	Opposes policy. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Amend SIGN-P3 (Digital and illuminated signs) as follows: Digital and illuminated signs Provide for digital and illuminated signs where: ... 5. The sign is not <u>directed at users of the</u> visible from a state highway. (Option A).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.467	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-P3	Oppose in part	Opposes policy. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Delete SIGN-P3 (Digital and illuminated signs) in its entirety. (Option B).
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.114	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P3	Support	Supports policy which allows signs that do not compromise the efficiency of the transport network, or the safety of its users. Signs located on sites adjoining the transport network have a potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the network.	Retain SIGN-P3 (Signs and historic heritage) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.66	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P3	Amend	Considers that the rate of change should be a matter of discretion when assessing digital signage believing that frequent and rapid change (minimal transitions) draws the eye and has the potential to detract from heritage buildings, structures and areas.	Amend SIGN-P3 (Signs and historic heritage) as follows: Enable signs on heritage buildings, heritage structures and within their sites, and within heritage areas to support wayfinding and interpretation and only allow signs for other purposes where they do not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to: 1. The extent to which: <u>a. The rate of change and transition between content on digital signs adversely affects heritage values</u> a- b. Damage to heritage fabric, from methods of fixing, including supporting structures, cabling or wiring is minimized or is reasonably reversible;
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.67	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P3	Amend	Considers that considering the benefits of additional signage to support sustainable long-term use, should be removed as this may lead to the proliferation of additional signage and should be removed.	Amend SIGN-P3 (Signs and historic heritage) as follows: Enable signs on heritage buildings, heritage structures and within their sites, and within heritage areas to support wayfinding and interpretation and only allow signs for other purposes where they do not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to: 1. The extent to which: 2. The benefits of allowing additional signage to support sustainable long term use.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.39	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P4	Oppose	Restaurant Brands is opposed to the cross reference to the Signs Design Guide within the Policy. The Design Guide does not appropriately recognise or provide for the requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide imposes certain outcomes that are required to be achieved in every circumstances and results in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Amend SIGN-P4 (Signs on scheduled archaeological sites and sites of significance to Māori) as follows: ... 1. The extent to which: ... g. The sign fulfils the intent of the Heritage and Signs Design Guides; and ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.88	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P4	Amend	Considers that SIGN-P4 does not provide any specificity to bilingual signage or signage displaying Te Reo Māori.	Seeks amendment to SIGN-P4 (Signs on scheduled archaeological sites and sites of significance to Māori) to include a requirement for Taranaki Whānui to lead the decision-making around what is appropriate regarding bilingual signage and appropriate naming opportunities.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.68	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P4	Amend	Considers that the rate of change should be a matter of discretion when assessing digital signage believing that frequent and rapid change (minimal transitions) draws the eye and has the potential to detract from heritage buildings, structures and areas.	<p>Amend SIGN-P4 (Signs on scheduled archaeological sites and sites of significance to Māori) as follows:</p> <p>Enable signs that relate to safety and interpretation within the extent of scheduled archaeological sites and sites of significance, and only allow other signs that do not detract from the identified archaeological values, having regard to:</p> <p>1. The extent to which:</p> <p><u>a. The rate of change and transition between content on digital signs adversely affects heritage values;</u></p> <p>a-b. Land disturbance required for the sign and impacts on archaeological features is minimised;</p>
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.69	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P4	Amend	Considers that considering the benefits of additional signage to support sustainable long-term use, should be removed as this may lead to the proliferation of additional signage and should be removed.	<p>Amend SIGN-P4 (Signs on scheduled archaeological sites and sites of significance to Māori) as follows:</p> <p>Enable signs on heritage buildings, heritage structures and within their sites, and within heritage areas to support wayfinding and interpretation and only allow signs for other purposes where they do not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to:</p> <p>1. The extent to which:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2. The benefits of allowing additional signage to support sustainable long term use. —</p>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.40	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P5	Support	Support	Retain SIGN-P5 (Wellington Regional Stadium signs) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.41	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-P6	Support	Support	Retain SIGN-P6 (Airport Zone Signage) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.468	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-P6	Support	Signs are a common feature of Airports. Supports Policy SIGN-P6 as recognises that signage with the Airport Zone needs to be designed to be in keep with the character of the area and not create a traffic hazard.	Retain SIGN-P6 (Airport Zone Signage) as notified.
Massey University	253.4	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain SIGN-R1.1 (Official signs) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.164	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R1	Support	Supports the rule as it makes an allowance for the display of signage in all zones as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity where required or provided for under any statute or regulation or are otherwise related to aspects of public safety, in accordance with the definition of 'Official Signs'.	Retain SIGN-R1 as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.238	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R1	Support	Support rule as notified which provides for official signs as a permitted activity	Retain SIGN-R1 (Official signs) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.83	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R1	Support	Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.104	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R1	Support	SIGN-R1 is supported, subject to compliance with Standards. This is important in relation to the range of signage required for public safety at petroleum industry sites and branding associated with service stations.	Retain SIGN-R1 (Official signs) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.469	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R1	Oppose in part	Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SIGN-R1 (Official signs) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.470	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R1	Amend	Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SIGN-R1 (Official signs) is amended to exclude application in the Airport Zone. (Option A).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.471	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R1	Oppose in part	Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Delete SIGN-R1 (Official signs) in its entirety (Option B).
Massey University	253.5	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain SIGN-R2.1 (Temporary signs) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.239	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R2	Oppose	The submitter does not support temporary signs as a permitted activity on the state highway. Any temporary signs should require the approval of Waka Kotahi, Waka Kotahi suggest that SIGN-S10 is amended to exclude signs that are oriented to be read from state highway.	Seeks to amend SIGN-R2 (Temporary signs) to ensure that the rule does not apply to the state highway
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.472	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R2	Oppose in part	Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SIGN-R2 (Temporary Signage) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.473	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R2	Amend	Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SIGN-R2 (Temporary Signs) is amended to exclude application in the Airport Zone. (Option A).
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.474	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R2	Oppose in part	Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Delete SIGN-R2 (Temporary Signs) in its entirety. (Option B).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.17	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R3	Amend	<p>Submitter does not support the use of a default Restricted Discretionary activity status for digital signs.</p> <p>There is no justifiable rationale to classify digital signs in a different manner to static signs, noting that there are comprehensive standards proposed (see rows below) that control the scale, location, design and operation of all signs, and specific standards which apply to the manner in which digital signs are to be operated.</p> <p>With standards in place, the submitter considers that the Proposed Plan can make provision for digital signs as a permitted activity, within zones in which billboards are characteristically compatible. In doing so, the submitter considers that Rule SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) can be deleted, with standard SIGN-S8 being incorporated into Rules SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) and SIGN-R4 (Third party advertising).</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) to include reference to SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>i. SIGN-S1; ii. SIGN-S2; iii. SIGN-S3; iv. SIGN-S4; v. SIGN-S5; vi. SIGN-S7; vii. <u>SIGN-S8</u>; viii. SIGN-S9; and ix. SIGN-S11.</p> <p>2. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>i. <u>SIGN-S8</u>; and ii. SIGN-S14.</p>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.46	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R3	Oppose	<p>Waka Kotahi supports the wording of SIGN-R3 as notified, and considers it is appropriate to address digital billboards in a separate rule, and that digital signs require consent due to the range of adverse effects they may have on traffic safety (due primarily to potential glare and driver distraction).</p>	Disallow
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.17	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R3	Amend	<p>Submitter does not support the use of a default Restricted Discretionary activity status for digital signs.</p> <p>There is no justifiable rationale to classify digital signs in a different manner to static signs, noting that there are comprehensive standards proposed (see rows below) that control the scale, location, design and operation of all signs, and specific standards which apply to the manner in which digital signs are to be operated.</p> <p>With standards in place, the submitter considers that the Proposed Plan can make provision for digital signs as a permitted activity, within zones in which billboards are characteristically compatible. In doing so, the submitter considers that Rule SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) can be deleted, with standard SIGN-S8 being incorporated into Rules SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) and SIGN-R4 (Third party advertising).</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) to include reference to SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>i. SIGN-S1; ii. SIGN-S2; iii. SIGN-S3; iv. SIGN-S4; v. SIGN-S5; vi. SIGN-S7; vii. <u>SIGN-S8</u>; viii. SIGN-S9; and ix. SIGN-S11.</p> <p>2. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>i. <u>SIGN-S8</u>; and ii. SIGN-S14.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.42	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R3	Support in part	<p>Restaurant Brands is opposed to the cross reference to the Signs Design Guide within the Policy. The Design Guide does not appropriately recognise or provide for the requirements of activities.</p> <p>The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p> <p>The Design Guide imposes certain outcomes that are required to be achieved in every circumstances and results in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. The Signs Design Guide, and</p> <p>...</p>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.43	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R3	Support in part	<p>Support with amendment</p> <p>Opposed to the cross reference to the Signs Design Guide within the Policy. The Design Guide does not appropriately recognise or provide for the requirements of activities.</p> <p>The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p> <p>The Design Guide imposes certain outcomes that are required to be achieved in every circumstances and results in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R3 to remove the reference to the Signs Design Guide, as follows.</p> <p>3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of SIGN-R3.1 cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The matters in SIGN-P1, SIGN-P2, SIGN-P3 and SIGN-P6; and</p> <p>2. The Signs Design Guide, and</p> <p>3. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards.</p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.80	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R3	Amend	<p>Supports permitted activity status for signs, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, under SIGN-S1 and S2 a retirement village would be restricted to one sign of less than 1.5m2. Considers that this provision is not sufficient for wayfinding to a village.</p>	<p>Amend Sign-P1 so signs are not required to comply with all of the listed matters, particularly (4) and (7).</p>
Woolworths New Zealand	359.39	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R3	Amend	<p>Considers that the matters listed in SIGN-R3.3 refer to the Signs Design Guide which, while containing generally standard and well-established signage protocols, does introduce uncertainty and relatively broad scope on what should be a straightforward assessment with clear discretion parameters.</p>	<p>Seeks that SIGN-R3.3 (On-site signs) is clarified with a straightforward assessment and clear discretion parameters.</p>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.105	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R3	Support	<p>SIGN-R3 is supported, subject to compliance with Standards. This is important in relation to the range of signage required for public safety at petroleum industry sites and branding associated with service stations.</p>	<p>Retain SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) as notified.</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.475	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R3	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14.</p> <p>Considers that that while Rule SIGN-R3(3) is intended to apply to the Airport Zone, as drafted it does not engage the Airport Zone rules. An amendment is therefore required to Rule SIGN-R3(3)(a) to cross reference SIGN-R3.2.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) and seeks amendment.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.476	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R3	Amend	<p>Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14.</p> <p>Considers that that while Rule SIGN-R3(3) is intended to apply to the Airport Zone, as drafted it does not engage the Airport Zone rules. An amendment is therefore required to Rule SIGN-R3(3)(a) to cross reference SIGN-R3.2.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of SIGN-R3.1 or <u>SIGN-R3.2</u> cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The matters in SIGN-P1, SIGN-P2, SIGN-P3 and SIGN-P6; <u>and</u></p> <p>2. The Signs Design Guide; and</p> <p>3.</p> <p><u>The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards.</u></p> <p><u>(Option A).</u></p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.477	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R3	Amend	<p>Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14.</p> <p>Considers that that while Rule SIGN-R3(3) is intended to apply to the Airport Zone, as drafted it does not engage the Airport Zone rules. An amendment is therefore required to Rule SIGN-R3(3)(a) to cross reference SIGN-R3.2.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>If SIGN-R3 (On-site Signs) is not amended:</p> <p>Seeks that SIGN-R3 is amended to elude application in the Airport Zone.</p> <p>(Option B).</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.478	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R3	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14.</p> <p>Considers that that while Rule SIGN-R3(3) is intended to apply to the Airport Zone, as drafted it does not engage the Airport Zone rules. An amendment is therefore required to Rule SIGN-R3(3)(a) to cross reference SIGN-R3.2.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Delete SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) in its entirety. (Option C).</p>
Go Media Ltd	236.19	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	<p>[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]</p>	<p>Retain SIGN-R4 (Third-party signs) as notified with regard to the zones in which it applies to.</p>
Massey University	253.6	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	<p>[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]</p>	<p>Retain SIGN-R4.1 (Third-party signs) as notified.</p>
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.18	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	<p>Supports the permitted activity status applied to third party signs, where they are designed to comply with relevant standards. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means. 	<p>Seeks to retain SIGN-R4.1 (Third-party signs) as notified</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.19	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	<p>Supports SIGN-R4's permitted activity status for 'third-party signs' in the specified zones. Third party signs are a common element within commercial and industrial environments, as well as in other locations which have a zone which provides for particular activities (for example, airports, hospitals, etc.).</p> <p>Third-party signs can be readily designed, sited and operated to integrate with the characteristics of such environments, and a permitted activity status (which is subject to compliance with specified standards) is an appropriate and efficient method to provide for this outcome.</p>	Retain SIGN-R4.1 (Third-party signs) as notified.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.20	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	<p>Supports SIGN-R4's Restricted Discretionary activity status applying to third-party signs in commercial, industrial and 'special purpose' zones, where such signs infringe a relevant standard.</p> <p>The nature of the potential adverse effects resulting from an infringement with a standard can be readily predicted, and as such it is appropriate to limit the consideration of adverse effects.</p>	Retain SIGN-R4.2 (Third-party signs) as notified.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.21	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	Supports SIGN-R4's Discretionary activity status applying to third-party signs in other zones which are potentially more 'sensitive' to the adverse effects of such signage.	Retain SIGN-R4.3 (Third-party signs) as notified.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.22	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Amend	<p>Submitter does not support the use of a default Restricted Discretionary activity status for digital signs.</p> <p>There is no justifiable rationale to classify digital signs in a different manner to static signs, noting that there are comprehensive standards proposed (see rows below) that control the scale, location, design and operation of all signs, and specific standards which apply to the manner in which digital signs are to be operated.</p> <p>With standards in place, the submitter considers that the Proposed Plan can make provision for digital signs as a permitted activity, within zones in which billboards are characteristically compatible. In doing so, the submitter considers that Rule SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) can be deleted, with standard SIGN-S8 being incorporated into Rules SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) and SIGN-R4 (Third party advertising).</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R4 (Third-party signs) to include SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>i. SIGN-S1; ii. SIGN-S2; iii. SIGN-S3; iv. SIGN-S4; v. SIGN-S5; vi. SIGN-S6; vii. SIGN-S7; viii. <u>SIGN-S8</u>; ix. SIGN-S9; x. SIGN-S11; and xi. SIGN-S14.</p>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.47	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Oppose	Waka Kotahi supports the wording of SIGN-R4 as notified, and consider it is appropriate to address digital billboards in a separate rule, and that digital signs require consent due to the range of adverse effects they may have on traffic safety (due primarily to potential glare and driver distraction).	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.23	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Amend	<p>Submitter does not support the use of a default Restricted Discretionary activity status for digital signs.</p> <p>There is no justifiable rationale to classify digital signs in a different manner to static signs, noting that there are comprehensive standards proposed (see rows below) that control the scale, location, design and operation of all signs, and specific standards which apply to the manner in which digital signs are to be operated.</p> <p>With standards in place, the submitter considers that the Proposed Plan can make provision for digital signs as a permitted activity, within zones in which billboards are characteristically compatible. In doing so, the submitter considers that Rule SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) can be deleted, with standard SIGN-S8 being incorporated into Rules SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) and SIGN-R4 (Third party advertising).</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R4 (Third-party signs) as follows:</p> <p>2. . Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance cannot be achieved with the requirements of SIGN-R4.1.a.i. to SIGN-R4.1.a.xi (excluding SIGN-R4.1.a.xi and SIGN-R4.1.7).</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The matters in SIGN-P1, SIGN-P2, SIGN-P3 and SIGN-P6; <u>and</u></p> <p>2. The Signs Design Guide; and</p> <p>3. 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards.</p>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.18	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	<p>Supports the permitted activity status applied to third party signs, where they are designed to comply with relevant standards. The submitter supports these provisions because the submitter considers that they will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means. 	<p>Seeks to retain SIGN-R4.1 (Third-party signs) as notified</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.19	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	<p>Supports SIGN-R4's permitted activity status for 'third-party signs' in the specified zones. Third party signs are a common element within commercial and industrial environments, as well as in other locations which have a zone which provides for particular activities (for example, airports, hospitals, etc.).</p> <p>Third-party signs can be readily designed, sited and operated to integrate with the characteristics of such environments, and a permitted activity status (which is subject to compliance with specified standards) is an appropriate and efficient method to provide for this outcome.</p>	<p>Retain SIGN-R4.1 (Third-party signs) as notified.</p>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.20	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	<p>Supports SIGN-R4's Restricted Discretionary activity status applying to third-party signs in commercial, industrial and 'special purpose' zones, where such signs infringe a relevant standard.</p> <p>The nature of the potential adverse effects resulting from an infringement with a standard can be readily predicted, and as such it is appropriate to limit the consideration of adverse effects.</p>	<p>Retain SIGN-R4.2 (Third-party signs) as notified.</p>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.21	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Support	<p>Supports SIGN-R4's Discretionary activity status applying to third-party signs in other zones which are potentially more 'sensitive' to the adverse effects of such signage.</p>	<p>Retain SIGN-R4.3 (Third-party signs) as notified.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.22	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Amend	<p>Submitter does not support the use of a default Restricted Discretionary activity status for digital signs.</p> <p>There is no justifiable rationale to classify digital signs in a different manner to static signs, noting that there are comprehensive standards proposed (see rows below) that control the scale, location, design and operation of all signs, and specific standards which apply to the manner in which digital signs are to be operated.</p> <p>With standards in place, the submitter considers that the Proposed Plan can make provision for digital signs as a permitted activity, within zones in which billboards are characteristically compatible. In doing so, the submitter considers that Rule SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) can be deleted, with standard SIGN-S8 being incorporated into Rules SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) and SIGN-R4 (Third party advertising).</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R4 (Third-party signs) to include SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. SIGN-S1; ii. SIGN-S2; iii. SIGN-S3; iv. SIGN-S4; v. SIGN-S5; vi. SIGN-S6; vii. SIGN-S7; viii. SIGN-S8; ix. SIGN-S9; x. SIGN-S11; and xi. SIGN-S14.</p>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.23	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R4	Amend	<p>Submitter does not support the use of a default Restricted Discretionary activity status for digital signs.</p> <p>There is no justifiable rationale to classify digital signs in a different manner to static signs, noting that there are comprehensive standards proposed (see rows below) that control the scale, location, design and operation of all signs, and specific standards which apply to the manner in which digital signs are to be operated.</p> <p>With standards in place, the submitter considers that the Proposed Plan can make provision for digital signs as a permitted activity, within zones in which billboards are characteristically compatible. In doing so, the submitter considers that Rule SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) can be deleted, with standard SIGN-S8 being incorporated into Rules SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) and SIGN-R4 (Third party advertising).</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R4 (Third-party signs) as follows:</p> <p>2. . Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance cannot be achieved with the requirements of SIGN-R4.1.a.i. to SIGN-R4.1.a.xi (excluding SIGN-R4.1.a.xi and SIGN-S14.7).</p> <p>Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in SIGN-P1, SIGN-P2, SIGN-P3 and SIGN-P6; 2. The Signs Design Guide; and 3. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard and the matters as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards.</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.479	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R4	Oppose	<p>Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14.</p> <p>Considers that the non-complying activity status, as set out in Rule SIGN(4) for the Miramar South Precinct and the associated notification clause is inappropriate in the context of an Airport Zone and has not been adequately justified in terms of section 32 of the RMA and is inconsistent with SIGN P6. WIAL also notes that the only other signage with a similar status relates to digital signage with the sensitive land use zones such as residential, open space and rural zones. No other signage provisions are subject to a similar notification clause.</p> <p>Considers that that a restricted discretionary activity status for non-compliance with SIGN-S14.7 (insofar as they relate to third party signage) would be more appropriate and that the notification clause should be deleted, with the necessity or otherwise of public notification assessed under the notification provisions of the RMA.</p> <p>[See paragraph 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes SIGN-R4 (Third party signs) and seeks amendment.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.480	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R4	Oppose	<p>Opposes these rules to the extent that they cross reference SIGN-S14.</p> <p>Considers that the non-complying activity status, as set out in Rule SIGN(4) for the Miramar South Precinct and the associated notification clause is inappropriate in the context of an Airport Zone and has not been adequately justified in terms of section 32 of the RMA and is inconsistent with SIGN P6. WIAL also notes that the only other signage with a similar status relates to digital signage with the sensitive land use zones such as residential, open space and rural zones. No other signage provisions are subject to a similar notification clause.</p> <p>Considers that that a restricted discretionary activity status for non-compliance with SIGN-S14.7 (insofar as they relate to third party signage) would be more appropriate and that the notification clause should be deleted, with the necessity or otherwise of public notification assessed under the notification provisions of the RMA.</p> <p>[See paragraph 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes SIGN-R4 (Third party signs) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.481	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R4	Amend	Requests deletion of RULE SIGN-R4.4	Delete SIGN-R4.4 (Third-party signs), non-complying activity status.
Go Media Ltd	236.20	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R5	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain Restricted Discretionary status in SIGN-R5 (Digital Signs) as notified, if the Proposed District Plan retains separate rules for digital signs..
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.24	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R5	Oppose	<p>Opposes the discretionary activity status for digital signs which do not comply with any relevant standard. The submitter opposes this provision because the submitter considers that they will not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means. 	Opposes the Restricted Discretionary activity status at SIGN-R5 (Digital Signs) for signs that are designed and operated to comply with relevant standards.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.25	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R5	Oppose	<p>Submitter does not support the use of a default Restricted Discretionary activity status for digital signs.</p> <p>There is no justifiable rationale to classify digital signs in a different manner to static signs, noting that there are comprehensive standards proposed (see rows below) that control the scale, location, design and operation of all signs, and specific standards which apply to the manner in which digital signs are to be operated.</p> <p>With standards in place, the submitter considers that the Proposed Plan can make provision for digital signs as a permitted activity, within zones in which billboards are characteristically compatible. In doing so, the submitter considers that Rule SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) can be deleted, with standard SIGN-S8 being incorporated into Rules SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) and SIGN-R4 (Third party advertising).</p>	Delete SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) in its entirety.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.48	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R5	Oppose	Waka Kotahi supports having a separate rule for digital signage, and considers it appropriate that it be a restricted discretionary activity due to the range of adverse effects they may have on traffic safety (due primarily to potential glare and driver distraction).	Disallow
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.24	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R5	Oppose	<p>Opposes the discretionary activity status for digital signs which do not comply with any relevant standard. The submitter opposes this provision because the submitter considers that they will not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means. 	Opposes the Restricted Discretionary activity status at SIGN-R5 (Digital Signs) for signs that are designed and operated to comply with relevant standards.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.25	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R5	Oppose	<p>Submitter does not support the use of a default Restricted Discretionary activity status for digital signs.</p> <p>There is no justifiable rationale to classify digital signs in a different manner to static signs, noting that there are comprehensive standards proposed (see rows below) that control the scale, location, design and operation of all signs, and specific standards which apply to the manner in which digital signs are to be operated.</p> <p>With standards in place, the submitter considers that the Proposed Plan can make provision for digital signs as a permitted activity, within zones in which billboards are characteristically compatible. In doing so, the submitter considers that Rule SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) can be deleted, with standard SIGN-S8 being incorporated into Rules SIGN-R3 (On-site signs) and SIGN-R4 (Third party advertising).</p>	Delete SIGN-R5 (Digital signs) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.44	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R5	Oppose	<p>Oppose</p> <p>Restaurant Brands' menu boards are digital, and despite being small scale in nature and typically located to the rear of the drive-through restaurant activity, will require resource consent in every instance. Such a requirement is inefficient and unduly onerous.</p> <p>Restaurant Brands is opposed to the cross reference to the Signs Design Guide within the Policy. The Design Guide does not appropriately recognise or provide for the requirements of activities.</p> <p>The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p> <p>The Design Guide imposes certain outcomes that are required to be achieved in every circumstances and results in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R5 (Digital Signs) as follows:</p> <p>SIGN-R3 On-site signs</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>i. ...</p> <p>... <i>vii</i> SIGN-S8; <i>viii</i> SIGN-S9; and <i>viii</i> <i>ix</i> SIGN-S11</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.482	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R5	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes SIGN-R5 insofar as it relates to the Airport Zone.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes SIGN-R5 (Digital Signs) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.483	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R5	Amend	<p>Opposes SIGN-R5 insofar as it relates to the Airport Zone.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R5 (Digital Signs) as follows:</p> <p>Seeks that SIGN-R5 is amended to make digital signage controlled within the Airport Zone where it complies with the relevant standards. (Option A).</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.484	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-R5	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes SIGN-R5 insofar as it relates to the Airport Zone.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete SIGN-R5 (Digital Signs) in its entirety. (Option B).
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.45	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R6	Support in part	<p>Support with amendment</p> <p>Opposed to the cross reference to the Signs Design Guide within the Policy. The Design Guide does not appropriately recognise or provide for the requirements of activities.</p> <p>The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p> <p>The Design Guide imposes certain outcomes that are required to be achieved in every circumstances and results in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R6 (Signs on heritage buildings, heritage structures and their sites, or on a site within a heritage area) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. The Signs Design Guide and the Heritage Design Guide.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.46	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R6	Support in part	Support with amendment Opposed to the cross reference to the Signs Design Guide within the Policy. The Design Guide does not appropriately recognise or provide for the requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide imposes certain outcomes that are required to be achieved in every circumstances and results in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Amend SIGN-R6 (Signs within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site or site of significance to Māori) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 2. The Signs Design Guide and the Heritage Design Guide.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.47	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R7	Support in part	Support with amendment Opposed to the cross reference to the Signs Design Guide within the Policy. The Design Guide does not appropriately recognise or provide for the requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide imposes certain outcomes that are required to be achieved in every circumstances and results in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Amend SIGN-R7 (Signs within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site or site of significance to Māori) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 2. The Signs Design Guide and the Heritage Design Guide.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.89	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R7	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that SIGN-R7 (Signs within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site or site of significance to Māori) is amended to include proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.90	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R7	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks amendments to matters of discretion to include engagement with Taranaki Whānui. [Inferred decision requested]
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.48	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R8	Support	Support	Retain SIGN-R8 (All other signs) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.240	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R8	Support	Support activity status of discretionary for signs not provided for.	Retain SIGN-R8 (All other signs) as notified.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.5	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R8	Support	In Lumo's opinion, a discretionary activity status is appropriate for any sign not otherwise provided for. Such an activity status allows any relevant effect to be appropriately assessed.	Allow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.5	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-R8	Support	In OOHMAA's opinion, a discretionary activity status is appropriate for any sign not otherwise provided for. Such an activity status allows any relevant effect to be appropriately assessed.	Allow
Go Media Ltd	236.21	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	Considers that the 5m2 area of a single sign in the NCZ, LCZ, NCZ zones could have a significant limitation on the ability of business owners to display signs and also limit the ability of a business or building owner to generate additional income from third party signage without the requirement for a resource consent.	Seeks that the 5m2 area limit on signs in SIGN-S1.1.c.i (Maximum area of any sign (Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Commercial Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone) is increased. [Inferred decision requested]
Go Media Ltd	236.22	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	Considers that there is no evidence that signs of 5m2 or larger is more dangerous for traffic.	Seeks that the 5m2 area limit on signs in SIGN-S1.1.f.i (Maximum area of any sign (facing the State Highway Network)) is increased. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Massey University	253.7	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Support in part	Supports the provision but considers that signage in the Tertiary Education Zone has been excluded.	Retain SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) with amendment.
Massey University	253.8	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	Considers that signage in the Tertiary Education Zone has been excluded, so it is recommended that it is added to Standard SIGN-S1(1)(b).	Amend SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) as follows: ... b. City Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone General Industrial Zone <u>Tertiary Education Zone</u>
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.26	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Support in part	Supports SIGN-S1 in part.	Retain SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) with amendments.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.27	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	Submitter generally supports Standard SIGN-S1, with the exception of the control which applies in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and to signs facing a State Highway. The submitter considers that the characteristics of the Metropolitan Centre zone are comparable to those of the City Centre and Mixed Use Zones, in that the Metropolitan Centre zone anticipates and provides for a broad range of activities and a high scale of development. Notably, these zones all anticipate a mix of activities, including residential activity. Accordingly, the submitter submits that the standards for signs within these zones should be consistent.	Amend SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) as follows: 1. The following maximum sign areas for any sign must be complied with: ... b. City Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone General Industrial Zone <u>Metropolitan Centre Zone</u> i. The area of a single sign must not exceed 20m2. c. Neighbourhood Centre Zone Local Centre Zone Commercial Zone Metropolitan Centre Zone . i. The area of a single sign must not exceed 5m2. ...
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.28	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	Submitter generally supports Standard SIGN-S1, with the exception of the control which applies in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and to signs facing a State Highway. The submitter considers that there is no justifiable rationale for applying different standards to the design of signs which face a State Highway, compared with signs which face a local road.	Amend SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) as follows: 1. The following maximum sign areas for any sign must be complied with: ... f. Signs facing the State Highway Network i. The area of a single sign must not exceed 5m2. ...
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.26	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Support in part	Supports SIGN-S1 in part.	Retain SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) with amendments.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.27	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	Submitter generally supports Standard SIGN-S1, with the exception of the control which applies in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and to signs facing a State Highway. The submitter considers that the characteristics of the Metropolitan Centre zone are comparable to those of the City Centre and Mixed Use Zones, in that the Metropolitan Centre zone anticipates and provides for a broad range of activities and a high scale of development. Notably, these zones all anticipate a mix of activities, including residential activity. Accordingly, the submitter submits that the standards for signs within these zones should be consistent.	Amend SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) as follows: 1. The following maximum sign areas for any sign must be complied with: ... b. City Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone General Industrial Zone <u>Metropolitan Centre Zone</u> i. The area of a single sign must not exceed 20m2. c. Neighbourhood Centre Zone Local Centre Zone Commercial Zone Metropolitan Centre Zone . i. The area of a single sign must not exceed 5m2. ...
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.28	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	Submitter generally supports Standard SIGN-S1, with the exception of the control which applies in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and to signs facing a State Highway. The submitter considers that there is no justifiable rationale for applying different standards to the design of signs which face a State Highway, compared with signs which face a local road.	Amend SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) as follows: 1. The following maximum sign areas for any sign must be complied with: ... f. Signs facing the State Highway Network i. The area of a single sign must not exceed 5m2. ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.49	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Oppose	Oppose The permitted standard does not provide for the reasonable needs of Restaurant Brands' activities, are impracticable and too onerous in the context of the scale and form of development that is enabled to occur by the District Plan, and will result in too many signs requiring resource consent.	Amend SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) as follows: c. Neighbourhood Centre Zone i. the area of a single sign must not exceed 5m² <u>10m²</u> . Local Centre Zone Commercial Zone Metropolitan Centre Zone ... f. Signs facing the State Highway Network i. The area of a single sign must not exceed 5m² <u>10m²</u> .
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.81	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Oppose in part	Supports permitted activity status for signs, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, under SIGN-S1 and S2 a retirement village would be restricted to one sign of less than 1.5m2. Considers that this provision is not sufficient for wayfinding to a village.	Opposes SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.82	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	Supports permitted activity status for signs, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, under SIGN-S1 and S2 a retirement village would be restricted to one sign of less than 1.5m2. Considers that this provision is not sufficient for wayfinding to a village.	Amend SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) to provide for two signs up to 3m2 per site for retirement villages.
Waka Kotahi	370.241	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Support in part	Supports 5m2 maximum area for signs oriented to be read from the state highway network and seeks amendment.	Retain SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any signs) with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.6	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Oppose	Lumo opposes the relief sought, insofar as it is inconsistent with the relief sought by Lumo's primary submission.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.6	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes the relief sought, insofar as it is inconsistent with the relief sought by OOHMAA's primary submission.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.242	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	The submitter prefers the wording 'oriented to be read from' rather than 'facing' the state highway as it is clearer. Therefore request that the wording is amended accordingly	Amend SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any signs) as follows: 1. The following maximum sign areas for any sign must be complied with: ... f. signs oriented to be read from facing the State Highway Network
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.7	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Oppose	In its primary submission, Lumo has sought to delete Rule SIGN-S1.1.f. Lumo opposes the relief sought by Waka Kotahi to amend this rule.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.7	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Oppose	In its primary submission, OOHMAA has sought to delete Rule SIGN-S1.1.f. OOHMAA opposes the relief sought by Waka Kotahi to amend this rule.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.139	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Oppose in part	No provision for Special Purpose Port Zone in standard. This should be treated the same as The City Centre and General Industrial Zones.	Opposes SIGN-S1 (Maximum area of any sign) and seeks amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.140	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S1	Amend	No provision for Special Purpose Port Zone in standard. This should be treated the same as The City Centre and General Industrial Zones.	Amend SIGN-S1.1.b (Maximum area of any sign) as follows: b. City Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone General Industrial Zone <u>Special Purpose Port Zone</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Go Media Ltd	236.23	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Amend	<p>Considers that the maximum sign area in the commercial and mixed-use zones under standard SIGN-S2.b is not evidence-based.</p> <p>The proposed 10% maximum total area of signs does not recognise the fact that sign area is just one factor in visual amenity and could have a significant limitation on the ability of business owners to display signs, for instance within Cuba Street where there are some single level buildings.</p> <p>It will also limit the ability of a business or building owner to generate additional income from third party signage without the requirement for a resource consent.</p> <p>The shape, framing and way in which the sign integrates into a building façade are some additional factors that affect the visual impact of billboards.</p>	<p>Seeks that the maximum sign area in SIGN-S2.b (Maximum total area of signs) is increased.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Go Media Ltd	236.24	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Amend	<p>Considers that the term "Facing" at SIGN-S2 is undefined and is open to interpretation.</p> <p>A sign angled away, but still with some area visible, from a State Highway may be considered under this standard despite the visual effects being significantly different.</p>	Clarify the meaning of "Facing" in SIGN-S2.1.e (Maximum total area of signs).
Go Media Ltd	236.25	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Not specified	Considers SIGN-S2.1.e is unreasonable because the angle of a sign is not sufficient to cause an adverse effect. Distance to a sign is also a significant factor in the visual effect of a sign.	Not specified.
Massey University	253.9	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Support in part	Supports the provision but considers that signage in the Tertiary Education Zone has been excluded.	Retain SIGN-S2 (Maximum total area of signs) with amendment.
Massey University	253.10	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Amend	Considers that signage in the Tertiary Education Zone has been excluded, so it is recommended that it is added to Standard SIGN-S2(1)(b).	<p>Amend SIGN-S2 (Maximum total area of signs) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>b. City Centre Zone Neighbourhood Centre Zone Local Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone Commercial Zone General Industrial Zone <u>Tertiary Education Zone.</u></p> <p>...</p>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.50	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Oppose	The permitted standard does not provide for the reasonable needs of Restaurant Brands' activities, are impracticable and too onerous in the context of the scale and form of development that is enabled to occur by the District Plan, and will result in too many signs requiring resource consent.	<p>Amend SIGN-S2 (Maximum total area of signs) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>c. City Centre Zone Neighbourhood Centre Zone Local Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone Commercial Zone General Industrial Zone</p> <p>i. The maximum total area of signage affixed to an elevation of a building or structure must not exceed 10% <u>20%</u> of the total area of the elevation.</p> <p>...</p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.83	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Oppose in part	Supports permitted activity status for signs, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, under SIGN-S1 and S2 a retirement village would be restricted to one sign of less than 1.5m2. Considers that this provision is not sufficient for wayfinding to a village.	Opposes SIGN-S2 (Maximum total area of signs) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.84	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Amend	Supports permitted activity status for signs, but considers the applicable standards are too restrictive. For example, under SIGN-S1 and S2 a retirement village would be restricted to one sign of less than 1.5m2. Considers that this provision is not sufficient for wayfinding to a village.	Amend SIGN-S2 (Maximum total area of signs) to provide for two signs up to 3m2 per site for retirement villages.
Waka Kotahi	370.243	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Support in part	Support 5m2 maximum area for signs oriented to be read from the state highway network and seeks amendment.	Retain SIGN-S2 (Maximum area of any signs) with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.8	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Oppose	Lumo opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.8	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.244	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Amend	The submitter prefers the wording 'oriented to be read from' rather than 'facing' the state highway as it is clearer. Therefore request that the wording is amended accordingly	Amend SIGN-S2 (Maximum number of signs) as follows: 1. The following maximum total area of signs per site must be complied with: ... e. signs <u>oriented to be read from</u> facing the State Highway Network, <u>including on-ramps and off-ramps</u>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.9	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Oppose	Lumo opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.9	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.141	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Oppose in part	No provision for Special Purpose Port Zone in standard. This should be treated the same as The City Centre and General Industrial Zones.	Opposes SIGN-S2 (Maximum total area of signs) and seeks amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.142	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S2	Amend	No provision for Special Purpose Port Zone in standard. This should be treated the same as The City Centre and General Industrial Zones.	Amend SIGN-S2.1.b (Maximum total area of signs) as follows: b. City Centre Zone Neighbourhood Centre Zone Local Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone Commercial Zone General Industrial Zone <u>Special Purpose Port Zone</u>
Go Media Ltd	236.26	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S4	Amend	Considers that the 4m maximum height for a freestanding sign in the NCZ, LCZ and MCZ is unduly restrictive given the existing urban form of some of these areas and the permitted building heights within them. For example, Rule 6.8.4.1.1 P15(b) of the Christchurch District Plan applies a maximum height limit of 9m. Further, the rule is overly restrictive when the new residential intensification measures allow building heights of more than 90m in some Central City areas.	Seeks that the height limit standards for free-standing signs in the commercial, mixed-use and industrial zones (SIGN-S4(a) and (b)) (Maximum height of free-standing signs) are increased.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Massey University	253.11	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S4	Support in part	Supports the provision but considers that signage in the Tertiary Education Zone has been excluded.	Retain SIGN-S4 (Maximum height of freestanding signs) with amendment: ... b. Commercial Zone General Industrial Zone <u>Tertiary Education Zone</u>
Massey University	253.12	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S4	Amend	Considers that signage in the Tertiary Education Zone has been excluded, so it is recommended that it is added to Standard SIGN-S4(1)(b).	Amend SIGN-S4 (Maximum height of freestanding signs) as follows: ... b. Commercial Zone General Industrial Zone <u>Tertiary Education Zone</u>
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.29	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S4	Amend	<p>The submitter considers that for the reasons set out in Row 3 of their submission [refer to original submission for full reasons], the standards which apply to signs in the Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, City Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centre Zone should be consistent, as these zones share similar characteristics with regards to the nature and mix of activities that are anticipated, and the scale of development that is provided for.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the height of signs within the Mixed Use Zone, City Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centre zone is more appropriately limited to 8m (as is to apply to the Commercial Zone), as opposed to the proposed 4m height control (which applies to more 'sensitive' environments/zones). The submitter considers that such a height is consistent with the provision for free-standing signs in the Central Area Zone in the Operative Wellington District Plan, which has appropriately managed the scale of signage.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-S4 (Maximum height of freestanding signs) as follows:</p> <p>1. The following maximum sign areas for any sign must be complied with:</p> <p>a. ... Metropolitan Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone Open Space Zone City Centre Zone</p> <p>b. ... <u>City Centre Zone</u> <u>Metropolitan Centre Zone</u> <u>Mixed Use Zone</u></p>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.29	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S4	Amend	<p>The submitter considers that for the reasons set out in Row 3 of their submission [refer to original submission for full reasons], the standards which apply to signs in the Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, City Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centre Zone should be consistent, as these zones share similar characteristics with regards to the nature and mix of activities that are anticipated, and the scale of development that is provided for.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the height of signs within the Mixed Use Zone, City Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centre zone is more appropriately limited to 8m (as is to apply to the Commercial Zone), as opposed to the proposed 4m height control (which applies to more 'sensitive' environments/zones). The submitter considers that such a height is consistent with the provision for free-standing signs in the Central Area Zone in the Operative Wellington District Plan, which has appropriately managed the scale of signage.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-S4 (Maximum height of freestanding signs) as follows:</p> <p>1. The following maximum sign areas for any sign must be complied with:</p> <p>a. ... Metropolitan Centre Zone Mixed Use Zone Open Space Zone City Centre Zone</p> <p>b. ... <u>City Centre Zone</u> <u>Metropolitan Centre Zone</u> <u>Mixed Use Zone</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.40	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S4	Amend	Considers that the proposed 4m height restriction in the Centre Zones is more restrictive in terms of permitted area and thresholds than the existing District Plan provisions and should be amended to 8m. Signage should be of a scale commensurate to enabled building height to ensure an appropriate relationship between the structures. Given heights in all CMUZ are increasing under the PDP, the height of signage should not be reduced. Signage should be considered acceptable in commercial zones in principle, with some limitation on size and location where it may adversely affect sensitive areas, including heritage, character or residential areas.	Amend SIGN-S4 (Maximum height of freestanding signs) as follows: ... Limit: The maximum height of any freestanding sign must not exceed 4m <u>8m</u> .
CentrePort Limited	402.143	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S4	Oppose in part	No provision for Special Purpose Port Zone in standard. This should be treated the same as General Industrial Zones.	Opposes SIGN-S4 (Maximum height of freestanding signs) and seeks amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.144	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S4	Amend	No provision for Special Purpose Port Zone in standard. This should be treated the same as General Industrial Zones.	Amend SIGN-S4.1.b (Maximum height of freestanding signs) as follows: b. Commercial Zone General Industrial Zone <u>Special Purpose Port Zone</u>
Go Media Ltd	236.27	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Amend	Considers that "Plain Wall Surface" in SIGN-S5.1 is open to interpretation.	Clarify "Plain Wall Surface" meaning in SIGN-S5.1 (Maximum height of free-standing signs).
Go Media Ltd	236.28	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Amend	Considers that the meaning of "Facing" and "Visible" in SIGN-S5.4 is open to interpretation.	Clarify the meaning of "Facing" and "Visible" in SIGN-S5.4 (Maximum height of free-standing signs)
Go Media Ltd	236.29	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Not specified	Considers that the restriction on internally illuminated signs in SIGN-S5 is without evidential basis. External lighting may be significantly brighter or more distracting than internally illuminated signs. Measurable variables such as lux spill are a more appropriate quantitative method of measurement. Given the suggested matters of discretion include 'The impact of the sign on traffic, pedestrian and cycling safety' there is not any apparent advantage to elevating internally illuminated signs which faces the state highway network, or is visible from any intersection with the state highway' to being discretionary.	Not specified.
Massey University	253.13	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structures) as notified.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.30	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Amend	The submitter considers that for the reasons set out in Row 3 of their submission [refer to original submission for full reasons], they do not support rules or standards which seek to manage the design or luminance of signs which face a State Highway, as compared to the manner in which signs facing other roads are to be managed.	Amend SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) as follows: Signs located on a building or structure 1. The sign must only be displayed on plain wall surfaces or fences. 2. The sign must not obscure windows or architectural features. 3. The sign must not project above the highest part of the building or structure. 4. Where the sign is facing the state highway network, or is visible from any intersection with the state highway, the sign must not be internally illuminated.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.30	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Amend	The submitter considers that for the reasons set out in Row 3 of their submission [refer to original submission for full reasons], they do not support rules or standards which seek to manage the design or luminance of signs which face a State Highway, as compared to the manner in which signs facing other roads are to be managed.	Amend SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) as follows: Signs located on a building or structure 1. The sign must only be displayed on plain wall surfaces or fences. 2. The sign must not obscure windows or architectural features. 3. The sign must not project above the highest part of the building or structure. 4. Where the sign is facing the state highway network, or is visible from any intersection with the state highway, the sign must not be internally illuminated.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.51	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Oppose	Oppose The restriction on illuminated signs that face the state highway network, or are visible from any intersection with the state highway, is impracticable and too onerous [within] the context of the nature of development that is enabled to occur by the District Plan, and will result in too many signs requiring resource consent.	Amend SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) as follows: ... 4. Where the sign is facing the state highway network, or is visible from any intersection with the state highway, the sign must not be internally illuminated.
Waka Kotahi	370.245	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Support in part	The submitter supports controls on illumination for any signage visible from the state highway, requests amendments to the wording.	Not specified.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.10	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Oppose	Lumo opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.10	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.246	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Amend	The submitter prefers the wording 'oriented to be read from' rather than 'facing' the state highway as it is clearer. Therefore request that the wording is amended accordingly	Amend SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) as follows: ... 4. Where the sign <u>oriented to be read from</u> facing the State Highway Network, <u>including on-ramps and off-ramps</u> , or is visible from any intersection with the state highway, the sign must not be internally illuminated.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.11	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Oppose	Lumo opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway. In its primary submission, Lumo has requested that Rule SIGN-S5.4 be deleted.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.11	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S5	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway. In its primary submission, OOHMAA has requested that Rule SIGN-S5.4 be deleted.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.485	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S5	Oppose	Opposes SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) insofar as it relates to the Airport Zone. Considers that many airport buildings are utilitarian in appearance due to their operational or functional requirements. Signs can therefore enhance the facade and appearance of the building. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.486	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S5	Amend	Opposes SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) insofar as it relates to the Airport Zone. Considers that many airport buildings are utilitarian in appearance due to their operational or functional requirements. Signs can therefore enhance the facade and appearance of the building. [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) is amended to exclude its application to the Airport Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.247	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S6	Support in part	SIGN-S6 is supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain SIGN-S6 (Verandah Signs) with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.12	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S6	Oppose	Lumo opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.12	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S6	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.248	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S6	Amend	Considers that as with SIGN-S5, there should be similar controls on illumination for Verandah signs that are oriented to be read from the State Highway network.	Amend SIGN-S6 (Verandah Signs) as follows: ... <u>4. Where the sign oriented to be read from facing the State Highway Network, including on-ramps and off-ramps, or is visible from any intersection with the state highway, the sign must not be internally illuminated.</u>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S6	Oppose	Lumo opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S6	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Paul Van Houtte	92.7	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Amend	Considers that digitally internally illuminated signs for commercial purposes should not be permitted in Wellington or at least not visible from any road. They are distracting, compromise amenity values and are highly imposing as they are difficult to ignore.	Seeks that SIGN-S7 (Traffic Safety) is amended to prevent digital signs being visible from any road. [inferred decision requested]
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.31	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Support in part	Supports SIGN-S7 in part. The submitter supports the intention to apply standards to manage the potential traffic safety effects from signs.	Retain SIGN-S7 (Traffic safety) with amendments.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.32	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Amend	Considers that SIGN-S7 which seeks to require minimum setback distances between signs which are within 10m of a legal road is too onerous and impracticable to comply with, particularly in urban environments where the density and 'spacing' of commercial activities will invariably result in closely spaced signage, and will lead to inefficient resource consent processes.	Amend SIGN-S7 (Traffic safety) as follows: Traffic Safety <u>1. Where any sign is located adjacent to any road, the sign, including the operation of any electronic display, must not contain any flashing or moving lights.</u> <u>2. Where any sign is located within 100m of an intersection and visible from a legal road, the sign, including the operation of any electronic display, must only contain static messaging and images.</u> ... Table 11 - SIGN: Minimum lettering heights ... 7. All signs within 10m of a legal road must comply with the minimum setback distances from other signs in Table 12 – SIGN: Minimum Separation Distances from Other Signs below. Table 12 – SIGN: Minimum separation distances from other signs Speed limit of road (KM/H) – Minimum separation distance (m) 0-70 50-71 80-100 >80-200
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.31	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Support in part	Supports SIGN-S7 in part. The submitter supports the intention to apply standards to manage the potential traffic safety effects from signs.	Retain SIGN-S7 (Traffic safety) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.32	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Amend	Considers that SIGN-S7 which seeks to require minimum setback distances between signs which are within 10m of a legal road is too onerous and impracticable to comply with, particularly in urban environments where the density and 'spacing' of commercial activities will invariably result in closely spaced signage, and will lead to inefficient resource consent processes.	Amend SIGN-S7 (Traffic safety) as follows: 1. Where any sign is located adjacent to any road, the sign, <u>including the operation of any electronic display</u> , must not contain any flashing or moving lights. 2. Where any sign is located within 100m of an intersection and visible from a legal road, the sign, <u>including the operation of any electronic display</u> , must only contain static messaging and images. ... Table 11 - SIGN: Minimum lettering heights ... 7. All signs within 10m of a legal road must comply with the minimum setback distances from other signs in Table 12 – SIGN: Minimum Separation Distances from Other Signs below. Table 12 – SIGN: Minimum separation distances from other signs Speed limit of road (KM/H) – Minimum separation distance (m) 0-70 50 71-80 100 >80 200.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.52	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Oppose	Oppose The minimum separation distances between signs are impracticable and too onerous in an urban environment and will result in too many signs requiring resource consent.	Amend SIGN-S7 (Traffic Safety) as follows: ... 7. All signs within 10m of a legal road must comply with the minimum setback distances from other signs in Table 12 – SIGN: Minimum Separation Distances from Other Signs below. [Delete Table 12 - SIGN: Minimum Separation Distances from Other Signs in its entirety]
Waka Kotahi	370.249	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Support in part	SIGN-S7 is supported as it includes standards relating to traffic safety, but amendments are sought.	Retain SIGN-S7 (Traffic safety) with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.14	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Oppose	Lumo opposes the amendments sought by the submission. The submission seeks adjustments to Standard SIGN-S7, which have the effect of restricting the types of signs which are orientated to be read from a state highway to static signs only (and not digital signs). In its submission, Waka Kotahi states "Standard S7.2 is unclear – Waka Kotahi understands this to mean that digital signs are not permitted within 100m of an intersection, which is supported and is consistent with the targets in the RLPT. If this is the intention, this should be reflected in SIGN-S8.1" Lumo does not agree that the intent of Standard SIGN-S7 is to restrict digital signs which are located within 100m of an intersection. Rather, the standard is intended to manage particular types of content (such as flashing or moving lights, or moving images). The amendments sought by the submission are not appropriate or necessary relative to the purpose of the standard.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.14	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes the amendments sought by the submission. The submission seeks adjustments to Standard SIGN-S7, which have the effect of restricting the types of signs which are orientated to be read from a state highway to static signs only (and not digital signs). In its submission, Waka Kotahi states "Standard S7.2 is unclear – Waka Kotahi understands this to mean that digital signs are not permitted within 100m of an intersection, which is supported and is consistent with the targets in the RLTP. If this is the intention, this should be reflected in SIGN-S8.1" OOHMAA does not agree that the intent of Standard SIGN-S7 is to restrict digital signs which are located within 100m of an intersection. Rather, the standard is intended to manage particular types of content (such as flashing or moving lights, or moving images). The amendments sought by the submission are not appropriate or necessary relative to the purpose of the standard.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.250	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Amend	Considers Standard S7.2 is unclear – Waka Kotahi understands this to mean that digital signs are not permitted within 100m of an intersection, which is supported and is consistent with the targets in the RLPT. If this is the intention, this should be reflected in SIGN-S8.1 S7.7 is supported to manage the cumulative effects of advertising signage.	Amend SIGN-S7 (Traffic safety) as follows: 1. Where any sign is oriented to be read from located adjacent to any road, the sign must not contain any flashing or moving lights. 2. Where any sign is located within 100m of an intersection and visible oriented to be read from a legal road, the sign must not be digital only contain static messaging and images . 3. Signs must not be shaped or use images or colours, including changeable messages, that could be mistaken for a traffic control device in colour, shape or appearance...
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.15	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Oppose	Lumo opposes the amendments sought by the submission. The submission seeks adjustments to Standard SIGN-S7, which have the effect of restricting the types of signs which are orientated to be read from a state highway to static signs only (and not digital signs). In its submission, Waka Kotahi states “Standard S7.2 is unclear – Waka Kotahi understands this to mean that digital signs are not permitted within 100m of an intersection, which is supported and is consistent with the targets in the RLPT. If this is the intention, this should be reflected in SIGN-S8.1” Lumo does not agree that the intent of Standard SIGN-S7 is to restrict digital signs which are located within 100m of an intersection. Rather, the standard is intended to manage particular types of content (such as flashing or moving lights, or moving images). The amendments sought by the submission are not appropriate or necessary relative to the purpose of the standard.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.15	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes the amendments sought by the submission. The submission seeks adjustments to Standard SIGN-S7, which have the effect of restricting the types of signs which are orientated to be read from a state highway to static signs only (and not digital signs). In its submission, Waka Kotahi states “Standard S7.2 is unclear – Waka Kotahi understands this to mean that digital signs are not permitted within 100m of an intersection, which is supported and is consistent with the targets in the RLPT. If this is the intention, this should be reflected in SIGN-S8.1” OOHMAA does not agree that the intent of Standard SIGN-S7 is to restrict digital signs which are located within 100m of an intersection. Rather, the standard is intended to manage particular types of content (such as flashing or moving lights, or moving images). The amendments sought by the submission are not appropriate or necessary relative to the purpose of the standard.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.115	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S7	Support	Supports clause 4 and 5 which ensures signs do obstruct the line of sign of any rail crossing or impair the view of any railway sign or signal.	Retain SIGN-S7 (Traffic safety) as notified.
Go Media Ltd	236.30	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Support	Supports SIGN-S8.1.a to SIGN-S8.1.d and SIGN-S8.1.h.	Retain SIGN-S8.1 (Digital Signs) points a to d, and h as notified.
Go Media Ltd	236.31	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Oppose	Considers that the content on billboards should only be restricted where evidence shows that there is a real risk to safety. Content restrictions are likely to be a non-resource management issue and therefore should not be included in planning provisions. Some text on signs is legally required, but not generally intended to be read. This may include references to terms and conditions or qualifiers to the product advertised. The restrictions on content and character volume on digital signs (SIGN-S8(1)(e) and (f)) are inappropriate and lack evidential basis across all zones. These should be removed. There is no reason to exclude, for example, web addresses but to include a company slogan. Further, the proposed standards will restrict the ability of community groups to advertise their contact details and event locations to the community.	Detail SIGN-S8.1 (Digital Signs) points e to g in their entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Go Media Ltd	236.32	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Oppose in part	Opposes 15 second dwell time at SIGN-S8.2.b for signs on roads with a speed limit less than or equal to 80km/h as 8 seconds is a generally accepted standard.	Seeks an amendment to SIGN-S8.2.b (Digital Signs) to change the dwell time to 8 seconds for all speed areas.
Go Media Ltd	236.33	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Oppose in part	Opposes 35 second dwell time at SIGN-S8.2.b for signs on roads with a speed limit greater than 80km/h as 8 seconds is a generally accepted standard.	Seeks that the 35 second dwell time specified in SIGN-S8.2.b (Digital Signs) is deleted.
Go Media Ltd	236.34	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Support in part	Supports a 0.5s transition time between images in SIGN-S8.2.c. Considers that the requirement that images transition to another image within 0.1 to 0.5 seconds without flashing, blinking, fading, scrolling, or dissolving encourages almost instantaneous changes from one image to another. In practice such immediate change is more likely to be noticed by a passer-by than a cross fade between images, as one image fades at the same time as another image fades out.	Amend SIGN-S8.2.c (Digital Signs) as follows: Digital Signs ... 2. Each image on a digital sign shall: ... c. Transition to another image within 0.1 to 0.5 seconds; and ... [Inferred decision requested]
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.33	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Support in part	Supports SIGN-S8 in part. The submitter supports the principle of prescribing parameters for the operation of digital signs and billboards. Standards which are specific to digital signs will ensure that the particular effects that might be generated by unregulated digital signs will be avoided, and provide the Council with the means to undertake enforcement against digital signs which are being operated in a non-compliant manner.	Retain SIGN-S8 (Digital signs), with amendments.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.34	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter considers that several of the proposed standards within SIGN-S8 are overly onerous, and are not justifiably necessary. The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.1.e for the following reasons: - The submitter considers that a standard restricting the use of contact details is presumably premised on a belief that a driver of a vehicle may be inclined to either hold their attention on the message for a dangerous length of time, or that such a detail may incite a driver to reach for a pen or another method of recording the contact detail. Contact details have been regularly used within advertising signs and billboards for decades, and there have been no known or recorded safety effects that have resulted from this practice. -Further, the submitter notes that such a standard has not been proposed for 'third-party signs' (which are not digital signs). - The submitter considers that there is no difference between the method of display (between digital and 'static' signs) which would result in the display of a contact detail being overly distractive on a digital sign.	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 1. Digital signs must not: ... e. Contain phone numbers, email addresses, web addresses, physical addresses or contact details; ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.35	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.1.f for the following reasons: - This standard seeks to restrict the number of characters of a message. The submitter considers that this is an overly prescriptive standard which is difficult to interpret or to enforce, as an advertising message may involve various components (text, images, graphics), all of which may include words or phrases which would contribute to the number of characters within the overall message, but which are not required to be read by a viewer for the overall message to be understood and assimilated. - The submitter considers that the character limit is understood to be based on research that has been undertaken on the speed at which a driver can read text, however there are concerns with the methodologies of this research, and its literal application to real-world activities such as advertising messages which do not generally rely on viewers to read each and every word within a message.	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 1. Digital signs must not: ... f. Contain more than 40 characters; or ...
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.36	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.1.g. The submitter does not support the proposed 'blanket' approach to digital or illuminated signs which are visible from a state highway [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 1. Digital signs must not: ... g. Be located adjacent to a State Highway. ...
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.37	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.2.b. The submitter considers that Digital billboards are typically operated to display a message for a length of eight seconds, which has been an industry standard since the first digital billboards were established in New Zealand in 2013. Research has been undertaken which demonstrates that there is no measurable difference in effect on driver performance resulting from the dwell time for the display of digital messages [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 2. Each image on a digital sign shall: a. Be static only; b. Be displayed for a minimum of 15 8 seconds for roads with posted speed limits of less than and equal to 80km/h and a minimum of 35 seconds for roads with a posted speed limit of greater than 80 km/h; ...
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.38	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.2.d for the following reasons: - The submitter considers that SIGN-S8.2.d. counteracts the intent of SIGN-S8.2.c., which requires messages to transition from one to the next within 0.1 and 0.5 seconds. However, Standard 2.d. states that the transition cannot involve flashing, blinking, fading, scrolling, or dissolving. - The submitter considers that it is standard industry practice for messages to transition by way of a 'dissolve' (which typically lasts 0.5 seconds), which involves one message fading out while the next message fades in at the same time, which provides a 'soft' transition effect which avoids undue distraction or catching someone's attention. - The submitter considers that SIGN-S8.2.d., as it is drafted, would preclude the use of the most effective transition (in terms of its effectiveness at avoiding adverse effects). The submitter considers that this standard should not preclude the use of a 'dissolve' transition.	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs ... 2. Each image on a digital sign shall: ... d. Transition to another image without flashing, blinking, fading, <u>or</u> scrolling, or dissolving.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.39	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	Seeks amendment to SIGN-S8.4 to refer to 'digital'.	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 4. Illumination of any <u>digital</u> sign shall: ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.33	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Support in part	Supports SIGN-S8 in part. The submitter supports the principle of prescribing parameters for the operation of digital signs and billboards. Standards which are specific to digital signs will ensure that the particular effects that might be generated by unregulated digital signs will be avoided, and provide the Council with the means to undertake enforcement against digital signs which are being operated in a non-compliant manner.	Retain SIGN-S8 (Digital signs), with amendments.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.34	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter considers that several of the proposed standards within SIGN-S8 are overly onerous, and are not justifiably necessary. The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.1.e for the following reasons: - The submitter considers that a standard restricting the use of contact details is presumably premised on a belief that a driver of a vehicle may be inclined to either hold their attention on the message for a dangerous length of time, or that such a detail may incite a driver to reach for a pen or another method of recording the contact detail. Contact details have been regularly used within advertising signs and billboards for decades, and there have been no known or recorded safety effects that have resulted from this practice. -Further, the submitter notes that such a standard has not been proposed for 'third-party signs' (which are not digital signs). - The submitter considers that there is no difference between the method of display (between digital and 'static' signs) which would result in the display of a contact detail being overly distractive on a digital sign.	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 1. Digital signs must not: ... e. Contain phone numbers, email addresses, web addresses, physical addresses or contact details; ...
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.35	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.1.f for the following reasons: - This standard seeks to restrict the number of characters of a message. The submitter considers that this is an overly prescriptive standard which is difficult to interpret or to enforce, as an advertising message may involve various components (text, images, graphics), all of which may include words or phrases which would contribute to the number of characters within the overall message, but which are not required to be read by a viewer for the overall message to be understood and assimilated. - The submitter considers that the character limit is understood to be based on research that has been undertaken on the speed at which a driver can read text, however there are concerns with the methodologies of this research, and its literal application to real-world activities such as advertising messages which do not generally rely on viewers to read each and every word within a message.	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 1. Digital signs must not: ... f. Contain more than 40 characters; or ...
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.36	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.1.g. The submitter does not support the proposed 'blanket' approach to digital or illuminated signs which are visible from a state highway [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 1. Digital signs must not: ... g. Be located adjacent to a State Highway. ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.37	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.2.b. The submitter considers that Digital billboards are typically operated to display a message for a length of eight seconds, which has been an industry standard since the first digital billboards were established in New Zealand in 2013. Research has been undertaken which demonstrates that there is no measurable difference in effect on driver performance resulting from the dwell time for the display of digital messages [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 2. Each image on a digital sign shall: a. Be static only; b. Be displayed for a minimum of 15 8 seconds for roads with posted speed limits of less than and equal to 80km/h and a minimum of 35 seconds for roads with a posted speed limit of greater than 80 km/h; ...
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.38	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	The submitter opposes SIGN-S8.2.d for the following reasons: - The submitter considers that SIGN-S8.2.d. counteracts the intent of SIGN-S8.2.c., which requires messages to transition from one to the next within 0.1 and 0.5 seconds. However, Standard 2.d. states that the transition cannot involve flashing, blinking, fading, scrolling, or dissolving. - The submitter considers that it is standard industry practice for messages to transition by way of a 'dissolve' (which typically lasts 0.5 seconds), which involves one message fading out while the next message fades in at the same time, which provides a 'soft' transition effect which avoids undue distraction or catching someone's attention. - The submitter considers that SIGN-S8.2.d., as it is drafted, would preclude the use of the most effective transition (in terms of its effectiveness at avoiding adverse effects). The submitter considers that this standard should not preclude the use of a 'dissolve' transition.	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 2. Each image on a digital sign shall: d. Transition to another image without flashing, blinking, fading, <u>or</u> scrolling, or dissolving .
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.39	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	Seeks amendment to SIGN-S8.4 to refer to 'digital'.	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: All zones Digital Signs 4. Illumination of any <u>digital</u> sign shall: ...
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.53	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Support	Support	Retain SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.251	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Support in part	SIGN-S8 is partially supported and amendments are sought.	Retain SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.16	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Oppose	Lumo opposes the amendments sought by the submission. In its primary submission, Lumo requests amendments to Standard SIGN-S8. The relief sought by Waka Kotahi is opposed, insofar as it is inconsistent with the relief sought by Lumo in its primary submission. In addition, Lumo opposes the additional standards sought by Waka Kotahi, which are unnecessarily onerous and difficult to enforce, particularly in respect of restricting billboards within 100m of an intersection or where another digital billboard is located within the driver's field of vision. Lumo opposes the standard requested by Waka Kotahi which would require the dwell time of each message displayed by a digital billboard to be determined by the proportion of drivers who could see an image change. Such an approach is variable and impractical to implement from an operational perspective, and is not justified relative to any adverse effects. Lumo supports the relief sought to delete the restriction on the use of a 'dissolve' between messages displayed on a digital billboard, consistent with the relief sought by Lumo in its primary submission.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.16	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes the amendments sought by the submission. In its primary submission, OOHMAA requests amendments to Standard SIGN-S8. The relief sought by Waka Kotahi is opposed, insofar as it is inconsistent with the relief sought by OOHMAA in its primary submission. In addition, OOHMAA opposes the additional standards sought by Waka Kotahi, which are unnecessarily onerous and difficult to enforce, particularly in respect of restricting billboards within 100m of an intersection or where another digital billboard is located within the driver's field of vision. OOHMAA opposes the standard requested by Waka Kotahi which would require the dwell time of each message displayed by a digital billboard to be determined by the proportion of drivers who could see an image change. Such an approach is variable and impractical to implement from an operational perspective, and is not justified relative to any adverse effects. OOHMAA supports the relief sought to delete the restriction on the use of a 'dissolve' between messages displayed on a digital billboard, consistent with the relief sought by OOHMAA in its primary submission.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.252	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Amend	Additions and changes are requested to manage the effects of digital billboards. As per the submitters interpretation of S7.2, which the submitter supports, the standard should be amended to restrict digital billboards within 100m of an intersection. In addition, the submitter considers that drivers should not be able to see more than one digital billboard at any one time. Waka Kotahi recommends that no digital billboards are located in environments where the posted speed limit is 70km/h or higher, as evidence does find a statistically significant increase in crashes in the presence of digital billboards in higher speed environments. Waka Kotahi also considers that dwell time should be determined based on the principle that no more than 5% of drivers should view an image change. 15 seconds may be appropriate in some circumstances, but each should be assessed on a case by case basis. Dissolving of images is preferred to flashing, blinking, fading, or scrolling.	Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital signs) as follows: 1. Digital signs must not: ... e. Contain phone numbers, email addresses, web addresses, physical addresses, or contact details <u>or logos</u> ; f. Contain more than 40 characters; or g. <u>Be oriented to be read from located adjacent to a State Highway, including on ramps and off ramps.</u> h. Impair the ability of Air Traffic Control to guide aircraft, or pilots to operate aircraft. <u>i. be located within 100m of an intersection</u> <u>j. be located where there are any other digital billboards in a driver's field of vision.</u> <u>k. be oriented to be read from any road where the posted speed limit exceeds 70km/h</u> 2. Each image on a digital sign shall: a. Be static only; b. Be displayed for a minimum of 15 seconds for roads with posted speed limits of less than and equal to 80km/h, <u>and an appropriate dwell time determined so that no more than 5 per cent of drivers are exposed to image changes. and a minimum of 25 seconds for roads with a posted speed limit of greater than 80km/h.</u> c. Transition to another image within 0.1 to 0.5 seconds; and d. Transition to another image without flashing, blinking, fading, <u>or scrolling, or dissolving.</u> ...
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.84	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Support	Supports restricting signs from being located within 100m of an intersection which includes level crossings. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.17	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Oppose	<p>Lumo opposes the amendments sought by the submission.</p> <p>In its primary submission, Lumo requests amendments to Standard SIGN-S8. The relief sought by Waka Kotahi is opposed, insofar as it is inconsistent with the relief sought by Lumo in its primary submission. In addition, Lumo opposes the additional standards sought by Waka Kotahi, which are unnecessarily onerous and difficult to enforce, particularly in respect of restricting billboards within 100m of an intersection or where another digital billboard is located within the driver's field of vision. Lumo opposes the standard requested by Waka Kotahi which would require the dwell time of each message displayed by a digital billboard to be determined by the proportion of drivers who could see an image change. Such an approach is variable and impractical to implement from an operational perspective, and is not justified relative to any adverse effects. Lumo supports the relief sought to delete the restriction on the use of a 'dissolve' between messages displayed on a digital billboard, consistent with the relief sought by Lumo in its primary submission.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the relief sought, except allow the relief sought in respect of deleting "or dissolving" in SIGN-S8.2.d.
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.17	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S8	Oppose	<p>OOHMAA opposes the amendments sought by the submission.</p> <p>In its primary submission, OOHMAA requests amendments to Standard SIGN-S8. The relief sought by Waka Kotahi is opposed, insofar as it is inconsistent with the relief sought by OOHMAA in its primary submission. In addition, OOHMAA opposes the additional standards sought by Waka Kotahi, which are unnecessarily onerous and difficult to enforce, particularly in respect of restricting billboards within 100m of an intersection or where another digital billboard is located within the driver's field of vision. OOHMAA opposes the standard requested by Waka Kotahi which would require the dwell time of each message displayed by a digital billboard to be determined by the proportion of drivers who could see an image change. Such an approach is variable and impractical to implement from an operational perspective, and is not justified relative to any adverse effects. OOHMAA supports the relief sought to delete the restriction on the use of a 'dissolve' between messages displayed on a digital billboard, consistent with the relief sought by OOHMAA in its primary submission.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the relief sought, except allow the relief sought in respect of deleting "or dissolving" in SIGN-S8.2.d.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.487	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S8	Support in part	<p>Opposes SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) insofar as it relates to the Airport Zone.</p> <p>Considers that many airport buildings are utilitarian in appearance due to their operational or functional requirements. Signs can therefore enhance the facade and appearance of the building.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain SIGN-S8 (Digital Signs) as notified and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.488	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S8	Amend	<p>Opposes SIGN-S5 (Signs located on a building or structure) insofar as it relates to the Airport Zone.</p> <p>Considers that many airport buildings are utilitarian in appearance due to their operational or functional requirements. Signs can therefore enhance the facade and appearance of the building.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-S8 (Digital Signs) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Visual amenity effects; 2. The impacteffect of the sign on aircraft safety or the safe and efficient functioning of the Airport; 3. The impacteffect of the sign on traffic, pedestrian and cycling safety; <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.40	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S9	Amend	<p>Considers that SIGN-S9 standards for 'illuminated signs' are confusing and are difficult for the average user of a District Plan to understand or to apply.</p> <p>The submitter considers it is more appropriate for a standard to establish a limit or threshold without reference to other technical standards.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the Auckland Unitary Plan contains standards to manage the effects of sign illumination. The submitter considers that these standards should be applied.</p> <p>The submitter considers that SIGN-S9 also repeats the illumination standards for digital signs, which are already provided within Rule SIGN-S8. Standard SIGN-S9 instead relates to the illumination of non-digital signs.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-S9 (Illuminated signs) as follows:</p> <p>All zones Illuminated Signs</p> <p>1. Any illuminated sign must be designed, measured and assessed in accordance with AS/NZS 4282:2019 Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. Any illuminated sign which is lit internally or by external means (excluding digital signs), must:</p> <p>a. Not be lit with an upwardly facing light source; b. Not exceed a luminance of 800cd/m² when lit by an artificial light source between dusk and dawn; or c. Be designed to reduce any glare or direct view of the light source when viewed by an observer at ground level 2 metres or more away from the illuminated sign.</p> <p>2. The Light standards for the relevant zone in the Light Chapter must be met.</p> <p>3. Illumination of any sign shall:</p> <p>a. Automatically adjust to allow for ambient light levels; and b. Not result in the illuminance of a roadway by over 4 lux in residential and rural areas and 20 lux in all other areas; and c. Shall not exceed:</p> <p>i. Daytime: 5,000cd/m² ii. Dawn and dusk: 600cd/m² iii. Night time: 250cd/m²</p>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.49	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S9	Oppose	Waka Kotahi supports the wording of SIGN-S9 as notified, and considers that illuminated signage should comply with the appropriate lighting standard AS/NZS4282:2019.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.40	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S9	Amend	<p>Considers that SIGN-S9 standards for 'illuminated signs' are confusing and are difficult for the average user of a District Plan to understand or to apply.</p> <p>The submitter considers it is more appropriate for a standard to establish a limit or threshold without reference to other technical standards.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the Auckland Unitary Plan contains standards to manage the effects of sign illumination. The submitter considers that these standards should be applied.</p> <p>The submitter considers that SIGN-S9 also repeats the illumination standards for digital signs, which are already provided within Rule SIGN-S8. Standard SIGN-S9 instead relates to the illumination of non-digital signs.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-S9 (Illuminated signs) as follows:</p> <p>All zones Illuminated Signs</p> <p>1. Any illuminated sign must be designed, measured and assessed in accordance with AS/NZS 4282:2019 Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. Any illuminated sign which is lit internally or by external means (excluding digital signs), must:</p> <p>a. Not be lit with an upwardly facing light source; b. Not exceed a luminance of 800cd/m2 when lit by an artificial light source between dusk and dawn; or c. Be designed to reduce any glare or direct view of the light source when viewed by an observer at ground level 2 metres or more away from the illuminated sign.</p> <p>2. The Light standards for the relevant zone in the Light Chapter must be met.</p> <p>3. Illumination of any sign shall:</p> <p>a. Automatically adjust to allow for ambient light levels; and b. Not result in the illuminance of a roadway by over 4 lux in residential and rural areas and 20 lux in all other areas; and c. Shall not exceed:</p> <p>i. Daytime: 5,000cd/m2 ii. Dawn and dusk: 600cd/m2 iii. Night time: 250cd/m2</p>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.54	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S9	Support	Support	Retain SIGN-S9 (Illuminated signs) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.489	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S9	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes SIGN-S9 in part.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes SIGN-S9 (Illuminated Signs) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.490	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S9	Amend	<p>Opposes SIGN-S9 in part.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-S9 (Illuminated Signs) as follows:</p> <p>SIGN-S9 Illuminated Signs</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. Illuminated signs must not impair the ability of Air Traffic Control to guide aircraft, or pilots to operate aircraft.</p> <p>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. The timing and hours of operation of the sign. and</p> <p>8. Any light spill or glare effects.</p> <p>9. The timing and house of operation of the sign.</p> <p>10. Any light spill or glare effects; and</p> <p>11. The effect of the sign on aircraft safety or the efficient functioning of the Airport.</p>
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.22	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S9	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Massey University	253.14	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain SIGN-S10 (Temporary signs) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.253	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S10	Support in part	SIGN-S10 is partially supported and amendments are sought.	Retain SIGN-S10 (Temporary signs) with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.254	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S10	Amend	Does not support temporary signs visible from the state highway as a permitted activity and therefore request that SIGN-S10 is amended to restrict signs visible from the State Highway that can occur without consent. 60 days is a long time for a sign to be permitted without the approval of Waka Kotahi.	Amend SIGN-S10 (Temporary signs) as follows: 1. The sign shall not be displayed any earlier than 28 days prior to the event or activity the sign is advertising, and for no longer than 60 days in total. 2. The sign must be removed within 7 days of the completion of the event or activity. 3. <u>The sign must not be oriented to be read from any state highway including on ramps and off ramps.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.30	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Support in part	Supports SIGN-S12 provided it aligns with SIGN-R6 (Signs on heritage buildings, heritage structures and their sites, or on a site within a heritage area) by including reference to heritage areas.	Retain SIGN-S12 (Signs on a heritage building or heritage structure) with amendment.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.20	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.19	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.31	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Amend	Seeks alignment between SIGN-R6 (Signs on heritage buildings, heritage structures and their sites, or on a site within a heritage area) and SIGN-S12 by including reference to heritage areas.	Amend SIGN-S12 (Signs on a heritage building or heritage structure) as follows: SIGN-S12: Signs on a heritage building or heritage structure <u>or within a heritage area.</u>
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.21	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.20	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.129	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Amend	Considers clarification is needed to SIGN-S12 (Signs on a heritage building or heritage structure). Considers the term "interpretative content" should be replaced with "interpretation" to match wording in the PDP.	Amend SIGN-S12 (Signs on a heritage building) as follows: 2. The sign displays only: (...) b. Interpretative content <u>Interpretation</u> about the values and history of the building/object.
Wellington City Council	266.130	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Amend	Considers SIGN-R7 (Signs within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site or site of significance to Māori) relates to archaeological sites and sites and areas of significance to Māori, but the standard referenced in this rule only refers to archaeological sites. This needs to be amended to include sites and areas of significance to Māori.	Amend title of SIGN-S13 (Permitted signs within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site) as follows: Permitted signs within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site <u>or site and area of significance to Māori.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.255	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Support in part	SIGN-S12 is partially supported and amendments are sought.	Retain SIGN-S12 (Signs on a heritage building or heritage structure) with amendment.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.18	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Oppose	Lumo opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.18	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.256	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Amend	Considers that as with SIGN-S5, there should be similar controls in SIGN-S12 on illumination for signs on a heritage building that are oriented to be read from the state highway network.	Amend SIGN-S12 (Signs on a heritage building or heritage structure) as follows: ... <u>3. Where the sign is oriented to be read from the state highway network including on-ramps and off-ramps, or is visible from any intersection with the state highway, the sign must not be internally illuminated.</u>
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	FS124.19	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Oppose	Lumo opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Out Of Home Media Association of Aotearoa (OOHMAA)	FS125.19	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Oppose	OOHMAA opposes a blanket approach to applying more onerous provisions for signs and billboards that are visible from a state highway.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.70	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S12	Amend	Considers that digital signs should not be a permitted activity due to the additional adverse affects of illumination levels and rates of change as compared to static signage.	Amend SIGN-S12 (Signs on a heritage building or heritage structure) as follows: Only one <u>static</u> sign is installed: 1. The size of the sign does not exceed 0.5m2; and
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.55	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S13	Support	Support	Retain SIGN-S13 (Permitted signs within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.91	General District wide Matters / Signs / SIGN-S13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that SIGN-S13 (Permitted signs within the extent of a scheduled archaeological site) is amended to include proximity to sites and areas of significance to Māori.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.491	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S14	Oppose	Opposes SIGN-S14 (Airport Zone signs and billboards). Considers that the blanket requirement for there to be no signs within the Airport East Side Designation should be deleted as it is unduly onerous and does not recognise or provide for the operational needs of the airport within this area. Considers that the standard should remove all references to designations. The rules of the signage chapter (and all chapters) need to be stand alone Considers that the standard should not duplicate controls addressed by other standards (for example, SIGN-S6). Considers that the rule should not include additional constraints that are not required by other signage rules for example, SIGN-S14(4) and (5). [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes SIGN-S14 (Airport Zne signs and billboards) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.492	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S14	Amend	<p>Opposes SIGN-S14 (Airport Zone signs and billboards).</p> <p>Considers that the blanket requirement for there to be no signs within the Airport East Side Designation should be deleted as it is unduly onerous and does not recognise or provide for the operational needs of the airport within this area.</p> <p>Considers that the standard should remove all references to designations. The rules of the signage chapter (and all chapters) need to be stand alone</p> <p>Considers that the standard should not duplicate controls addressed by other standards (for example, SIGN-S6).</p> <p>Considers that the rule should not include additional constraints that are not required by other signage rules for example, SIGN-S14(4) and (5).</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>(Option A).</p> <p>Amend SIGN-S14 (Airport Zne signs and billboards) as follows:</p> <p><u>1. Signs are not permitted in the Airport East Side designation. Any sign within the East Side Precinct shall be limited to official signs and signs associated instructional or directional signage.</u></p> <p>2. Any sign which is erected in the Airport Miramar South <u>Precinct designation</u>, and which is visible from the road reserve or immediately adjacent land:</p> <p>a. Shall not contain moving images, moving text or moving lights; and a. b. Shall not be for the purpose of third party advertising.</p> <p>Airport Main Site Designation-</p> <p>3. Signs on buildings shall:-</p> <p>a. Be affixed to the underneath of a verandah and shall provide at least 2.5 metres clearance directly above the footpath or ground level:- b. Be displayed only on plain wall surfaces:- c. Not obscure windows or architectural features: or- d. Not project above the parapet level, or the highest part of that part of the building/structure to which it is attached (including above verandah)-</p> <p>4. Signs on buildings, where the sign projects more than 12 metres in height above ground shall:-</p> <p>a. Bear only the name and/or logo of the building owner or occupier, or the building on which the sign is located.- b. Not flash.-</p> <p>5. Any illuminated sign (excluding signs below verandah level) within 50 metres and visible from any Residential zone shall not flash.-</p> <p><u>3.6. For any free-standing sign or sign located on a structure within any part of the Airport <u>Zone</u> area, except the Terminal Precinct:</u></p> <p>a. the maximum area <u>of a single sign</u> is 8m²i. b. the maximum height <u>of a single sign</u> is 4m. c. any illuminated sign must not flash. <u>d. any sign that is visible from Residential zoned land must be located a minimum of 50 metres from that area-</u> e. no sign shall front onto State Highway 1, Moa Point Road, or Lyall Parade.-</p> <p>7. In relation to requiring authority signage in the (Airport Main Site) Terminal precinct, any free-standing sign or sign located on a structure shall not exceed a maximum height of 9 metres (above ground level)-</p> <p><u>4. For any free-standing sign or sign located on a structure within the Terminal Precinct, the maximum area of a single sign must not exceed 20m².</u></p>

General District-wide Matters - Temporary Activities

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.131	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S14	Support	Considers amendments need to occur and support the changes to the East Side Precinct wording however the removal of references to the designation is a bigger question of clarification with Wellington City on how a designation and District Plan work together on signs.	Allow / Supports amendment to SIGN-S14 (Airport Zne signs and billboards) in the East Side precinct, with the addition of the word 'small' as follows: <u>1. Any sign within the East Side Precinct shall be limited to small official signs and signs associated instructional or directional signage.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.132	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S14	Oppose	Considers amendments need to occur and support the changes to the East Side Precinct wording however the removal of references to the designation is a bigger question of clarification with Wellington City on how a designation and District Plan work together on signs.	Disallow / Seeks that the remainder of the submission be disallowed.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.493	General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S14	Oppose in part	Opposes SIGN-S14 (Airport Zone signs and billboards). Considers that the blanket requirement for there to be no signs within the Airport East Side Designation should be deleted as it is unduly onerous and does not recognise or provide for the operational needs of the airport within this area. Considers that the standard should remove all references to designations. The rules of the signage chapter (and all chapters) need to be stand alone Considers that the standard should not duplicate controls addressed by other standards (for example, SIGN-S6). Considers that the rule should not include additional constraints that are not required by other signage rules for example, SIGN-S14(4) and (5). [See paragraphs 4.103 to 4.106 of original submission for full reason]	Delete SIGN-S14 (Airport Zone Signs and billboards) in its entirety. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.133	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S14	Support	Considers amendments need to occur and support the changes to the East Side Precinct wording however the removal of references to the designation is a bigger question of clarification with Wellington City on how a designation and District Plan work together on signs.	Allow / Supports amendment to SIGN-S14 (Airport Zne signs and billboards) in the East Side precinct, with the addition of the word 'small' as follows: <u>1. Any sign within the East Side Precinct shall be limited to small official signs and signs associated instructional or directional signage.</u>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.134	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / SIGNS / SIGN-S14	Oppose	Considers amendments need to occur and support the changes to the East Side Precinct wording however the removal of references to the designation is a bigger question of clarification with Wellington City on how a designation and District Plan work together on signs.	Disallow / Seeks that the remainder of the submission be disallowed.
Screen Production and Development Association	17.1	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Support	Screen Wellington office provisions are fit-for-purpose. Screen Wellington provides a fast, low friction system of permitting through a very flexible and pragmatic approach. Screen Wellington permit system is flexible to account for differing production finance margins to account for varying levels of production. Supporting Screen Wellington will help regional development of the film industry. Screen Wellington has respect for Māori sites of significance and relationships with local iwi.	Retain TEMP (Temporary Activities) as notified - referencing support for short term film activities being managed through Screen Wellingtons Permit Process.
Screen Production and Development Association	17.2	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Support	Supports consultation with iwi over temporary film activities on sites of significance.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Screen Production and Development Association	17.3	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Support	Opposes resource consenting for temporary film activities on sites of significance.	Retain TEMP (Temporary Activities) as notified.
Paul Yates	26.1	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Support	The management of short-term filming activities by Screen Wellington's Film Permit Process, with the exception of semi-permanent structures, earth works or noise, is supported.	Supports filming being classified as a "temporary activity" and being managed through Screen Wellington.
The Gibson Group Limited	122.1	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Support	Screen Wellington office provisions are fit-for-purpose. Screen Wellington provides a fast, low friction system of permitting through a very flexible and pragmatic approach. Screen Wellington permit system is flexible to account for differing production finance margins to account for varying levels of production. Supporting Screen Wellington will help regional development of the film industry. Screen Wellington has respect for Māori sites of significance and relationships with local iwi.	Retain TEMP (Temporary Activities) as notified - referencing support for short term film activities being managed through Screen Wellingtons Permit Process.
The Gibson Group Limited	122.2	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Support	Supports consultation with iwi over temporary film activities on sites of significance but considers this should occur separate to RMA requirements.	Not specified.
The Gibson Group Limited	122.3	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Support	Opposes resource consenting for temporary film activities on sites of significance.	Retain the Temporary Activities chapter as notified.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.30	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Not specified	Considers that the current temporary activity provisions require consideration of the efficiency of the network and these should prioritise the safety of vulnerable users over efficiency.	Seeks that the temporary activity provisions prioritise the safety of vulnerable users over efficiency of the network.
Waka Kotahi	370.257	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Oppose	Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network Considers that traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter. Considers that temporary events for which anticipated numbers exceed 100 vehicles on any day which are accessed from the state highway should require a traffic management plan. Notes that the transport chapter does not make it clear that the trip generation applies to temporary events. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter	Seeks to amend to include trip generation triggers, above which the activity status should be restricted discretionary, with discretion restricted to traffic and safety effects.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.494	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Support in part	Considers that an advice note should be included in the introduction of the temporary activity chapter drawing plan users attention to the presence of the OLS designation and the need to adhere to its requirements, in addition to those set out in the Temporary Activities chapter of the Proposed Plan. [See paragraphs 4.111 to 4.113 of original submission for full reason]	Supports TEMP chapter introduction and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.495	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / General TEMP	Amend	Considers that an advice note should be included in the introduction of the temporary activity chapter drawing plan users attention to the presence of the OLS designation and the need to adhere to its requirements, in addition to those set out in the Temporary Activities chapter of the Proposed Plan. [See paragraphs 4.111 to 4.113 of original submission for full reason]	Amend TEMP chapter introduction as follows: ... <u>Temporary activities involving temporary structures such as cranes in the vicinity of Wellington International Airport are also drawn to the requirements of the Wellington International Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface designation.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.165	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / New TEMP	Amend	Considers that to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response, firefighter training is an essential activity undertaken by FENZ. Firefighter training may include live fire training and equipment training both on and off site. The FENZ's Statement of Performance Expectations (SPE) 2021/22 confirms a commitment to the Government that all firefighters achieve a certain level of training. In order to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response, firefighter training is an essential activity undertaken by FENZ. Firefighter training may include live fire training and equipment training both on and off site. It is noted that 'emergency service activities' are provided for in the various zones of the district, however, does not explicitly provide for temporary emergency services training activities. FENZ therefore seeks that the DP clearly provides FENZ the ability to undertake firefighting training activities throughout the city. This will assure that any adverse effects of temporary activities are managed in accordance with community expectations.	Add new TEMP policy: TEMP-PX : <u>Temporary Emergency Services Training Activities</u> <u>Enable temporary emergency services training activities in all zones provided any adverse effects are managed in accordance with community expectations.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.166	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / New TEMP	Amend	Considers a rule should be added to allow for live fire training and equipment training both on and off site for temporary durations, subject to conditions.	Add new TEMP rule: TEMP-RX <u>Temporary emergency services training activities (All Zones)</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The activity is limited to a period of two days, excluding set-up or pack-down activities, which can occur up to one week prior to commencement and up to one week following completion of the temporary emergency services training activity.</u> <u>2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: N/A</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.71	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-P3	Support	Supports that the policy recognises the need to engage with mana whenua when temporary activities are to take place on culturally significant land to ensure that these areas are not negatively affected.	Retain TEMP-P3 (Managing Adverse Effects on Sensitive Environments) as notified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.72	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-P4	Support	Supports that the policy recognises the need to engage with mana whenua when temporary activities are to take place on culturally significant land to ensure that these areas are not negatively affected.	Retain TEMP-P4 (Mana whenua) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.21	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-P5	Amend	Considers that it is crucial for the District Plan policy framework to enable temporary military training activities to be undertaken where the adverse effects on amenity values of the site or surrounding area are remedied or mitigated. Supports the intent of this Policy, but requests Council adopt a clearer wording of this Policy.	Amend TEMP-P5 (Temporary military training activities) as follows: Enable temporary military training activities where they remedy or mitigate their adverse effects on the amenity values of the site and the surrounding area are <u>remedied or mitigated.</u>
Massey University	253.15	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEMP-R1(1) (Temporary activities, excluding short term filming and temporary military training activities) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.22	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R1	Support	Supports the rule title which specifically excludes TMTA (Temporary Military Training Activities) from Rule TEMP-R1.	Retain TEMP-R1 (Temporary activities, excluding short term filming and temporary military training activities) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.23	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Oppose	Opposes TEMP-R3.1 and seeks amendment.	Opposes TEMP-R3.1 (Temporary military training activities) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
New Zealand Defence Force	423.24	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Amend	<p>Rule TEMP-R3.1 provides for TMTA (Temporary Military Training Activities) as a permitted activity in the following zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open Space Zones; - Rural Zones; - Port Zone; and - General Industrial Zone. <p>TMTA in all other zones is a restricted discretionary activity in accordance with Rule TEMP-R3.3.</p> <p>NZDF opposes Rule TEMP-R3.1 on that basis that it is appropriate to provide for TMTA as a permitted activity in all zones subject to compliance with the relevant permitted activity standards. As outlined in the introduction to this submission, NZDF must undertake training in a range of activities and locations in order to fulfil its statutory obligations under the Defence Act 1990. TMTA can involve a broad range of activities including classroom activities, search and rescue, driver training, dog training, small construction tasks, and many others that have effects similar to other day-to-day activities. Due to the nature of TMTA and the need for NZDF to train in unfamiliar realworld situations, TMTA may be undertaken in any zone within a city / district. TMTA are entirely appropriate within all zones where the noise standards are met, and the permitted activity standards are complied with.</p> <p>Including a permitted activity rule that provides for TMTA in all zones in Wellington City would also ensure a consistent approach to TMTA is adopted nationwide. Many district plans around the country are being or have been reviewed and NZDF is engaging in those review processes to ensure that where training activities might be subject to controls through a district plan, those controls are consistent and that compliance is simply achieved and assessed.</p>	Seeks amendment to TEMP-R3.1 (Temporary military training activities) to explicitly provide for temporary military training activities as a permitted activity in all zones subject to compliance with permitted activity standards.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.25	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Amend	NZDF notes that the reference to "Port Zone" should be updated to refer to "Special Purpose Port Zone".	Seeks amendment to TEMP-R3.1 (Temporary military training activities) to change "Port Zone" to "Special Purpose Port Zone".
New Zealand Defence Force	423.26	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Oppose	Opposes TEMP-R3.1.b and seeks amendment.	Opposes TEMP-R3.1.b (Temporary military training activities) and seeks amendment.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.27	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Amend	<p>Considers that From time to time, and at the landowner's request, buildings or structures constructed as part of a TMTA may be permanent and not removed at the conclusion of the training exercise, provided it is a permitted activity, or a resource consent obtained. Buildings or structures constructed as part of TMTA should not be required to be removed when they are intended to be permanent and meet relevant permitted activity rules in the Plan (or otherwise a resource consent is obtained).</p>	<p>Amend TEMP-R3.1.b (Temporary military training activities) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>b. No permanent structures are constructed <u>unless provided for elsewhere in this plan as a permitted activity (or resource consent is obtained for the structure); and</u></p>
New Zealand Defence Force	423.28	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Oppose	Opposes TEMP-R3.2 and seeks amendment.	Opposes TEMP-R3.2 (Temporary military training activities) and seeks amendment.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.29	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Amend	Opposes Rule TEMP-R3.2 on the basis that any TMTA that cannot comply with the requirements of TEMP-R3.1 should be a controlled activity for the reasons outlined above with respect to Rule TEMP-R3.1 (submission point 21).	Seeks that TEMP-R3.2 (Temporary military training activities) is amended to provide for temporary military training activities that does not comply with the requirements of TEMP-R3.1 to be a controlled activity (noting that temporary military training activities should be provided for as a permitted activity across all zones).
New Zealand Defence Force	423.30	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Support	NZDF supports any resource consent applications made in respect of Rule TEMP-R3.2 being precluded from public notification as per the activity status note.	Retain TEMP-R3.2 (Temporary military training activities) as notified with respect to the notification clause that precludes public notification.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
New Zealand Defence Force	423.31	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Oppose	<p>Opposes TEMP-R3.3 on the basis of the proposed changes to Rules TEMP-R3.1. and R3.2.</p> <p>Opposes TEMP-R3.3 on the basis that it is appropriate to provide for TMTA as a permitted activity in all District Plan zones subject to compliance with the permitted activity requirements. In addition, the submitter considers that where TMTA do not achieve compliance with the requirements of TEMP-R3.1, they should be a controlled activity. As outlined in the introduction to their submission, NZDF must undertake training in a range of activities and locations, as outlined in the introduction to this submission, in order to fulfil its statutory obligations under the Defence Act 1990. Training activities are carried out "off-base" for a variety of reasons including diversity and realism. Skills that are learned and practiced "on-base" must be tested or extended in unfamiliar contexts "off base". Due to the broad nature of TMTA and the need for NZDF to train in unfamiliar real-world situations, they may be undertaken in any zone within a district. Therefore, it is important to NZDF that TMTA are provided for in all zones in a district plan. In many respects, TMTA are identical to, and not discernible from, day-to-day and training activities carried out by other emergency services and civilian organisations, such as the Police Force, search and rescue organisations and Fire and Emergency NZ, which are provided for as a permitted activity in the majority of District Plan zones, subject to compliance with the relevant standards.</p>	Delete Rule TEMP-R3.3 (Temporary military training activities) in its entirety.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.32	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R3	Oppose	<p>Opposes the notification direction set out in Rule TEMP-R3.3, which requires that an application for resource consent made in respect of Rule TEMP-R3.3 must be publicly notified, for the reasons outlined above in submission.</p> <p>Temporary Military Training Activities (TMTA) are identical to, and not discernible from, day-to-day and training activities carried out by other emergency services and civilian organisations, such as the Police Force, search and rescue organisations and Fire and Emergency NZ, which are provided for as a permitted activity in the majority of District Plan zones, subject to compliance with the relevant standards. Applications for TMTA made with respect to Rule TEMP-R3.3 should not be subject to a blanket requirement for public notification.</p> <p>A notification determination should be made based on an assessment of individual TMTA proposals, noting TMTA can vary in nature, scale and duration. Assessment should involve consideration of the proposal with respect to the subject site, surrounding environment, proposed effects, along with measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, in order to reach a conclusion on the overall level of effects in terms of Section 95 of the Resource Management Act 1991. A presumption of blanket public notification for all resource consent applications for TMTA made in respect of Rule TEMP-R3.3 is not appropriate, nor does it reflect an 'effects-based' approach as anticipated by the RMA.</p>	Seeks that the requirement for public notification of a resource consent application made in respect of TEMP-R3.3 (Temporary military training activities) is deleted in its entirety.
Massey University	253.16	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEMP-R4(1) (Emission of noise from a temporary activity excluding military training activities) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.33	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R4	Support	NZDF supports the rule title which specifically excludes TMTA from Rule TEMP-R4.	Retain TEMP-R4 (Emission of noise from a temporary activity excluding temporary military training activities) as notified.
Massey University	253.17	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R6	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEMP-R6(1) (Temporary buildings or structures ancillary to a temporary activity) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.34	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-R6	Support	NZDF supports the note in Rule TEMP-R6.1, which specifically excludes TMTA from this Rule.	Retain TEMP-R6.1 (Temporary buildings or structures ancillary to a temporary activity) as notified.
Massey University	253.18	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEMP-S1 (Maximum duration of a temporary activity excluding short-term filming activities and temporary military training activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.31	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S1	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain EMP-S1 (Maximum duration of a temporary activity excluding short-term filming activities and temporary military training activities) with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.32	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S1	Amend	Considers that cycleways are generally not considered when setting conditions to manage temporary activities leading to poor safety outcomes. Only requiring the efficiency of the transport network to be considered as a part of assessment criteria does not address the increased risk to cyclist safety.	Amend the Assessment Criteria in TEMP-S1 (Maximum duration of a temporary activity excluding short-term filming activities and temporary military training activities) as follows: 1. The extent to which the nature, intensity and scale of the activity adversely effects: a. Amenity values; and b. The safety and efficiency of the transport network, including on pedestrians, and cyclists and cycle and micromobility facilities.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.35	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S1	Support	NZDF supports that the title of activity standard TEMP-S1, which clarifies that this standard does not apply to TMTA.	Retain title of TEMP-S1 (Maximum duration of a temporary activity excluding short-term filming activities and temporary military training activities) as notified.
Paul Yates	26.2	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S3	Oppose	Considers that TEMP-S3 places restrictions on the hours of operation that short-term filming activities can take place. To finish at 10pm/11pm would be too restrictive for a lot of film and TV productions that often need to film night scenes and maximise night time by starting later and shooting entire 'days' through the night.	Seeks that the noise restrictions at TEMP-S3 (House of operation) are not applied to short film activities.
Massey University	253.19	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEMP-S3 (Hours of operation) as notified.
Massey University	253.20	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEMP-S4 (Maximum noise levels - activity specific, excluding temporary military training activities) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.36	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S4	Support	NZDF supports that the title of activity standard TEMP-S4, which clarifies that this standard does not apply to TMTA.	Retain title of TEMP-S4 (Maximum noise levels – activity specific, excluding temporary military training activities) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.37	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S6	Amend	Considers that TEMP-S6 should apply to all zones within the Proposed District Plan as opposed to the four listed zones (as per NZDF's submission on rule TEMP R3.1).	Seeks that TEMP-S6 (Temporary military training activities) applies to all District Plan zones, not just the four expressly listed zones.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.38	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S6	Amend	Temporary Military Training Activities are by their very nature temporary, ranging from a period of days through to several weeks on an intermittent or continuous basis depending on the nature of the activity. NZDF does not consider it necessary or appropriate to impose a time limit on TMTA as per TEMP-S6.1. However, NZDF would support an amendment to this standard to allow TMTA to be undertaken so as not exceed a period of 31 consecutive days (excluding set up and pack down activities). This would also ensure a consistent approach to TMTA is adopted nationwide. Many district plans around the country are being or have been reviewed and NZDF is engaging in those review processes to ensure that where training activities might be subject to controls through a district plan, those controls are consistent and that compliance is simply achieved and assessed.	Amend TEMP-S6.1 (Temporary military training activities) as follows: The duration of the activity must not exceed a period of 14 <u>31</u> consecutive days (excluding set up and pack down activities);
New Zealand Defence Force	423.39	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S6	Oppose	Opposes TEMP-S6.2, which states that no TMTA is to be undertaken on Sundays. As outlined in submission, given the nature of TMTA, some activities may need to be undertaken at the weekend, including Sunday, on a continuous basis over the period of several weeks. Providing the TMTA complies with the relevant permitted activity standards and the noise standards for TMTA in Table 26 – APP6, there should be no reason that TMTA could not be undertaken on a Sunday.	Amend TEMP-S6 (Temporary military training activities) as follows: Temporary Military Activities ... 2. No activity to be undertaken on Sundays; ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
New Zealand Defence Force	423.40	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S6	Oppose	<p>The assessment criteria listed under TEMP-S6 are not considered suitable or appropriate given the inherent nature of TMTA. The only effect from TMTA which requires specific management is noise. In this regard, NZDF have developed appropriate controls to manage noise effects from TMTA outlined in submission point 36 below.</p> <p>Given the nature of TMTA (i.e. that they are not public events held in public spaces and outdoor events venues, such as the waterfront, as are most other activities provided for under the Temporary Activities chapter of the Draft District Plan) it is not appropriate to require TMTA resource consent applications to consider the adverse effects on pedestrian health and safety, traffic generation and effects on the transport network and public access (assessment criteria 1, 5 and 6). Depending on the nature of a TMTA, they may not involve any traffic movements nor effects on pedestrians.</p> <p>The assessment criteria as notified are very specific in nature and may be more appropriate for other temporary events, such as parades held on public streets or in public spaces, or community, recreational or sporting orientated events but are not considered to be relevant to TMTA, which is very tightly managed given the nature of NZDF's activities.</p>	Delete Assessment Criteria 1 in TEMP-S6 (Temporary military training activities).
New Zealand Defence Force	423.41	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S6	Oppose	<p>The assessment criteria listed under TEMP-S6 are not considered suitable or appropriate given the inherent nature of TMTA. The only effect from TMTA which requires specific management is noise. In this regard, NZDF have developed appropriate controls to manage noise effects from TMTA outlined in the submission.</p> <p>Given the nature of TMTA (i.e. that they are not public events held in public spaces and outdoor events venues, such as the waterfront, as are most other activities provided for under the Temporary Activities chapter of the Draft District Plan) it is not appropriate to require TMTA resource consent applications to consider the adverse effects on pedestrian health and safety, traffic generation and effects on the transport network and public access (assessment criteria 1, 5 and 6). Depending on the nature of a TMTA, they may not involve any traffic movements nor effects on pedestrians.</p> <p>The assessment criteria as notified are very specific in nature and may be more appropriate for other temporary events, such as parades held on public streets or in public spaces, or community, recreational or sporting orientated events but are not considered to be relevant to TMTA, which is very tightly managed given the nature of NZDF's activities.</p>	Delete Assessment Criteria 5 in TEMP-S6 (Temporary military training activities).
New Zealand Defence Force	423.42	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S6	Oppose	<p>The assessment criteria listed under TEMP-S6 are not considered suitable or appropriate given the inherent nature of TMTA. The only effect from TMTA which requires specific management is noise. In this regard, NZDF have developed appropriate controls to manage noise effects from TMTA outlined in submission point 36 below.</p> <p>Given the nature of TMTA (i.e. that they are not public events held in public spaces and outdoor events venues, such as the waterfront, as are most other activities provided for under the Temporary Activities chapter of the Draft District Plan) it is not appropriate to require TMTA resource consent applications to consider the adverse effects on pedestrian health and safety, traffic generation and effects on the transport network and public access (assessment criteria 1, 5 and 6). Depending on the nature of a TMTA, they may not involve any traffic movements nor effects on pedestrians.</p> <p>The assessment criteria as notified are very specific in nature and may be more appropriate for other temporary events, such as parades held on public streets or in public spaces, or community, recreational or sporting orientated events but are not considered to be relevant to TMTA, which is very tightly managed given the nature of NZDF's activities.</p>	Delete Assessment Criteria 6 in TEMP-S6 (Temporary military training activities).

General District-wide Matters - Wind

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Massey University	253.21	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEMP-S7 (Temporary building or structure) as notified.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.33	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S7	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain TEMP-S7 (Temporary building or structure) with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.34	General District wide Matters / Temporary Activities / TEMP-S7	Amend	Considers that cycleways are generally not considered when setting conditions to manage temporary activities leading to poor safety outcomes. Only requiring the efficiency of the transport network to be considered as a part of assessment criteria does not address the increased risk to cyclist safety.	Amend the Assessment Criteria in TEMP-S7 (Temporary building or structure) as follows: 1. Adverse effects on: Pedestrian health and safety; a. The <u>safety and efficiency</u> of the transport network, <u>including cycle and micromobility facilities</u> ; and b. Any restrictions on public access. c. The proposed location, scale, intensity of the activity.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.56	General District wide Matters / Wind / General WIND	Support	Support	Retain WIND chapter as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.304	General District wide Matters / Wind / General WIND	Support in part	All rules in the WIND chapter are supported, but it is considered that these Rules should also apply in MRZ and HRZ.	Retain all Rules in the Wind chapter with amendment.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.23	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Wind / General WIND	Support	Effective wind rules should be applied in MRZ and HRZ. Parts of inner residential Thorndon already experience nasty wind effects aggravated by 6+ story buildings. TRA seek to avoid any more wind hazards arising from constructed features being introduced to adjacent properties and/or onto our streets.	Allow / Allow in part.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.305	General District wide Matters / Wind / General WIND	Amend	Considers that Rules in the WIND chapter should apply to the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone, as there will be rules providing for buildings over 20m. These zones are currently not included.	Amend Rules in the Wind chapter so that they apply to the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone, where buildings go over 20m in height.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.85	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-O1	Support in part	Supports the focus of this objective on public spaces. It also supports the focus on safety of wind conditions. Considers reference to amenity effects should be removed.	Retain WIND-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment .
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.86	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-O1	Amend	Supports the focus of this objective on public spaces. It also supports the focus on safety of wind conditions. Considers reference to amenity effects should be removed.	Amend WIND-O1 (Purpose) as follows: The adverse impact of wind from new developments, additions and alterations on public spaces is managed to: 1. Provide comfortable conditions for pedestrians, whilst acknowledging that not all wind effects can be mitigated; 2 1. Ensure that new developments, additions and alterations do not generate unsafe wind conditions in public spaces and, where possible, ameliorate existing unsafe wind conditions; and 3 2. Prevent the gradual degradation of Wellington's pedestrian wind environment over time.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.312	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-O1	Support	Considers that the built environment can either worsen or mitigate wind, and Wellington has examples of both of these: with the benefit of modern knowledge, we can now design for the wind: this is particularly important for pedestrian and public areas. This objective will help the city progressively reduce windage in these areas, contributing to liveability.	Retain WIND-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.313	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P1	Support	Considers that the built environment can either worsen or mitigate wind, and Wellington has examples of both of these: with the benefit of modern knowledge, we can now design for the wind: this is particularly important for pedestrian and public areas. This objective will help the city progressively reduce windage in these areas, contributing to liveability.	Retain WIND-P1 (Early consideration of wind in design) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.87	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P2	Oppose in part	Supports the focus of this objective on public spaces. It also supports the focus on safety of wind conditions. Considers reference to amenity effects should be removed.	Opposes WIND-P2 (Managing effects) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.88	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P2	Amend	Supports the focus of this objective on public spaces. It also supports the focus on safety of wind conditions. Considers reference to amenity effects should be removed.	Amend WIND-P2 (Managing effects) as follows: Require that larger-scale buildings, including additions and alterations, are designed to: ... 3. Limit any deterioration of the wind environment that effects: a. Safety and amenity of pedestrians; and b. Existing wind mitigation measures.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.314	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P2	Support	Considers that the built environment can either worsen or mitigate wind, and Wellington has examples of both of these: with the benefit of modern knowledge, we can now design for the wind: this is particularly important for pedestrian and public areas. This objective will help the city progressively reduce windage in these areas, contributing to liveability.	Retain WIND-P1 (Managing effects) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.89	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P3	Support in part	Supports the focus of this objective on public spaces. It also supports the focus on safety of wind conditions. Considers reference to amenity effects should be removed.	Retain WIND-P2 (Managing effects) and seeks amendment. [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.90	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P3	Amend	Supports the focus of this objective on public spaces. It also supports the focus on safety of wind conditions. Considers reference to amenity effects should be removed.	Seeks to amend WIND-P2 (Managing effects) to replace 'practical' with 'practicable' in clause (3). [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.91	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P3	Oppose in part	Opposes the requirement in (3) to limit any deterioration of the wind environment that affects amenity of pedestrians. Considers (2) should refer to practicability, rather than practicality.	Seeks to amend WIND-P3 (Comfort and safety in public spaces) to remove "and comfort of". [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.92	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P3	Oppose in part	Opposes the requirement to maintain and where possible enhance the comfort of public space as it is inconsistent with the acknowledgement in WIND-O1(1).	Opposes WIND-P3 (Comfort and safety in public spaces) and seeks amendment. [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.93	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P3	Amend	Opposes the requirement to maintain and where possible enhance the comfort of public space as it is inconsistent with the acknowledgement in WIND-O1(1).	Seeks to amend WIND-P3 (Comfort and safety in public spaces) to remove "and comfort of public space". [Inferred decision requested]
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.315	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P3	Support	Considers that the built environment can either worsen or mitigate wind, and Wellington has examples of both of these: with the benefit of modern knowledge, we can now design for the wind: this is particularly important for pedestrian and public areas. This objective will help the city progressively reduce windage in these areas, contributing to liveability.	Retain WIND-P3 (Comfort and safety in public spaces) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.316	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-P4	Support	Considers that the built environment can either worsen or mitigate wind, and Wellington has examples of both of these: with the benefit of modern knowledge, we can now design for the wind: this is particularly important for pedestrian and public areas. This objective will help the city progressively reduce windage in these areas, contributing to liveability.	Retain WIND-P4 (Comfort and safety in public spaces created through new development) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.94	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-R1	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status when the construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures meet the permitted heights of various zones (being non-residential zones). where a wind report is required, supports the focus on effects on public spaces and considers the matters of discretion should be limited to the wind effects of the building height exceedance.	Retain WIND-R1.2 (Construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.95	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-R1	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status when the construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures meet the permitted heights of various zones (being non-residential zones). where a wind report is required, supports the focus on effects on public spaces and considers the matters of discretion should be limited to the wind effects of the building height exceedance.	Amend WIND-R1.2 (Construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures) to ensure matters of discretion (1), (3) and (4) are limited by (2).
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.317	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-R1	Support	Considers that the built environment can either worsen or mitigate wind, and Wellington has examples of both of these: with the benefit of modern knowledge, we can now design for the wind: this is particularly important for pedestrian and public areas. This objective will help the city progressively reduce windage in these areas, contributing to liveability.	Retain WIND-R1 (Construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.306	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-R1	Support in part	WIND-R1 is partially supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain WIND-R1 (Construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures) with amendment.

General Points on Part 3

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.307	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-R1	Amend	Considers that height limits in WIND-R1 should be amended to align with proposed Centre heights. Heights of buildings are restricted to between 12-20m depending on Centre type. These heights should be adjusted to better align with the height limits sought in the relevant centres to not preclude development necessary to have a quality urban environment.	Amend WIND-R1 (Construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures) to align with the heights of buildings restricted to between 12-20m depending on Centre type. [Refer to original submission for specific height amendments]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.96	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-R2	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of the construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures in residential zones provided by WIND-R2.	Retain WIND-R2 (Construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.8	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that the Wind rules should not apply to the Tertiary Education zone. Wind rules did not previously apply to the Institutional Precinct under the Wellington Operative District Plan. The University is not aware of any widespread and/or significant existing adverse wind effects that would justify extending control of wind effects to include the Tertiary Education zone.	Amend standard WIND-S1 (Safety) as follows: WIND-S1 ... Tertiary Education Zone
Property Council New Zealand	338.8	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-S1	Amend	Considers that wind test requirements at 20 m/s is inadequate and should be amended to 22m/s to allow for a buffer to the newly proposed minimum building heights and residential maximum heights. Proposing minimum building heights that sit above the 20 metre City Centre wind test threshold could have adverse effects for development within the city. For example, a minimum building height of 21.5 metres in Te Aro would mean all future developments would have to undertake a wind test which costs around \$20,000 - \$25,000 and adds approximately six to nine months to a project. Increasing the wind test level will likely encourage more large-scale developments in Wellington and would also simplify the Council's and applicant's overall development process.	Amend WIND-S1 (Safety) as follows: 1. The proposed building, additions or alterations must not result in an annual maximum gust speed in excess of 20 22 m/s in any public space.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.155	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-S1	Oppose	Considers Wellington is notoriously windy, and increasing the wind safety speed threshold when climate change is resulting in more extreme and uncertain weather conditions would be unsafe for pedestrians.	Disallow
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.9	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-S2	Oppose in part	Considers that the Wind rules should not apply to the Tertiary Education zone. Wind rules did not previously apply to the Institutional Precinct under the Wellington Operative District Plan. The University is not aware of any widespread and/or significant existing adverse wind effects that would justify extending control of wind effects to include the Tertiary Education zone.	Amend standard WIND-S1 (Safety) as follows: WIND-S2 ... Tertiary Education Zone
Dawid Wojasz	295.8	General District wide Matters / Wind / WIND-S2	Amend	Considers that undesirable conditions are not allowed to deteriorate by a set amount of days per year for new development. This is currently measured by comparing the existing environment with a proposed building. Considers that given that there are minimum heights in the district plan this should be the base level effects are measured against not the existing environment.	Seeks to amend the WIND-S2 (Deterioration of the wind environment), by changing the wording to allow a minimum height building be used as a reference to measure wind effects of proposed developments.
James Coyle	307.4	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks building height for all other zones apart from the CCZ and the Centres Zones be reduced by one or two storeys to be more specific to Wellington. [Inferred decision requested]
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.10	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	Considers that freedom camping should be a permitted activity in the zoned-based chapters on the basis that freedom camping should instead be managed through the Council's bylaw. [Option 2]	Seeks that freedom camping is a permitted activity in all zones.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.11	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	Considers that campgrounds should be a permitted activity in the zoned-based chapters, as allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for vehicle-based camping in the Wellington District. [Option 2]	Seeks that campgrounds are a permitted activity in all zones.

Residential - General Points

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Carolyn Stephens	344.8	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design. This is to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments, and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the plan be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect to urban design.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.383	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Support in part	For all zones, opposes any provisions that lessen the protection given to SNAs, OFLS, SALS, or areas of natural character in the coastal environment. We submit that all provisions in Zones still have to give effect to the requirements of the Act and national direction, including the NZCPS. Any exemptions from those requirements are opposed.	Amend all zones to remove any exemptions to requirements of national direction instruments, particularly the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
Ministry of Education	400.92	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	Submitter considers that educational facilities should be enabled as part of urban growth and development and are considered in any zoning changes made. The submitter notes that various changes are proposed to the zoning of land throughout the district. Changes in zoning have the potential to result in changes in development and in the population size and demographic of residents throughout the district, which can consequently impact on the capacity of educational facilities. The submitter acknowledges the changing nature of zoning and development within a district as part of the District Plan process.	Seeks that educational facilities are enabled as part of urban growth and development and are considered in any zoning changes made.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.496	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks an amendment that prohibiting noise sensitive activities within zones where such activities are not generally anticipated (i.e. the general industrial and Open Space Zones) are a prohibited activity.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.151	Part 3 / Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this decision requested as prohibiting activities is excessive and does not consider options for well-functioning urban environments when there may be opportunities to mitigate effects.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.151	Part 3 / Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guy Marriage	407.2	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	Considers that the shift in density and a residential zone level and potential for 3x3 on a single site calls for the need to have a design review, certainly if a 3x3 is proposed, and any development within the inner city as this will have a significant impact on the cities character. Without clear incentives for high quality design outcomes we simply risk creating a dumbed down mediocre city. A mandatory Design Panel Review will encourage high quality design outcomes.	Seeks the addition of a mandatory Design Review Panel for all inner-city developments, 3x3 developments in the medium density residential zone, mixed use developments and centres where developments are over 3 levels.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.14	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	Considers that Wellingtonians will relish the challenge of working together. Some suburbs such as Newtown are proactively taking a lead in rethinking their localities. Such initiatives create a sense of community, enhance democracy and deliver change in ways that build on community strengths. Seeks that participatory design projects, coupled with clear housing targets, so communities are involved in welcoming new people. Imposing arbitrary change when better options exist simply fosters local resentment.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design so as to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments, and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed.
Gregory Webber	33.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Green Street has houses primarily built in the 1890's and very early 1900's and you cannot bring these houses back once they're gone. Green Street housing is of the same era and aesthetic as the upper part of Wilson Street and Coromandel Street which are classified as heritage areas.	Seeks that the housing in Green Street has the same protection as Coromandel Street and Wilson Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.216	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Michael Harvey	38.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Seeks that "Sausage Flats" are actively discouraged through the MDRS in the District Plan, in a similar fashion to Auckland City Council.	Not specified
Peter Hill	41.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the Ministry for the Environment and Ministry of Housing and Urban Development are concerned about the effects of tall apartment blocks immediately adjacent to zones of much smaller housing. Considers that WCC does not follow the directives of the NPS-UD with respect to sensible zoning patterns when establishing the boundaries of the character precincts within the High Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan zoning patterns, in establishing the boundaries of Character Precincts within a High Density Residential Zone, adhere more closely to the points 1, 3 and 5 in Figure 11 "Sensible Zoning Patterns" of the Ministry for the Environment document: Understanding and Implementing Intensification Provisions for the NPS-UD. [Inferred decision requested].
Peter Hill	41.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the 11 blocks split between character precincts and the HDRZ in Mt Cook result in fragmentation of the suburb.	Seeks that Figure 1 (Peter Hill Submission to Proposed District Plan 26-8-22) is an example plan for the re-drawing of Character Precinct boundaries in Mount Cook. [Refer to original submission]
Peter Hill	41.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that Table 2.21 of the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (Demand and capacity comparison by housing type and by housing catchment 2021-2051) shows that the capacity for Inner Wellington exceeds the demand, it should be practicable to redraw the Character Precinct boundaries.	Seeks that the Character Precincts boundaries for Mount Cook are redrawn to create the type of sensible zoning pattern outlined by the Ministry for the Environment.
Peter Hill	41.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the PDP protects only 28.8% of the previous character areas while the equivalent Auckland plan protects about 75% which has not raised any objections from the Ministry for the Environment or the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.	Not specified.
Peter Hill	41.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that based on a site-by-site examination of Mt Cook brownfield areas, this yields a total area of 4.1884ha and at an uptake rate of 30% at least 300 new dwellings could be built in the potential brownfield sites identified in Figure 2 (Plan showing Potential Brownfield Sites in the Suburb of Mt Cook (excluding Adelaide Road area)). [Refer to original submission including attachments "Housing Notes - Mt Cook" and "Mt Cook - Brownfield Sites Survey" for full calculations]. Considers that as the estimated growth figures of additional dwellings for Mount Cook is 79-174 over 30 years [refer to Table 2: Inner Suburbs Estimated Growth Figures in original submission] this growth could be met by development in the potential brownfield sites alone.	Seeks that Figure 2 - Plan showing Potential Brownfield Sites in the Suburb of Mt Cook (excluding Adelaide Road area) support the practicability of a sensible zoning pattern for Mount Cook.
James Barber	56.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports intensification in the residential zones	Seeks that the residential intensification enabled by the PDP is approved
Conor Hill	76.23	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that limiting dwellings is anti-people. Considers that dwelling-per-section limits fail to take into account dwelling size.	Seeks that the limit of three dwellings per site are deleted in every zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.54	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers the submission point is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.88	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	This would be inconsistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS	Disallow
Judith Graykowski	80.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that dwellings built to the site boundaries are poor quality places and should require some transition from street to doorway.	Not specified.
Rowan Hannah	84.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers that the changes to the District Plan (specifically intensification provisions) will change the look and feel of the rural area and opposes medium density development in this area.	Seeks that intensification is not enabled in the General Rural Zone.
Interprofessional Trust	96.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the operative District Plan does not follow best practice with respect to medium density housing and that the PDP must rectify this. [Refer to original submission for further detail].	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to follow international best practice with respect to medium density housing. [refer to submission for further details]
Interprofessional Trust	96.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the recession plane provisions in the operative District Plan are inappropriate and that these must be accepted as mistakes and removed. [Refer to original submission for further details]	Seeks that the recession plane (Height in Relation to Boundary) standards are removed from the Proposed District Plan.
Interprofessional Trust	96.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that indoor-outdoor ambience should be provided to evert dwelling.	Seeks limits for indoor-outdoor ambience be imposed as set out in the submission.
Kate Zwartz	110.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers that preserving neighbourhood character and access to sunlight is important, and that controls are needed on how well high density is built.	Seeks reconsideration of loss of heritage protections and of the blanket 21m height limits in the central suburbs.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.39	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts in Newtown.	Allow
Gael Webster	114.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the WCC should only implement rules providing for the minimum intensification required by the government's new legislation.	Seeks that more qualifying matters are provided to give greater protection of heritage/character/townscape and amenity values (particularly sunshine hours on dwellings).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Braydon White	146.10	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Braydon White	146.11	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.
Braydon White	146.12	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Braydon White	146.13	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Braydon White	146.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that universal accessibility should be a non-negotiable for all developments.	Seeks that universal accessibility is a non-negotiable for all developments.
Vivienne Morrell	155.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the PDP will see a random scattering of six-or higher-storey tower blocks in what are largely one and two storey residential suburbs, with those blocks dominating and shading existing neighbours. The potential for poor health outcomes, poor housing and resentment of occupants is considerable.	Seeks that a transition zone next to heritage buildings and character precincts is created.
Vivienne Morrell	155.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that HRZ new six-storey buildings will make existing neighbours' houses shadier, damper, less healthy, and unpleasant to live in.	Not specified.
Vivienne Morrell	155.6	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that design requirements for multi-unit residential developments should be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience. Considers that the provisions for recession planes, privacy, outlook space and solar access (HRZ-S3, HRZ-S14, and HRZ-S15) are very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the HRZ can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.
Vivienne Morrell	155.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that it is a particular issue if a new building blocks the sunlight from existing solar panels on a neighbour's property.	Not specified.
Vivienne Morrell	155.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that dwellings built to the site boundaries are poor quality places and should require some transition from street to doorway.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jill Ford	163.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that all new multiunit developments include public outdoor green space suitable for children.
Amos Mann	172.16	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	<p>Considers that we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>Considers that these alternative housing solutions are not only excellent viable solutions to housing affordability barriers but also, if well planned for by council, are solutions to reducing the climate change and environmental impacts of single family traditional housing because they can use much less land per occupant and less building materials per occupant.</p> <p>In addition, well-planned co-living is a viable solution for increasing social cohesion.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that the District Plan empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including co-housing, tiny housing, and Papakāinga projects.
Ros Bignell	186.6	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Supports and welcomes new residential building that is well designed and complementary to the current streetscape of Newtown.	Seeks that new residential building that is well designed and complementary to the current streetscape of Newtown.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	F568.24	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow
Michael O'Rourke	194.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that height zoning should be applied more microscopically and be graduated based on neighbourhood, topography, and position on block in order to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.	Seeks that height zoning should be applied more microscopically and be graduated based on neighbourhood, topography, and position on block to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.
Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is contradictory to permit building intensification in the Kilbirnie, Lyall Bay, and Miramar suburbs, which are flood and tsunami prone, when the Government are not willing to invest in transport infrastructure (light rail) in the area due to its environmental vulnerability.</p> <p>In addition, the aging and unmaintained infrastructure will not tolerate this level of housing intensification.</p>	<p>Seeks that building intensification is reduced in the Eastern Suburbs area.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Supports densification when it is "done well" and fairly distributed across the entire city.	<p>Seeks that densification is distributed across the entire city and that six-storey buildings are not concentrated in Crofton Downs, Ngaio, and Khandallah.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the likes of Ngaio and Khandallah could benefit from some degree of densification to provide more local amenities and socio-cultural facilities, but this needs to be designed and executed well with constraint or consideration for the impacts on the community.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the housing crisis cannot be solved purely through increased supply alone. If new housing is not "affordable" and there are no controls on who can purchase all of this new housing supply, it is highly likely that a large percentage of new housing will be purchased by rent-seeking landlords, who will continue to push up rent costs.	Seeks that the WCC stipulate a certain percentage of newly built dwellings to be classed as "affordable".
Russell Taylor	224.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the requirement to ensure all residential properties have north facing sunlight and no property can shade adjacent properties needs to be strengthened.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.12	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that demolishing many functional wooden buildings to replace them with steel and concrete high-rises will create excessive landfill and excessive carbon emissions with consequent burdens on future generations.	Seeks that well-functioning older housing should be retained as much as possible to avoid landfill waste and reduce carbon emissions.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.13	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that homes should be warm, dry places of stability where natural sunlight, mood enhancing benefits and areas of open space are recognised as essential to human wellbeing. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Because the first areas to be intensified will be at the whim of developers, well-functioning, established heritage and character housing such as Lower Kelburn will be among the first to be demolished as an investment opportunity.	Not specified.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan be amended to make greater provision for limited notification in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.
Victoria Stace	235.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that yard setbacks enable adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Seeks that yard setbacks of at least 1.5m front yard and 1m side yard are required in all residential zones.
Alan Fairless	242.12	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that throughout the city are many sites that sit idle or underutilised. Developing these sites provides a means to addressing much of the future housing demand while avoiding adverse effects on quality, amenity and character. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the District Plan sets out a clear sequence for intensification that focusses first on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport, rather than upzoning broad areas of land.
Alan Fairless	242.13	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities.
Alan Fairless	242.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that current proposals only develop 14% of rezoned areas. LIVE Wellington want to see partnerships that will develop at least 50% of underutilised land in the next ten years.	Seeks that the District Plan identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Alan Fairless	242.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the District Plan more comprehensively provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas.
Steve Dunn	288.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Does not support having a blanket provision enabling 3 units up to 3 storeys or multi unit buildings up to 6 storeys and considers this contrary to the objective of providing a liveable well-functioning urban environment.	Seeks that an urban development plan, specific to the local area be developed as a refined response and would allow for intensive development in specific areas that consider the immediate surroundings, topography, local character, and ecology.
Steve Dunn	288.6	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that Newtown is suited to 3-4 storey housing along its transport spine [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that building heights in central Newtown are amended to 3-4 storeys. [Inferred decision requested]
Steve Dunn	288.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that to meet the objectives of a healthy living environment, the plan is amended to protect sunlight access for all outdoor living areas, not just public open space, as well as solar panels on roofs.	Seeks that the plan is amended to protect sunlight access for all outdoor living areas, not just public open space, as well as solar panels on roofs.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports restricted discretionary status for breached standards, rather than a broader discretionary status.	Retain approach where a standard is breached that a restricted discretionary activity status is used.
Tawa Community Board	294.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Concerned about the transition edges between areas of differing permitted density not being addressed nor the effect of topography in Tawa.	Not specified.
Matthew Plummer	300.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that there is insufficient infrastructure to deliver the significant uplift in housing that Wellington needs.	Not specified.
Matthew Plummer	300.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers WCC should enable infrastructure development in the form of big apartment buildings in areas like Adelaide Road, Cambridge Terrace and Kent Terrace, in similar fashion to what has been done on Victoria Street. The Proposed District Plan in its current form will not incentivise development of affordable homes.	Seeks that infrastructure development be incentivised on Adelaide Road, Cambridge Terrace and Kent Terrace.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the proposed set-back provisions of the Draft District Plan should be reinstated. Requiring developments on narrow streets to have to step back as they rose higher would stop the obliteration of daylight and sunlight to the residents on lower levels. This was a vitally important step to take and should not have been removed from the Proposed District Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Draft District Plan's set-back provisions be reinstated for City Centre Zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	305.30	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the zoning applied to parts of Aro Valley in the PDP reflects historical errors that have been carried over from the ODP. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that historical errors are corrected by relief sought in submission.
James Coyle	307.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Opposes the current change for Multi-Unit properties from 4-hour winter sunlight to living areas to 1 hour daylight to living areas.	Seeks that the 4-hour sunlight requirement for living areas from the Operative Plan Residential Design Guide be reinstated.
James Coyle	307.6	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers Newtown should have special zones dedicated to intensive development, such as terraced housing blocks and plazas. These zones could be brownfield and part of centre zones. For instance, the area opposite the entry to the zoo with borders of Owen, Daniell and Manchester.	Seeks that Newtown have special zones dedicated to intensive development to create terraced housing blocks and plazas.
James Coyle	307.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that building topologies should not be mixed too much.	Not specified.
James Coyle	307.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that over shadowing and overlooking should be minimised.	Not specified.
James Coyle	307.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers there needs to be a maximum height for single dwellings that is much lower than for multi-unit. The demographic of Newtown is changing and outcome may be large houses that have car parking underneath and that build high to access views.	Seeks that the maximum height for single dwellings is much lower than for multi-unit.
Penelope Borland	317.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Penelope Borland	317.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the PDP should include sunlight provisions in all residential zone housing areas, rather than a minimum of 2 hours of daylight.	Seeks that Residential Zones include sunlight provisions for housing areas.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.24	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	It would be useful to have clarity on how low decks and eaves are to be treated in relation to setbacks - exclusion of decks no more than 500mm above ground and also eaves up to 600mm (as applying at b & c in the Makara Beach & Makara Village precinct) could usefully be applied generally.	Clarify how low decks and eaves will be treated in the residential zones.
Bruce Crothers	319.16	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that planning for new housing and rural areas should include the implementation of wildlife corridors including encouragement to restore the Queens chain to public access.	Seeks that wildlife corridors and access to the Queen's chain be taken into account when planning for new housing.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.10	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that residential zones in Mt Cook may get too much shading from neighbouring City Centre Zones. Private properties should benefit from the same shading limits as green places. The proposed plan has constraints on shading green areas, other than very limited recession plane requirements, but nothing to limit the shading of private properties.	Seeks that constraints be developed to prevent City Centre Zones from shading private properties, in similar fashion to constraints in place for Open Space Zones.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.99	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	[Not specified].	Disallow
Property Council New Zealand	338.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that residential standards meant for new apartments and townhouses to be pleasant places to live in could have unintended consequences if not worked closely with the sector.	Not specified.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.23	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that some measure of minimum floor space per person should be required to avoid tiny low-quality spaces for people to live in.	Seeks that minimum residential unit size standards include a measure of minimum floor space per person.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.24	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that housing needs to provide a high standard of accessibility, because 25% of New Zealanders will be over 65 by 2030 and 25% of New Zealanders have a disability.	Seeks that housing provide a high standard of accessibility.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.25	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that developments with oppressive street frontages, like garages, are impediments to community connection, and should be discouraged in the District Plan's design rules.	Seeks that developments with oppressive street frontages be discouraged.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.384	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Seeks reinsertion of the deleted SNAs in the residential zones, and the provisions protecting them, and apply the ECO provisions to these zones.	Amend GRUZ-P2 (Keeping of goats): Provide for the keeping of goats <u>outside of significant natural areas</u> in the General Rural Zone where they are contained and managed to avoid adverse ecological effects within identified significant natural areas
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.158	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes amendments as this may impact on residential intensification outcomes.	Disallow
Inner City Wellington	352.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the current level of intensification already occurring is exacerbating the existing deficit in amenities available to inner-city residents living in 'vertical streets.	Not specified.
Inner City Wellington	352.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the plan may not be able to directly influence and improve Sunlight protection.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Inner City Wellington	352.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the plan may not be able to directly influence and improve Diversity of Inner City Neighbourhoods.	Not specified.
John Bryce	354.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that WCC should develop special rules for areas like Aro Valley where one size building rules will result in poor quality and unhealthy dwellings. For example, six story buildings are totally inappropriate in many parts of Aro Valley where they would block the small amount of winter sunshine from nearby property. Considers that sunshine is important for healthy living spaces, particularly in freestanding older wooden houses that do not benefit from the heated thermal mass that exists in concrete apartment buildings where sunlight may suffice.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan protects future inhabitants of dwellings by ensuring good quality living spaces. [Inferred decision requested]
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.13	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that building height in relation to boundary, outdoor living spaces, landscaped areas, permeable surface area, minimum residential unit size and setbacks from any boundary, especially the street facing boundary might impact neighbouring properties and reduce the adjacent street's amenity, vibrancy and safety.	Not specified.
Waka Kotahi	370.258	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Seeks that Wellington City Council undertake further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD. [Inferred decision requested]
Waka Kotahi	370.259	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Seeks that Wellington City Council undertake further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD. [Inferred decision requested]
Waka Kotahi	370.260	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Submitter supports greater heights for multi-unit developments that are subject to resource consent.	Not specified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.106	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	The submitter acknowledges that relief is not appropriate in relation to the construction and use of up to three dwellings per site. However, the submitter notes that residential amenity will be better protected for larger-scale and higher-density residential developments where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity where there is an interface with a Commercial or Mixed-Use Zone, or with lawfully established non-residential activities.	Amend the Residential Zones to ensure that larger-scale and higher-density residential developments are designed to managed reverse sensitivity where there is an interface with a commercial or Mixed-use Zone, or with lawfully established non-residential activities. [Inferred decision requested].
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.46	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought due to potential impacts on the scale of residential intensification.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.14	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.14	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in these submission points as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.107	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	The submitter notes that several of the fuel companies assets are located in close proximity to residential zoned properties. The proposed changes to the residential zones have the potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects and amenity effects.	Not specified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.318	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support in part	Generally supportive of the proposals for medium density and high density residential zones. Minor suggestions made [further detail provided in later parts of submission and summarised below]	Not specified.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.10	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium density residential zone) height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Sue Kedgley	387.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that there are numerous sites in the inner city which are ideal for high-rise buildings such as along main arterial routes such as Kent Terrace, Adelaide Road, Taranaki Street, Vivian Street and Te Aro flats.	Seeks that densification focuses on the areas such as along Kent Terrace, Adelaide Road, Taranaki Street, Vivian Street and Te Aro flats.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.52	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Prioritising Brownfield development is Supported There are strong economic & social benefits from concentrating development in Te-Aro and on the city fringes of inner-city suburbs close to main transport routes, on relatively flat ground and where renewal of 3 water infrastructure can be concentrated into a smaller area. This is a much better alternative than the propose scattergun approach of allowing 6-story apartment blocks to be built through the majority of the inner-city suburbs. By doing this, valuable heritage and innercity character areas could be retained while meeting the required housing need in Wellington at the same time.	Disallow
Sue Kedgley	387.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that there are numerous vacant or under-utilised commercial buildings in the city centre that could be converted and re-purposed into apartment blocks. Valuable character areas comprised of pre-1930s wooden houses should be retained and high-rise development concentrated in the CBD. By doing this, valuable heritage and inner-city character areas could be retained while meeting the required housing need in Wellington at the same time.	Seeks that densification focuses on the areas such as in the central city, where there are numerous vacant or under-utilised commercial buildings that could be converted and re-purposed into apartment blocks.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.53	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Prioritising Brownfield development is Supported There are strong economic & social benefits from concentrating development in Te-Aro and on the city fringes of inner-city suburbs close to main transport routes, on relatively flat ground and where renewal of 3 water infrastructure can be concentrated into a smaller area. This is a much better alternative than the propose scattergun approach of allowing 6-story apartment blocks to be built through the majority of the inner-city suburbs. By doing this, valuable heritage and innercity character areas could be retained while meeting the required housing need in Wellington at the same time.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.308	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the residential intensification provisions in the Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential Zones should be reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board. Residential intensification standards should be expanded to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops, and where necessary introduce a new chapter.	Seeks that residential intensification provisions in the Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential Zones are reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.29	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.309	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that where standards are not referenced in building and structure activity rules, an activity status should be provided for non-compliance with the standard. It is sought that this activity status in Residential Zones is a Restricted Discretionary to be consistent with the general approach throughout the Plan.	Seeks that where Residential Zone standards are not referenced in building and structure activity rules a Restricted Discretionary activity status is provided for non-compliance with the standard, to be consistent with the general approach throughout the Plan
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.310	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	The submitter has noted that as a result of their amendments requested for height adjustments there may be consequential changes needed to other standards such as wind and daylight standards.	Seeks that standards are amended across the plan to be proportionate to the building height changes sought in the submission.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.31	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers that what is proposed will lead to an increase in building height.	Disallow
Stephen Minto	395.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the historic low-rise suburbs of older wooden buildings are a character feature throughout Wellington that is of huge liveability and tourist value.	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.497	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Air Noise Boundary is amended to establish a policy framework where resource consents can be declined within existing residential zones for noise sensitive activities on reverse sensitivity grounds;
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.152	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from noise can be appropriately managed and the concept of reverse sensitivity is not supported.	Disallow
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.152	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Emma Osborne	410.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Emma Osborne	410.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.
Stephen Minto	FS100.17	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacrter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow
Emma Osborne	410.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for provding pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stephen Minto	FS100.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>Submtter 410 proposes the encouragement of ‘Pop-up public realm’ for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. ‘Closing time drink up ya tea’. That just doesn’t match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It’s simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it’s just bad luck.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 410.9]</p>	Disallow
Donna Yule	421.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>Opposes the blanket policy of Medium Density 3 Storey Residential housing in all residential areas - the height limits are too high. Also no residential minimum boundaries space of at least 1 metre.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the geographical location of each individual suburb, its terrain and orientation to the sun. For suburbs that are built in a north south direction with hills either side and the main housing is on the flat, any 3 storey building will cast a significant shadow over many properties.</p> <p>Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows.</p> <p>Added to that no space between properties, no outside areas to enjoy a little privacy. These suburbs will become sunless undesirable transitional suburbs where people will only stay a short time until the can afford to move elsewhere with sun & outdoor space.</p>	Not specified.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington is a folded landscape with valleys and ridges, and this means that a single large dwelling in the wrong place can adversely affect many others.</p> <p>The PDP needs to allow and adjust for this reality by adopting a more carefully tailored and locally nuanced approach, rather than a one-size-fits-all approach if it is to avoid serious and long-lasting adverse impacts in Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that planning needs to drive and encourage quality and ensure the design of new, more intensive development works with the city’s idiosyncratic landscape and for the communities in which it is located. We need local Design Guides, founded on a sophisticated understanding of local character, as a proven and effective vehicle for addressing good residential quality.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan must more comprehensively provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas, the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities and strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association	429.28	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that the Spatial Plan/PDP proposes that over 2/3rds of population growth be absorbed into selected outer suburban areas while inner suburbs will take a much smaller impact. The experience of the Johnsonville MDRA shows that simply zoning residential areas for denser development does not lead to more housing or affordable housing. This is simply unsustainable to focus growth on a few suburbs as population growth needs to be supported across the city.</p> <p>Increasing the available residential accommodation close to the city centre is more likely to be attractive to new residents, as inner suburbs are more accessible by active modes and have more frequent and faster public transport services. Living in inner suburbs is attractive to many because they can access the vibrant city centre – including its work cultural and sporting opportunities – easily and efficiently, without clogging roads or wasting resources on transport unnecessarily.</p>	Seeks that the proposed district plan focuses on increasing available residential accommodation close to the city centre.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.29	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that about half of the multi-level developments in Johnsonville have been built in breach of the MDRA planning rules but have been allowed because impacts were less than minor.</p> <p>Considers that there has been a breach of the WCC Planning Officers duty of care to consider and act to protect the best interests of home owners where residential developments do not comply with Council planning rules.</p> <p>The expectation with multi-unit developments is now that there will be non-notified permits for developments that exceed the limits of the PDP rules.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the criteria required for permitting non-compliant housing developments on a non-notified basis is more clearly outlined in the Proposed District Plan.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.30	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	<p>Considers that 3+ storey developments will render neighbouring homes less warm and dry.</p> <p>Considers whether council has fulfilled its fiduciary duty, duty of care obligation to affected residential home owners impacted by new building heights.</p>	Not specified.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that allowing extensive redevelopment which removes the existing trees and other plants in Newtown's backyards does permanent damage to the natural bio-diversity of the area. Private gardens comprise the greatest proportion of green space in urban environments, so their potential to contribute to biodiversity is significant</p>	Not specified.
Ingrid Downey	443.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that the existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan should be retained rather than replacing them with the minimum daylight provisions in the PDP.</p> <p>Keeping the Operative Plan provisions will ensure a minimum level of quality - and humanity - will be maintained in our new homes.</p> <p>Considers that light is fundamental to our well-being, and shading is far more than simply a minor issue. Reductions in sunlight can and do affect: heating and light cost; dampness; the ability to dry clothes outside and grow food; and mental well-being.</p>	<p>Seeks that the existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan are reinstated in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.17	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that a height limit of 11m on properties bordering the town belt will lead to a loss of character over time and will degrade the natural backdrop that the town belt provides for the City.</p>	Amend the rules (and associated objectives and policies) so that a height limit of 8m is applied to all properties bordering the town belt.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ben Barrett	479.21	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that Constable Street is not a major transport corridor. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that appropriate building planning needs to be had along Constable Street, varying in height, with building heights reducing as the elevation of the road rises.
Catharine Underwood	481.21	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that design requirements for multi-unit residential developments regarding sunshine and shading need to be strengthened or made mandatory to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience. New 22m, 14m and 11m storey blocks will make existing neighbouring houses shadier, damper, less healthy, and unpleasant to live in. A particular issue is if a new building blocks sunlight from existing solar panels on a neighbour's property.	Seeks that provisions for multi-unit developments be stricter in regards to the shade they can cast.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.46	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that many people are concerned about multi-unit developments not providing the sort of quality, privacy and amenity that a house in its own section can. That is not true if the units are well-designed.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments have good design that provides privacy. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.47	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments are accessible. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.48	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments have outside spaces including for clothes drying. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.49	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments include storage and bike parking. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.50	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments provide green space both private and communal. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.51	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments be insulated for noise and energy efficiency. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.52	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments have access to daylight. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.73	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that there are inconsistencies in the zoning and identifying of rapid transit stops across the region. Concerned about the impact this will create in the future.	Not specified.

Residential - Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jonathan Markwick	490.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports the increase in height controls in the Mt Cook area.	Retain the building height controls in the Mt Cook area as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Greg Coyle	39.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that any building over two storeys will shade roof-top solar panels and make these useless. Therefore written approval should be required if development is occurring next to a site with solar panels.	Seeks that neighbours' approval is required for any development next to a site that has roof top solar panels.
Karen Serjeantson	43.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that the recent government amendments for denser housing have not taken into account older, unique areas such as Roseneath where properties can have no bordering street. Considers that the building of a 12-metre high house on the North side of 95 Grafton Road could restrict sunlight access to the house and change the outlook to a huge wall - which could be expected in the city centre but not the residential area. Seeks that space between houses is maintained for passive solar access.	Not specified.
Karen Serjeantson	43.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Seeks clarification as to where is the heritage protection for the site at 95 Grafton Road, which historically was one of only two houses overlooking Balaena Bay.	Seeks clarification about heritage protection.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that the PDP growth estimates need to allow for children's primary education and day centres in the Mount Victoria area.	Not specified.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that allowing the neighbour at 43 Porritt Avenue to build higher than an 11 metre building would block the sun and make any solar panels, if installed, redundant.	Seeks that existing utilities such as solar panels, skylights etc. on neighbouring properties will be considered and safeguarded in the consent decision making process.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Seeks clarification as to whether the Council will reimburse the cost of setting up solar and provide a replacement solution for alternative energy.	Seeks clarification.
Shailesh Kumar Patel	49.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Opposes the restrictions and provisions on site in the Air Noise Overlay, which mean that Council and Wellington Airport permission is required for subdivision and infill new housing on the existing section. Currently the Airport is not giving any permission for subdivision and infill on the existing section for resident housing as well as commercial buildings. Considers that sites in the Air Noise Boundary should have the same development rights as sites outside this (i.e. be able to build in accordance with the MDRS).	Seeks that council ease restrictions on subdivision and infill housing in the Air Noise Boundary so that these sites have the development potential available under the MDRS.
Michael Hamilton	53.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	PDP does not protect or acknowledge existing heating and energy consumption patterns of storey bungalows that make up most of Karori and will lose passive-heating if with no protections. Loss of passive heating during winter will require alternative heating methods which consume more energy and have a larger carbon footprint. Retrofits to account for changes in passive heating will be expensive for property owners. [Refer to original submission for further detail, including attachments]	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter is amended to recognise and protect the energy efficiency and energy consumption of the existing housing stock, through recognising these effects as a resource with their own protections, or new developments should not be allowed to impact existing dwellings energy daytime energy requirements by more than 10%.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Trace Quinn	54.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that 369 Adelaide Road would benefit from increased height control to 21 meters, rather than the current 14m limit. The site has potential for housing development that will depend on the outcome of the district plan changes. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that height control be increased from 14m to 21m at 369 Adelaide Rd.
Judith Ellen Bleach	60.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that challenging the heritage status of areas and properties in Wellington by the WCC in the name of progress has been a superficial process. There has been serious concern expressed by residents.	Reinstate the Officers Recommended Plan as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.43	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports submission seeking textending character precincts in Owen Street Newtown.	Allow
Judith Ellen Bleach	60.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that 98 Owen Street should be included in a character precinct. Notes that the WCC records for 98 Owen Street stated that the house existed prior to 1892. The property was purchased substantially due to the character of the house and surrounding houses in the street (Owen Street and Cardall Street). The property has undergone substantial renovations to ensure it is warm and dry and its rich and interesting heritage is a source of pride for the owner.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include 98 Owen Street.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.44	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports submission seeking textending character precincts in Owen Street Newtown.	Allow
Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that if the entire site at 9 Comber Place is not rezoned MRZ, then the zoning should be split with the northern portion being zoned MRZ and the southern portion zoned NOSZ as shown in the submission. (OPTION A)	Seeks that if the entirety of the site at 9 Comber Place is not zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, then the zoning should be split Medium Density Residential Zone/Natural Open Space Zone with the zone boundary across the centre of the site. Consequential amendment to the mapping.
Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that if the entire site at 9 Comber Place is not rezoned MRZ, then the existing split zoning should be retained. (OPTION B)	Seeks that if the entirety of the site at 9 Comber Place is not zoned Medium Density Residential Zone and OPTION A is not selected, then the zoning should be split Medium Density Residential Zone/Natural Open Space Zone to reflect the Outer Residential/Open Space B zoning in the Operative District Plan. Consequential amendment to the mapping.
Susan Rotto	63.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	MRZ-P8.4 (Achieve attractive and safe streets), MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) and MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) cannot work without provision for off-street parking. Lack of off-street parking drives parking on-street which packs up streets, which are unsafe and provide no space for workers.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter is amended to require at least one off-street car park per residential unit on a site.
Susan Rotto	63.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	MRZ-P8.4 (Achieve attractive and safe streets), MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) and MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) cannot work without provision for off-street parking. Lack of off-street parking drives parking on-street which packs up streets, which are unsafe and provide no space for workers.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter is amended to require 1 > off-street car parks on sites that are used for non-residential purposes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Juliet Cooke	68.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ standards will lead to inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values and are therefore contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan.</p> <p>Heritage and character are qualifying matters under MRZ Pt1 Sch 1.</p> <p>The height limits in Height Control Area 9 would allow inappropriate scale of development adjacent to land which is zoned for residential purposes or has character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>Moir Street will have adverse effects due to the potential for development in neighbouring CCZ zoning.</p> <p>Moir street is a key and coherent character and heritage area.</p> <p>Moir street is unique with the amount of overlapping relevant overlays.</p> <p>[See submission for further detail]</p>	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter appropriately considers the transition between the Medium Density Residential Zone and the City Centre Zone to protect heritage and character values.
Brett McKay	69.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes MRZ provisions in their entirety.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions are recrafted to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock.
Richard Murcott	FS71.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Reasonable, well-regulated intensification in MDRZ's is OK. Unreasonable intensification is not OK. Intensification that jeopardises things that are valued by communities (liveability), and risk things that are valuable for the city's reputation overall (its character and heritage), may be considered imprudent or irresponsible. The city doesn't need to rush into this. This increases the risks. The stakes are high; one mistake at this point could jeopardise a lot over the next 10-30yrs.	Allow
Brett McKay	69.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the Council should recraft provisions for the inner residential neighbourhoods that will achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock.</p> <p>This will require objectives and policies that recognise both residential character and heritage qualities supported by rules with 'teeth' to ensure appropriate implementation.</p>	Seeks that the Council devise new provisions relating to intensification of residential neighbourhoods.
Richard Murcott	FS71.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Reasonable, well-regulated intensification in MDRZ's is OK. Unreasonable intensification is not OK. Intensification that jeopardises things that are valued by communities (liveability), and risk things that are valuable for the city's reputation overall (its character and heritage), may be considered imprudent or irresponsible. The city doesn't need to rush into this. This increases the risks. The stakes are high; one mistake at this point could jeopardise a lot over the next 10-30yrs.	Allow
Judith Graykowski	80.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP will result in a random scattering of tower blocks in the Mount Victoria area. These blocks will dominate and shade existing neighbours in what is mainly a one or two storey residential suburb.</p> <p>This has considerable potential for poor health outcomes and resentment.</p>	Seeks that the maximum building height is reduced to 11 or 14 metres for a much greater proportion of the Mount Victoria area.
Rachel Marr	89.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that residential multi-unit developments affect neighbours and need to be notified.	Seeks that notification of multi-unit developments is required. [Inferred decision requested]
Hugh Good	90.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure should not be a qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.	Seeks that three waters infrastructure should not be a qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
292 Main Road Limited	105.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes 292 Main Road, Tawa (The site) being zoned as MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone). Considers that the site is within 700m walking distance from Lindon Station in Tawa which is a rapid transit stop and is therefore within a walkable catchment. WCC Spatial Plan puts the site within NPS-UD Policy 3 (c) areas. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that 292 Main Road, Tawa is rezoned to HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).
Tawa Business Group	107.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of 1 Redwood Avenue, 3 Redwood Avenue, and 85 Main Road, Tawa as Medium Density Residential. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Rezone 1 Redwood Avenue, 3 Redwood Avenue, and 85 Main Road, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.
Gael Webster	114.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that based on evidence from expert Council officers, Boffa Miskell consultants, and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga assessment, the character areas in other parts of Wellington (as well as Mount Victoria) should also be considerably larger.	Not specified.
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Anne Lian	132.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.
Anne Lian	132.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Anne Lian	132.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.
Anne Lian	132.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Ingo Schommer	133.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.
Ingo Schommer	133.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Ingo Schommer	133.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Olivier Reuland	134.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.
Olivier Reuland	134.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Olivier Reuland	134.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.
Olivier Reuland	134.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Ella Patterson	138.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Ella Patterson	138.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Grant Buchan	143.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that all inconsistencies between the NPS-UD and MDRS should be removed (in favour of NPS-UD directions).	Seeks that all NPS-UD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development) recommendations are adhered to in the Medium Density Residential Zones. [Inferred decision requested].
Grant Buchan	143.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.
Grant Buchan	143.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Grant Buchan	143.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.
Grant Buchan	143.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Braydon White	146.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations with respect to building height limits, recession planes and setbacks.	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.
Braydon White	146.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.

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

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John Schiff	166.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that intensive development in character areas such as Mt Victoria will not offer "affordable" housing as the demand for inner city living will continue to grow and new builds will fetch high prices, shutting out those seeking affordable living. In fact, the houses that are likely to be demolished to make way for new developments are most likely providing affordable rental accommodation. These will disappear if the character zones are reduced as significantly as proposed. Considers that a more balanced approach between retaining character precincts and allowing more intensive development is required.	Not specified.
Amos Mann	172.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.
Amos Mann	172.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Amos Mann	172.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Patrick Wilkes	173.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.
Patrick Wilkes	173.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Patrick Wilkes	173.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.
Patrick Wilkes	173.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (Medium density Residential Zone) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.
Pete Gent	179.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.
Pete Gent	179.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Pete Gent	179.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pete Gent	179.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
James Harris	180.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
James Harris	180.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that strong controls on shading caused by proposed new developments are required such as build to the sun, enabling passive solar house, and solar panels.
Historic Places Wellington	182.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the extent of the character areas of the operative district plan are a matter of national importance under s6 of the RMA supported by the following reasons: - The Pre-1930s character area review - The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga submission on the Draft Spatial Plan. - Council officers recommendations June 2021 recommendations on the Spatial Plan. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that a resource consent be required to demolish a building built before 1930 applies to the same spatial extent as the Operative District Plan.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.103	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	All inner Residential suburbs should be MDZ Exemption from upzoning Importance of character areas Character Precincts, rules & design regime Extended Character Precincts in line with Boffa Miskell Demolition be a restricted activity for pre-1930 buildings New viewshaft for views of St Paul's	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.80	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is concerned about the potential loss in intensification opportunities if the proposed relief is granted.	Disallow
Athena Papadopoulos	183.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.
Lara Bland	184.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.
Emma Baines	185.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the PDP heights for Cockayne Road, Khandallah.	Retain proposed building heights for Cockayne Road as notified.
Ros Bignell	186.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the existing newer, infill townhouses on Lawrence Street are positioned such that they have a relatively low impact on the overall streetscape. This might be similarly possible with new 3 storey (11 metres height) townhouses or residential buildings but not with 4 storey multi dwelling buildings of up to 14 metres.	Seeks that the building height limit in Lawrence Street is reduced from 14m to 11m. [Inferred decision requested].
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Anne Lian	198.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.51	Part 3 / Residential I Zones / Medium Density Residential I Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Sunlight is important for health and well-being, as well as practical applications such as passive heating and solar PV. Retain or improve allowance for sunlight.	Disallow
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that it is not fair nor reasonable that the outer northern suburbs deal with the brunt of intensification, while the inner suburbs that are close walking distance to the CBD or on the proposed light-rail route, appear not to be included in the six-plus storey building densification plans. This will increase the value of the already costly inner suburbs while the comparably more affordable outer suburbs will decrease in value.	Seeks that Ngaio and Khandallah should not be expected to accommodate the construction of six-storey residential buildings to ease the housing affordability crisis but not other Wellington suburbs which are within walking distance of the central city.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the upzoning of residential land to medium-density, in keeping with the MDRS. Considers that this will allow more housing across current suburbs, providing more choice for young people of where to live in the future and reducing reliance on new greenfield developments.	Retain MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that non demolition rules should be extended to other building cohorts that are durable.	Seeks non-demolition rules for other building cohort eras that have produced durable residential buildings.
Dougal and Libby List	207.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the Proposed District Plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (Medium Density Residential Zone) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.
Craig Forrester	210.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.
Richard W Keller	232.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Richard W Keller	232.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.
Richard W Keller	232.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.
Stephen Minto	FS100.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacrter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Regan Dooley	239.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.
Regan Dooley	239.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary.	Remove the references to "supported residential care activity" from the Medium Density Residential zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Prime Property Group	256.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Spenmoor area defined in the district plan restricts any multi residential development in this area by seeking further assessments with respect to traffic.</p> <p>Considers that the street is no worse than others in Newlands that do not have a specific policy focussed on traffic effects and roading capacity.</p> <p>Works are scheduled which negate the need for the policy and further assessment of traffic effects</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Seeks to remove all references in the chapter to Spenmoor Street Area.
Wellington City Council	266.131	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Considers introduction to the chapter needs to be amended to include reference to inundation areas as a qualifying matter.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 6 of the Medium Density Residential Zone Introduction as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stream corridors, and overland flow paths <u>and inundation areas</u> (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter). <p>Note – for changes to the MRZ chapter, refer to the annotated version of the chapter that is included with the submission.</p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.105	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes this submission, noting that inundation areas are managed by other rules so therefore do not necessarily need to be included as qualifying matters.</p>	Disallow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) at 395 Middleton Road in Upper Stebbings and Glenside West development zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes Medium Density Residential Zone in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Future Development Zone (specifically at 395 Middleton Road).
Parsons Green Trust	291.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that The current and ongoing childcare centre use of the PGT land would better align with the purpose of the MUZ, and the MUZ provisions would better enable commercial and mixed use development opportunities to service the surrounding residential catchment,</p> <p>A MUZ and MDRZ zone interface is not out of the ordinary. The PGT land is similarly located on the corner of Redwood Avenue / Main Road and adjoins the General Industrial Zone to the east. Furthermore, in order to address the interface with residential zones The MUZ contains rules relating to buildings and standards, noting that Rule MUZ-S5 requires windows on walls adjacent to Residential Zones to comprise of opaque privacy glazing to mitigate privacy or overlooking onto adjoining residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>MUZ is the most appropriate zoning for the PGT land. Applying the MUZ to the PGT land would create a practical zoning boundary and the MUZ contains provisions which manage potential privacy and amenity effects on adjoining MDRZ sites.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes 1 & 3 Redwood Avenue and 85 Main Road, Tawa being zoned as Medium Density Residential Zone.
Priscilla Williams	293.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	<p>Considers that the spatial area coverage (Medium Density Residential Zoning) to Kinross Street in the PDP is appropriate.</p>	Retain the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) zoning at Kinross Street as notified.
Johanna Carter	296.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the MRZ objectives, policies and standards</p>	Opposes Medium Density Residential zone chapter as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johanna Carter	296.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the proposed outlook provisions do not appear to achieve privacy and in some instances will have adjoining neighbours looking directly at each other with very little separation between properties.	Seeks addition of a new provision in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter to add a parking standard requirement for new units where there is insufficient available on road parking.
Johanna Carter	296.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the simplistic notion that getting rid of parking will discourage private vehicle use is short sighted and not justified and without adequate provision for some parking per site will generate adverse effects – such as impeding traffic flow especially for emergency vehicles, creating pedestrian hazards as well as generating unsightly negative visual effects. Not all streets in Wellington have sufficient on street parking available so encouraging some off-street parking seems prudent.	Seeks the addition of a new provision in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter to add a requirement that sites accommodate some parking to cater for people with disabilities and families not able to use public transport and for those where public transport is erratic. [Inferred decision requested]
Johanna Carter	296.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that there is no reason why the multi-unit rules have lesser standards of privacy outlook and open space.	Seeks that provisions relating to outlooks in multi-unit developments need further refinement and investigation to better control the adverse effects such developments will generate.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes changing zoning of part of the Tapu te Ranga marae site at 44 Rhine Street, Island Bay from NOSZ to MRZ. Submitter acknowledges their original request for increased residential zoning in the PDP, they would like to amend the extent of residential zoning within the PDP to reflect the original residential and open space zoning in the operative district plan. This is to reflect the aspirations the submitter has for the site in the next 10-15 years. At this stage, the Trust do not have the resources to comprehensively address contamination and geotechnical issues, so would like to revert to the zoning shown in the operative district plan (changing additional Medium Residential Zone back to Open Space).	Seeks that land at 44 Rhine Street, Island Bay that has been rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone from Natural Open Space Zone, be rezoned back to Natural Open Space Zone.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the specific reference to Tapu-te-Ranga requiring specific policies to manage opportunities on their site.	Retain introduction of Medium Density Residential Zone as notified.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that the revised recession plane (height in relation to boundary) provisions introduced by the MDRS and the adoption of the MRZ removes the chance for sunlight, while also reducing adequate daylight, and that design guidance on this would improve built outcomes.	Seeks amendments to the design guides to address sunlight/daylight access.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.221	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which seeks for retirement villages to be excluded from the application of the Design Guides.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.221	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which seeks for retirement villages to be excluded from the application of the Design Guides.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers the need for a Design Review Panels for 3 x3 developments in MDRZ where developments are over 3 levels. The wholesale adoption of the MDRS standards could well result in a drastic lowering of design standards of housing, given that there are no quality control standards applied at the same time. A solution would be a mandatory Design Panel Review, as it would encourage high quality design outcomes in the city. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a mandatory Design Panel Review be adopted for all 3x3 Medium Density Residential Zone developments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.222	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.222	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.35	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.	Seeks that special character qualifying matters are applied within the Medium Density Residential Zone only where there has been a rigorous, site-specific analysis and only to areas with a high concentration of character.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.87	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission and associated submissions to the extent that they align with Kāinga Ora's primary submission.	Allow
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.36	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose in part	Considers that MRZ standards should be amended to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle. Multi-unit housing should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking that meets the standards set out in the Transport chapter of the PDP.	Opposes standards in the 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.198	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, The RVA considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provisions.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.198	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provisions.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.37	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ standards should be amended to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle. Multi-unit housing should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking that meets the standards set out in the Transport chapter of the PDP.	Amend standards in the 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.199	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, The RVA considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provisions.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.199	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provisions.
Roland Sapsford	305.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan should better identify and protect areas of existing green space from partial or complete loss within Medium Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that the District Plan be amended to better identify and protect areas of existing green space from partial or complete loss within Medium Density Residential Zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	305.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that six-storey buildings should not be allowed on Adams Terrace. Most of Aro Street, as well as Adams Terrace and lower Durham Street, are zoned for at least six storeys, with the exception of some heritage-listed buildings.</p> <p>While six storeys may be appropriate for structures tucked into the escarpment below Landcross Street or Durham Street, one poorly-placed building fronting Aro Street could have catastrophic effects on winter sunlight for many dwellings, including a large amount of recent infill housing.</p>	<p>Retain Adams Terrace as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Roland Sapsford	305.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to the Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to provide a far more nuanced and careful consideration of issues such as light, shading, wind, privacy, design quality, retention of green areas, character and heritage.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to provide more careful consideration to issues such as light, shading, wind, privacy, design quality, retention of green areas, character and heritage.
Roland Sapsford	305.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas, the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities, and take a more sophisticated and nuanced approach to design guidance.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas, the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities, and take a more sophisticated and nuanced approach to design guidance.
Roland Sapsford	305.35	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that Palmer Street should not be surrounded on four sides by buildings with permitted heights of six storeys and eight storeys. Palmer Street is identified in the Proposed Plan as a "character precinct" with an 11m height limit for new buildings. Palmer Street already experiences significant shading from the existing high rise located between Palmer and Abel Smith Streets.	<p>Seeks that Palmer Street not be surrounded on four sides by buildings with permitted heights of six storeys and eight storeys.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Roland Sapsford	305.36	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to retain the capacity within Aro Valley for site-by-site consideration of each development by ensuring that most developments triggers the need for a resource consent, as is currently the case.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to require resource consents for new developments in Aro Valley.
Roland Sapsford	305.37	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to develop location specific design guides and relevant standards to enable a more granular approach to local character. Standards should include access to sunlight and shade, the maintenance of personal privacy, the variety and location of green spaces, the location and scale of exterior space and development, the control of heat island effects and the look and feel of the streets we inhabit.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to include location specific design guides and standards to enable a more granular approach to local character.
Roland Sapsford	305.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone standards for height limit, site coverage, height in relation to boundary and side and rear yard setbacks so as to require resource consents where new developments have a more than minor impact on local character, sunlight, shading and outdoor recreation space.
Roland Sapsford	305.39	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to require resource consents related to the location of buildings on sites and issues of personal privacy and shading within and between multiple developments on a single site so to enable management of these design quality issues.
Roland Sapsford	305.40	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to retain existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan rather than replace them with the minimum daylight provisions of the proposed Plan.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to retain existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan.
Roland Sapsford	305.41	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to identify underutilised sites and locations within Aro Valley that are not subject to demolition controls and are suitable for intensification within the existing character areas (as defined in the Operative Plan).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	305.42	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to identify sites and areas within Aro Valley where more intensive development could occur without adverse effects on sunlight, privacy, heritage and local character.
Roland Sapsford	305.43	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that objectives and rules relating to the MRZ as they relate to Aro Valley should clearly identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls set out above, and provide for this planning to occur so as to be complete prior to significant infrastructure investment.	Seeks that community-based planning be identified prior to infrastructure investments in the Medium Density Residential chapter.
James Coyle	307.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that carparking be minimised and accessed via rear lots or lanes.
James Coyle	307.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that tree canopy and soil be prioritised over concrete and carparks.
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested].
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.58	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen — seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow
Philip O'Reilly and Julie Saddington	310.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that there is a lack of policy and standards managing the transition between areas that have a 21m maximum height and adjacent character areas, with the 11m height. Considers that this will lead to the character areas being boxed in and reduce amenity in these areas.	Seeks an appropriate transition zone adjacent to character areas. [Inferred decision sought]

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

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.90	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Richard Herbert	360.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that SNAs should be reinstated on residential zones as originally proposed in earlier drafts of the Proposed District Plan, and prior to the Councillor Amendment to remove SNAs from Residential zones in June 2022. SNAs on Medium Residential Zones are supported. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Reinstate Significant Natural Areas for Medium Density Residential Zones.
Z Energy Limited	361.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	The MRZ chapter is partially supported, granted MRZ-P6 (Multi unit housing) is amended to require consideration of reverse sensitivity effects. This policies i a matter of discretion for multi-unit housing (i.e. more than 3 dwellings per site) in the MRZ.	Retain the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter with amendment.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.153	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought relating to recognition of reverse sensitivity in policies and matters of discretion in order to maximise residential intensification.	Disallow
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the MRZ objectives and policies relating to housing supply need to allow for public and private collaborations and inducements. The submitter notes that if left to their own devices (and profit goals) and without a change in the current offerings, it is difficult to anticipate the majority of developers unilaterally offering the range and variety of housing at an appropriate price point to meet the actual demands of Wellington home buyers and renters. Public and private collaborations and inducements will achieve the goal of future development increasing housing choice and affordability, including assisted living and social housing.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) objectives relating to housing supply allow for public and private collaborations and inducements.
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ and Design guide standards must ensure that scale and intensity requirements for new builds or additions are consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone. This means that the impact of the increased development on the amenity value of neighbouring properties needs to be considered as required by guideline 21 from the Residential Design Guide.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and Residential Design Guide standards ensure scale and intensity requirements for new builds or additions are consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone.
Waka Kotahi	370.261	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	[Relates to Special Character Precincts only] The submitter does not Consider that the extent of special character precincts and the way that they have been applied is supported by the NPS-UD, the limitations will affect the ability of Waka Kotahi to deliver on key strategic priorities (such as mode shift and emissions reduction) without the densities to support the ambitious targets. [See original submission for full reasons].	Undertake further assessment to weigh the benefits of character protection against the wider opportunity costs of development limitations in key areas. Amend underlying zoning to Medium or High-Density Zone, depending on locations within walkable catchments and provide for Special Character Areas as an overlay. Either remove the demolition control or include provisions that provide for demolition only as part of an approval for a replacement development. Provide for special character by instituting design controls in the overlays which allow for special character to be considered and incorporated in design while enabling levels of development anticipated by the zones.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Oppose because submitter objects to extent of special character precincts. Further weighting exercise for character precincts not justified - already reduced in Mt Victoria from what evidence indicates they should be. Do not allow further weighting exercise which has the express purpose of reducing extent of character precincts.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.99	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that character precincts should be expanded in accordance with the Boffa Miskell or Council officer recommendations, and should not be reduced to the extent in the notified plan or any further. Considers the evidence and analysis in the section 32 reports provides a sufficient basis to identify and apply character precincts as a qualifying matter and to a wider area than in the notified plan.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.95	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Greater Wellington consider Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified a rapid transit service to align with the Regional Land Transport Plan which support the 'upzoning' of walkable catchments. Johnsonville Rail Line is recognised as a key part of the region's transport network.	Allow / Seeks review of walkable catchments and reclassification of Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.19	Part 3 / Residential zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the decision requested, to the extent it is consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission. Kāinga Ora supports subsequent and associated submission points from Waka Kotahi which relate to the character precincts being overlays and further assessment to weigh the benefits of character protection against the wider opportunity costs of development limitations in key areas.	Allow / Seeks that the submission is allowed in part, to the extent that it is consistent with the Kainga Ora primary submission.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.20	Part 3 / Residential zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not support for the inclusion of any design controls related to special character to be inserted into the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission is disallowed in part.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.89	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Reduction of character precincts is strongly opposed. These are a justifiable means of protecting areas that are special to Wellington. Their reduction is not justified on grounds of requiring capacity.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.262	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Support higher densities being enabled in the medium density residential zone. Considers that the precinct would be more appropriate as an overlay, and/or the area rezoned to high density residential zone.	Seeks Oriental Bay Height Precinct is amended to be an overlay. [Inferred decision requested]
Waka Kotahi	370.263	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that a further weighting exercise is needed to justify inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Undertake further assessment to weigh the benefits of character protection against the wider opportunity costs of development limitations in key areas.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Oppose because submitter objects to extent of special character precincts. Further weighting exercise for character precincts not justified - already reduced in Mt Victoria from what evidence indicates they should be. Do not allow further weighting exercise which has the express purpose of reducing extent of character precincts.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.264	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that all boundary setbacks should have immediate legal effect to align with the MDRS requirements, and to avoid confusion where boundary setbacks are applied from both the operative and district plan. Notes that the intention of the NPS-UD is to enable urban environments to evolve and change, enabled by the national standards.	Seeks that all that relate to MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) have immediate legal effect. [Inferred decision requested]
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.108	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	The MRZ chapter is generally supported. As it stands, the PDP will enable the construction and use of three dwellings on most residential properties, with a maximum height of 11m and more permissive building recession planes, as a permitted activity. In addition, resource consents may be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity to construct buildings up to 25m in height with no limit to the number of residential units (i.e.: density). The Fuel Companies consider these greater residential densities and more permissive building standards are likely to generate greater potential for reverse sensitivity effects that may affect the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of their facilities which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.47	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought due to potential impacts on the scale of residential intensification.	Disallow
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as day-cares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.
Stephen Minto	FS100.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.92	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential with a 'Te Motu Kairangi Precinct' with associated objectives, policies, rules and standards to recognise the cultural and environmental overlays over the site whilst enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.29	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer.</p> <p>Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.14	Part 3 / Residential Zones/ Medium Density Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.92].</p>	Disallow
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whānui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks.</p> <p>This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones/ Medium Density Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whanui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whanui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whanui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.92]</p>	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.311	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ heights in walkable catchments of Local Centre Zones should be amended.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone heights be increased by up to 5 storeys within 5 min/400m walkable catchments of Local Centre Zones.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes Medium Density Residential Standards' heights to increase by 5 stories with 5 mins/ 400 meters of Local Centre Zone.</p> <p>Considers that this is beyond the scope of National Policy Statement on Urban Development / Medium Density Residential Standards.</p>	Disallow
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.13	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers 5-storey intensification in and near Local Centre Zones is too extensive and inappropriate and goes beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.64	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that 5-storey intensification in and near Local Centre Zones is too extensive and inappropriate and goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.30	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Increasing medium density residential zone heights to 5 storeys within a 5 min catchment of local centre zones is opposed. This would make them high density and this is a radical change that has not been widely socialized. 5-storey intensification in and near Local Centre Zones is too extensive and inappropriate and goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	FS117.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Increasing medium density residential zone heights to 5 storeys within a 5 min catchment of local centre zones is opposed. This would make them high density and this is a radical change that has not been widely socialized. 5-storey intensification in and near Local Centre Zones is too extensive and inappropriate and goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.312	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that amendments to centres and height limits would achieve well-functioning urban environments and national and regional consistency.	Seeks to expand the geographical extent of centres and height limits, to better reflect their role and function in the Centres hierarchy.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.31	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.313	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose in part	The Introduction to the MRZ is generally supported, in particular the provision of medium density housing to give effect to the NPS-UD and the Act. But amendments are sought relating to the introduction of Character Precincts and different provisions related to the construction of 4 or more residential units. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters.	Opposes the Introduction of the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter and seeks amendment.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.12	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>The WCC summary reads: <i>The Introduction to the MRZ is generally supported, in particular the provision of medium density housing to give effect to the NPS-UD and the Act. But amendments are sought relating to the introduction of Character Precincts and different provisions related to the construction of 4 or more residential units. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters.</i></p> <p>Special character precincts enable rigorous, targeted, sustainable urban planning regulation, and a role for community engagement in future changes.</p> <p>TRA specifically oppose 391.318 which seeks to delete Objective UFD-08 and rejects its recognition of "special character" at the strategic level of the Plan.</p> <p>The TRA supports Character precincts because they comply with the NPS-UD, and are an important qualifying matter under the RMA.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.314	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the Introduction of the MRZ chapter should be amended to make it clear that incompatible activities in the MRZ will be managed or discouraged in line with a Discretionary / Non-Complying activity status. Character Precincts, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Oriental Bay Precinct should be removed from the introduction. These precincts do not fulfil the matters of national importance as set out under section 6(f) and the requirements under section 77L and 77R of the RMA, and therefore do not meet the threshold to be applied as a qualifying matter to restrict height and density.</p> <p>It is also considered that 4 or more dwellings should not be classified as a different activity as the potential, or actual effects of residential development should not be distinguished between building 3 and 4 (or more) residential units.</p>	<p>Amend the Introduction of the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>The Medium Density Residential Zone adopts the medium density residential standards from the RMA which allow for three residential units of up to three storeys on a site. <u>Developments of four or more residential units are also encouraged through the policy framework and provided for through a resource consent process. Multi-unit housing of four or more units is also anticipated through a resource consent process subject to standards and design guidance.</u></p> <p>There are parts of the Medium Density Residential Zone where the permitted development, height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters. These include the following:</p> <p>Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct (refer to MRZ-PREC01 and MRZ-PREC02).</p> <p>...</p> <p>The Medium Density Residential Zone accommodates a range of compatible non-residential uses that support the needs of local communities. Incompatible non-residential activities are not anticipated managed or discouraged in this zone.</p> <p>Precincts within the Medium Density Residential Zone include Character Precincts, the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct, and the Oriental Bay Height Precinct.</p>
Ann Mallinson	FS3.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The review or elimination of MRZ-PREC-03 and policies and rules and standards relating to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct are opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).	Disallow
Jackie Pope	FS8.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Denis Foot	FS10.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 391.314]</p>	Disallow
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.7	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Oppose removal of reference to Character Precincts and Mt Victoria North Townscape from the introduction because it is important to make it clear that these are qualifying matters.	Disallow
Jenny Gyles	FS53.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.	Disallow
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.13	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The WCC summary reads: The Introduction to the MRZ is generally supported, in particular the provision of medium density housing to give effect to the NPS-UD and the Act. But amendments are sought relating to the introduction of Character Precincts and different provisions related to the construction of 4 or more residential units. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters. Special character precincts enable rigorous, targeted, sustainable urban planning regulation, and a role for community engagement in future changes. TRA specifically oppose 391.318 which seeks to delete Objective UFD-08 and rejects its recognition of "special character" at the strategic level of the Plan. The TRA supports Character precincts because they comply with the NPS-UD, and are an important qualifying matter under the RMA.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.132	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers the signalled direction in the introduction would be more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stephen Minto	FS100.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow
David Cadman	398.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.
David Cadman	398.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
David Cadman	398.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as day-cares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
David Cadman	398.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.28	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>The WCC Summary reads: The submission seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed. Shading impacts are a considerable issue. Shading can impact the use, enjoyment, amenity, and thermal performance of wooden and other dwellings originally built with solar advantages assumed on their sites.</p> <p>TRA are mindful that the greenest buildings are those timber buildings that are already built. There's an accumulative benefit from our older native timber buildings. They have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stephen Minto	FS100.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow
Guy Marriage	407.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that the wholesale adoption of the MDRS standards and only the MDRS could well result in a drastic lowering of design standards of housing, given that there are no quality control standards applied at the same time.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.116	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>The Proposed Plan does not recognise rail as a qualifying matter. KiwiRail seeks that the railway corridor be identified as a qualifying matter and be applied to impose building setback requirements from the rail boundary.</p> <p>The Medium Density Residential Zone adjoins the rail corridor in several suburbs in Wellington City, including Wadestown, Ngaio, Khandallah, Johnsonville and Tawa. KiwiRail supports urban development, including around transport nodes, and recognises the benefits of co-locating housing near transport corridors.</p> <p>However, it is critical that the Proposed Plan provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway network. This is necessary to ensure our communities are built in healthy living environments, and the railway network can operate and develop in the future without constraint. An integrated and proactive approach to planning is critical to support the overall vision of our urban environments, and to ensure that our transport network can support the increasing growth and housing intensification.</p> <p>The nature of railway operations means KiwiRail cannot fully internalise all its effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Environmental legislation and caselaw recognises the lawful emission of such effects. Increasing development around railway corridors consequentially means the introduction of more sensitive receivers to adverse effects of existing and lawful railway activities. With a likely increase in sensitive activities forecast to locate in proximity to the railway corridor as a result of the Amendment Act, KiwiRail is concerned that without appropriate planning measures in place at a territorial level, the risk of adverse health and amenity effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor, and reverse sensitivity effects constraining our operations is significantly elevated.</p> <p>For this reason, it is essential that the Proposed Plan appropriately manages the development of new sensitive activities in proximity to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Amend the MRZ Introduction as follows:</p> <p>There are parts of the Medium Density Residential Zone where the permitted development, height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters. These include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct (refer to MRZ-PREC01 and MRZ-PREC02). - Wellington Fault (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter). - Stream corridors and overland flow paths (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter). - Medium and high coastal hazards (refer to Coastal Environment Chapter). - Very high and high coastal natural character areas (refer to Coastal Environment Chapter). - Coastal margins and riparian margins (refer to Coastal Environment and Natural Character Chapters). - Air noise overlay (refer to Noise Chapter). - Heritage buildings, heritage structures and heritage areas (refer to Historic Heritage Chapter). - Notable trees (refer to Notable Trees Chapter). - Sites and areas of significance to Māori (refer to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Chapter). - <u>Railway corridor (building setback from rail boundary); (refer to MRZ-S4).</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.27	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes changes to provisions and rules relating to the rail corridor as a qualifying matter in KiwiRail's submission.	Disallow
Emma Osborne	410.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.
Metlifecare Limited	413.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	The introduction to this chapter is generally supported.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Metlifecare Limited	413.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers it would be helpful if it also recognises that retirement villages are provided for and that these have different built for requirements to meet the needs of residents.	<p>Amend MRZ Introduction to read as follows (or words to similar effect):</p> <p>The Medium Density Residential Zone adopts the medium density residential standards from the RMA which allow for three residential units of up to three storeys on a site. Multi-unit housing of four or more units is also anticipated through a resource consent process subject to standards and design guidance. <u>Retirement village development is also enabled and the provisions recognise the functional and operational needs of this type of housing.</u></p>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.68	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the medium density residential zone provisions (other than those referred to specifically in other submission points), noting these reflect the requirements of the medium density residential standards in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as notified, subject to amendments sought in specific provisions comments on other submission points.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.69	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.
Luke Stewart	422.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Luke Stewart	422.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for recession planes.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative Medium Density Residential Standards recession planes.
Luke Stewart	422.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for building heights.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative Medium Density Residential Standards building height limits.
Luke Stewart	422.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.
Stephen Minto	FS100.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacrter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association	429.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Supports medium density residential standards as they allow 3 dwellings up to 3 storeys in height in all residential zones. This would enable higher levels of development than is currently proposed in the Draft District Plan in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones	Not specified.
Kat Hall	430.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the reduced protection of character areas under the pre-1930s demolition rule should be amended to at least 50%. The current 71% reduction of character protection is considered too high. Wellington's character suburbs provide value through amenity, character enjoyment and architecture. They provided a sense of place and neighbourhood, as well as a historical record of a period of time that cannot be replicated. According to the 2019 Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review, there are only around 4,500 homes in Wellington's inner city suburbs that predate 1930 (p.11). Therefore a reduction in character protection of 71% would see only around 1300 dwellings remaining as part of character areas.	Seeks that the extent of the Character Precincts is increased.
Michelle Rush	436.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the MRZ should be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville line as a rapid transit route. All other consequential amendments to the plan's sections should also be made to give effect to this.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville Line as a Rapid Transit Line
Michelle Rush	436.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Objectives and policies in the MRZ chapter are supported as they provide for intensification whilst safeguarding the environment.	Retain Objectives in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as notified.
Michelle Rush	436.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Objectives and policies in the MRZ chapter are supported as they provide for intensification whilst safeguarding the environment.	Retain Policies in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as notified.
Kirsty Woods	437.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports the current character areas identified, but considers that the character precinct should be extended in Newtown.	Retain Character Precincts identified in the Medium Density Residential Zone Chapter as notified and seeks amendment to extent to Newtown.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that Newtown's residential streets outside the suburban centre should be classified as MRZ. In particular the zoning of several blocks around the Newtown suburban centre for heights of up to 21m seems unnecessary and counter productive to maintaining a well functioning urban environment. Allowing 6-storey development blocks in low-rise residential areas would have damaging effects on the value of neighbouring houses. Furthermore, combining terraced homes, typically of 3 storeys, with 6 storey apartment blocks doesn't give good results unless the sites are carefully planned.	Seeks that the permitted heights for the medium density zones in Newtown and Berhampore to be 11m, not 14m.
Chrissie Potter	446.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.
Kay Larsen	447.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that carefully thought out medium density houses considering sunlight and space a right to any people living in the neighbourhood is encouraged.
Dorothy Thompson	449.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (Medium Density Residential Zone) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.
Guardians of the Bays	452.61	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers it would be useful to include cross references to qualifying matters in the rules to make the plan easier to understand their implications e.g. the Air Noise Overlay (Inner Air Noise Overlay and Outer Air Noise Overlay)	Amend rules to reference qualifying matters.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.
Stephen Minto	FS100.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacrter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow
Christina Mackay	478.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	Supports the overall concept of Character Precincts and rules, including new in-fill housing, but rules appear too loose. Submitter recommende the guidance and direction of a Urban Design panel.	Supports in parts provisions for Character precincts, but seeks amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Catharine Underwood	481.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the MRZ for Brooklyn should be removed and the status quo remains until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed for the Brooklyn Area. Allowing 11 and 14 metres in height is likely to undermine potential character areas could create towering buildings dominating the neighbourhood.	Opposes Brooklyn being classified as Medium Density Residential Zone until a character/heritage assessment has been completed for the Brooklyn Area.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.53	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	Supports in principle the provision of medium density housing zones but it is vital that the design rules work well to ensure that these continue to provide quality private and public spaces.	Not specified.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.98	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Provision of medium density housing zones Provision of Character Precincts. Tall buildings create wind and shade problems	Allow
Jonathan Markwick	490.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.
Dinah Priestley	495.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes the provisions of the MRZ and associated design guides relating to residential development within the residential suburbs of the city. Considers that Council's proposals are aimed specifically at achieving a complete transformation of the inner residential neighbourhoods through intensification that will result in the irrevocable loss of the city's older housing stock which gives Wellington its special character and unique sense of place. It is believed that the inner residential neighbourhoods can make an acceptable contribution to city growth without destroying the existing residential fabric.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium density residential zone) provisions are re-written to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock. The provisions will need to recognize both residential character and heritage qualities ensure appropriate implementation.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.62	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	The TRA believes that the city can have its cake and eat it. That it is not necessary to plan and zone for irrevocable loss of the city's valued older housing stock. And especially when this is part of Wellington special character and unique sense of place. It is observed how liveable cities overseas are enhanced by appreciating these values, and undertaking urban planning accordingly to get the right balance. Inner residential neighbourhoods like Thorndon have made an acceptable contribution to city growth, and can continue to do so without destroying the existing residential fabric.	Allow
Dinah Priestley	495.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Opposes the provisions of the MRZ and associated design guides relating to residential development within the residential suburbs of the city. Considers that Council's proposals are aimed specifically at achieving a complete transformation of the inner residential neighbourhoods through intensification that will result in the irrevocable loss of the city's older housing stock which gives Wellington its special character and unique sense of place. It is believed that the inner residential neighbourhoods can make an acceptable contribution to city growth without destroying the existing residential fabric.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium density residential zone) provisions are re-written to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock. The provisions will need to recognize both residential character and heritage qualities ensure appropriate implementation.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.63	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	<p>The TRA believes that the city can have its cake and eat it.</p> <p>That it is not necessary to plan and zone for irrevocable loss of the city's valued older housing stock. And especially when this is part of Wellington special character and unique sense of place.</p> <p>It is observed how liveable cities overseas are enhanced by appreciating these values, and undertaking urban planning accordingly to get the right balance.</p> <p>Inner residential neighbourhoods like Thorndon have made an acceptable contribution to city growth, and can continue to do so without destroying the existing residential fabric.</p>	Allow
Mark Tanner	24.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellingtonians benefit from heritage because heritage is visible across the city. [inferred that this submission relates to character areas not heritage areas - as it refers to housing in Newtown, Mount Victoria and Thorndon]</p> <p>Wellingtons heritage makes it more competitive in attracting talent and residents.</p> <p>Wellingtonians will regret losing heritage buildings and areas because new buildings become outdated at a faster rate than heritage buildings.</p>	Seeks that the proposed District Plan is amended to include Character Areas from the Operative District Plan. [Inferred decision requested]
Peter Preston	42.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that 'Heritage' should be the most significant characteristic in deciding 'Character Precincts' and that this has largely been ignored in determining the 'Character Precincts' in Mount Victoria.</p>	Seeks that 'Heritage' is used as the most significant characteristic in deciding 'Character Precincts'. [Inferred decision requested].
Peter Preston	42.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that based on evidence from Council officers, Council-commissioned consultants, and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga assessment, the 'Character Precincts' in Mount Victoria should be considerably larger.</p> <p>Considers that decisions about 'Character Precincts' in Mount Victoria were based on allowing more housing and ignored heritage values and character.</p> <p>Considers that a critical mass is required to preserve character and the PDP creates small, disconnected blocks.</p> <p>Mount Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings.</p> <p>Considers that the plan provides for more than enough housing capacity to meet demand over the next 30 years, and accordingly there is no overall loss to the city in increasing the size of the Mount Victoria Character Precincts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Peter Preston	42.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that based on evidence from Council officers, Council-commissioned consultants, and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga assessment, the 'Character Precincts' in Mount Victoria should be considerably larger.</p> <p>Considers that decisions about 'Character Precincts' in Mount Victoria were based on allowing more housing and ignored heritage values and character.</p> <p>Considers that a critical mass is required to preserve character and the PDP creates small, disconnected blocks.</p> <p>Mount Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings.</p> <p>Considers that the plan provides for more than enough housing capacity to meet demand over the next 30 years, and accordingly there is no overall loss to the city in increasing the size of the Mount Victoria Character Precincts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Heritage New Zealand recommendations.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that 'Character' and 'Heritage' should be the most significant characteristics in deciding 'character' and that this has largely been ignored in determining the 'Character Precincts' in Mount Victoria.</p> <p>Considers that critical mass is required to preserve character and that WCC officers' recommended character precincts in Mt Victoria, guided by the Boffa Miskell Report, were reduced significantly with reasons for this decision not clear.</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell Primary/Contributory Character sub-area plus Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's recommendations.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Mount Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings.</p> <p>Considers that a critical mass is required to preserve character.</p> <p>Notes that the area that WCC Officers, presumably guided by the Boffa Miskell assessment, originally recommended to be classified as Character Precincts in Mount Victoria was considerably larger than the those in the PDP.</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell Primary/Contributory Character sub-area plus Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's recommendations.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Considers that the current provision for Council to notify neighbours regarding demolition, new builds, and major alterations was a strong control over keeping Wellington's Character.</p> <p>In the case of Mount Victoria, downgrading the current controls will lead to the development of small disconnected blocks where its character will progressively be destroyed by high density and "affordable" cheaply built housing.</p> <p>Considers that critical mass is required to preserve character and that WCC officers' recommended character precincts in Mt Victoria, guided by the Boffa Miskell Report, were reduced significantly with reasons for this decision not clear.</p>	Seeks that the current (operative District Plan) provisions relating to notifying neighbours with respect to demolition, new builds and major alterations remain.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	Considers that giving developers a fairly open book with regard to the Character of Mount Victoria will encourage them to utilise simple design and cheaper materials.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Robert and Chris Gray	46.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that the upzoning of the Mount Victoria area does not cater for the increased street usage. Over the past four years, the car parking in Porritt Avenue has increased markedly.</p> <p>Considers that the Council's notion that people who live near the city won't need cars is a fallacy.</p> <p>Considers that the PDP is requiring that new builds have no on-site parking.</p>	Seeks that the Council allow carparking on new build property.
Owen Watson	51.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that that the character areas in Mt Victoria should be extended, in line with the recommendations in the Boffa Miskell Report.	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to areas recommended by Boffa Miskell report.
Phil Kelliher	58.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that Council should extend the 38% Mt Victoria Pre-1930s housing retained as Character Precincts to 76%, under Option 1 in Boffa Miskell "Indicative Character Contribution Sub-Area Mt Victoria".</p> <p>These are areas in Mt Victoria where concentrations of primary & contributory buildings were identified through the assessment by Boffa Miskell's Pre-1930 Character Area Review.</p> <p>Two thirds of Draft Spatial plan submitters from Mt Victoria found that the approach to preserving pre-1930s character area was not well balanced. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended from 38% to 76% of pre-1930 housing retained as Character Precincts, as recommended in Boffa Miskell's Pre-1930 Character Area Review.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.39	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Ellice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow
Judith Ellen Bleach	60.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the subsequent Officers Recommended plan should be reinstated. This will put at least 300 houses back into character precincts. This will include 98 Owen street.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include previously identified character precinct areas in Newtown.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.45	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission seeking textending character precincts in Owen Street Newtown.	Allow
Melissa Harward	65.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	<p>Prefers intensification over protection of character homes.</p> <p>Prefers people living in newer, up-to-standard homes than character homes which can contribute to poor health outcomes.</p>	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	<p>Support the inclusion of Character Precincts in the PDP.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington's character housing areas are a significant and valued resource, which form a tangible connection with our history, and confer a sense of place and identity.</p>	Retain Character Precincts with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision or development in accordance with s.6 of the RMA.	Allow
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Considers that Armour Avenue could be classified as part of a Character Precinct.	Retain Armour Avenue within the MRZ-PREC01 as notified.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Armour Avenue, Doctor's Common area, Elizabeth Street, Moir Street and Porritt Avenue should not be changed from Heritage Areas to Character Precincts because they have particularly high concentrations of original Victorian and Edwardian housing with high heritage value. This value is not only to Mt Victoria but to Wellington city as a whole and warrants the higher level of protection. (Refer to our submission on the Proposed DP). Do not change these areas from their Heritage Area designation to Character Precincts	Disallow
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Considers that the Doctors' Common Heritage Area could be classified as part of a Character Precinct.	Retain Doctors Common within the MRZ-PREC01 as notified.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Armour Avenue, Doctor's Common area, Elizabeth Street, Moir Street and Porritt Avenue should not be changed from Heritage Areas to Character Precincts because they have particularly high concentrations of original Victorian and Edwardian housing with high heritage value. This value is not only to Mt Victoria but to Wellington city as a whole and warrants the higher level of protection. (Refer to our submission on the Proposed DP). Do not change these areas from their Heritage Area designation to Character Precincts	Disallow
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Considers that the Elizabeth Street Heritage Area could be classified as part of a Character Precinct.	Retain the Medium Density Residential Zone portion of Elizabeth Street within the MRZ-PREC01 as notified.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Armour Avenue, Doctor's Common area, Elizabeth Street, Moir Street and Porritt Avenue should not be changed from Heritage Areas to Character Precincts because they have particularly high concentrations of original Victorian and Edwardian housing with high heritage value. This value is not only to Mt Victoria but to Wellington city as a whole and warrants the higher level of protection. (Refer to our submission on the Proposed DP). Do not change these areas from their Heritage Area designation to Character Precincts	Disallow
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Considers that the Moir Street Heritage Area could be classified as part of a Character Precinct.	Retain Moir Street within the MRZ-PREC01 as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Armour Avenue, Doctor's Common area, Elizabeth Street, Moir Street and Porritt Avenue should not be changed from Heritage Areas to Character Precincts because they have particularly high concentrations of original Victorian and Edwardian housing with high heritage value. This value is not only to Mt Victoria but to Wellington city as a whole and warrants the higher level of protection. (Refer to our submission on the Proposed DP).</p> <p>Do not change these areas from their Heritage Area designation to Character Precincts</p>	Disallow
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Considers that the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area could be classified as part of a Character Precinct.	Retain Porritt Avenue within the MRZ-PREC01 as notified.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Armour Avenue, Doctor's Common area, Elizabeth Street, Moir Street and Porritt Avenue should not be changed from Heritage Areas to Character Precincts because they have particularly high concentrations of original Victorian and Edwardian housing with high heritage value. This value is not only to Mt Victoria but to Wellington city as a whole and warrants the higher level of protection. (Refer to our submission on the Proposed DP).</p> <p>Do not change these areas from their Heritage Area designation to Character Precincts</p>	Disallow
Phil Kelliher	FS57.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Supports evidence provided by the WCC for the inclusion of Porritt Ave into new Heritage Area (45) This addition recognises the importance of heritage to Wellington's identity and sense of place. Porritt Avenue recognised by experts as an important example of an intact late 19th / early 20th century streetscape. There are unlikely to be few others in Wellington from the same period that can match its overall integrity.</p>	Disallow
Tim Bright	75.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers an extension to character precincts should be made.	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended.
Judith Graykowski	80.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Character Precincts are extended.
Ann Mallinson	81.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that character precincts must be much larger. Character homes are an important part of the attraction of Wellington to tourists and others.	Seeks that the extent of the Character Precincts is increased.
Joanna Newman	85.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that character and heritage are qualifying matters under the PDP. Heritage is the most significant characteristic which must be considered in deciding 'character' and this has largely been ignored in deciding the extent of character precincts in Mt Victoria. There is strong evidence from Council officers and consultants (Boffa Miskell) whom the Council commissioned to undertake a house-by-house analysis, along with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga assessment, that the character areas in Mt Victoria should be considerably larger than they are. Boffa Miskell's house-by-house analysis resulted in the definition of a clear Primary/Contributory character area which should be the minimum extent of Character Precincts. Therefore, even the WCC Officers' Final Spatial Plan Recommendation (pre-Council amendment 24 June 2021) area represents a political compromise, not justified by the evidence WCC, itself, commissioned. Decisions about character precinct extent in Mt Victoria were based on allowing more housing, therefore it is essentially a political decision ignoring heritage values and character. The Proposed District Plan creates small, disconnected blocks where the character can be destroyed by high-density development around, for little housing gain on a city-wide scale. Mt Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings. It is important to both for its accessibility and visibility, and for the cultural, social and economic stories it tells about the development of Wellington. Supports evidence submitted by Mt Victoria Historical Society.</p>	<p>Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell Primary/Contributory Character sub-area plus Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's recommendations.</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Aro Valley Community Council	87.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts should be extended in line with the recommendations of the Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report .	Seeks that the Character Precincts in Aro Valley are extended and requests specific areas be included in these.
Generation Zero	FS54.35	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskell report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Aro Valley Community Council	87.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the sites at 39, 41, 43 and 45 Palmer Street should be included as a Character Precinct.	Seeks that the sites at 39, 41, 43 and 45 Palmer Street are included as a Character Precinct.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.36	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports Devon Street's classification as a Character Precinct.	Retain Character Precinct on Devon Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.37	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that 24-30 Devon Street should be classified as a Character Precinct.	Seeks that 24-30 Devon Street are included within the Character Precinct.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.38	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.35	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that all lots between 109 and 181 Aro Street should be classified as a Character Precinct.	Seeks that all lots between 109 and 181 Aro Street should be classified as Character Precincts.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.39	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Kirsty Wood	109.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that Character and heritage are qualifying matters and under the Proposed District Plan MRZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.</p> <p>Considers that heritage has largely been ignored in deciding character precinct in Mount Victoria.</p> <p>Considers that there's a lot of evidence to suggest the character areas should be larger than they are.</p> <p>Considers that the limits of Mt Victoria character area were based on need for housing, not heritage or character.</p> <p>Considers that the PDP creates small, disconnected blocks where character can be destroyed by high-density development.</p> <p>Considers that Mt Victoria's Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings are important for both accessibility and visibility, and cultural, social and economic stories it tells about Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that there is sufficient housing capacity to meet demand for the next 30 years and therefore no loss to the City if the character areas are extended.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that Character and heritage are qualifying matters and under the Proposed District Plan MRZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.</p> <p>Considers that heritage has largely been ignored in deciding character precinct in Mount Victoria.</p> <p>Considers that there's a lot of evidence to suggest the character areas should be larger than they are.</p> <p>Considers that the limits of Mt Victoria character area were based on need for housing, not heritage or character.</p> <p>Considers that the PDP creates small, disconnected blocks where character can be destroyed by high-density development.</p> <p>Considers that Mt Victoria's Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings are important for both accessibility and visibility, and cultural, social and economic stories it tells about Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that there is sufficient housing capacity to meet demand for the next 30 years and therefore no loss to the City if the character areas are extended.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review.
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that Character and heritage are qualifying matters and under the Proposed District Plan MRZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.</p> <p>Considers that heritage has largely been ignored in deciding character precinct in Mount Victoria.</p> <p>Considers that there's a lot of evidence to suggest the character areas should be larger than they are.</p> <p>Considers that the limits of Mt Victoria character area were based on need for housing, not heritage or character.</p> <p>Considers that the PDP creates small, disconnected blocks where character can be destroyed by high-density development.</p> <p>Considers that Mt Victoria's Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings are important for both accessibility and visibility, and cultural, social and economic stories it tells about Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that there is sufficient housing capacity to meet demand for the next 30 years and therefore no loss to the City if the character areas are extended.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's recommendations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	121.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that character precincts are still significant as proposed and via a variety of controls will materially restrict the ability of development to be responsive in these areas.</p> <p>Notes that provisions and proposed policies are in many cases much more restrictive than those for nearby properties.</p> <p>Considers that the requirements of section 77L of the RMA have not been met, particularly with regard to wider costs. There is limited evidence the relevant costs of the character restrictions, including impacts on development capacity, accessibility and well-functioning urban environments, have been taken into account and it is likely that, if they were, the proposed extent of the character precincts would be smaller.</p> <p>Considers that HUD and MFE's evidence base clearly shows the benefits of intensification, including social benefits, economic benefits, more efficient use of infrastructure and environmental benefits. These benefits tend to outweigh costs such as sunlight loss and congestion. Benefits are widespread, longstanding and projected to grow over time. Costs are real but tend to be smaller and more narrowly focused, affecting current homeowners.</p> <p>Proposed character precincts are in areas well suited to development. Costs will fall predominantly on future homeowners, renters and public at large. Character provisions will shift development to areas less-suited for this.</p> <p>Considers that these impacts are not reflected in Wellington City Council's section 32 report. Impacts considered relate primarily to aesthetic concerns and relatively minor impacts on current homeowners. Wellington City Council did not take into account the main negative impacts of these restrictions in its evaluation report, meaning that the character areas at present cannot be justified as qualifying matters. HUD requests that these impacts are considered, and that the extent of the character areas are reviewed in light of these costs and the requirements of section 77L of the RMA.</p> <p>HUD notes that several of Wellington City Council's documents refer to additional analysis that would be published in late August. However, this analysis was not published in time for the drafting of this submission and did not inform the options analysis in the relevant section 32 report.</p>	Seeks that the extent of the character areas are reviewed in light of the negative impacts of these restrictions and the requirements of section 77L of the RMA.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Character precincts should be expanded in accordance with the Boffa Miskell plus Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga recommendations, or at a minimum Council officer recommendations, and not reduced to the extent in the Plan or any further.</p> <p>Do not allow review of, and decrease in, the extent of character areas.</p>	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.98	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Considers that character precincts should be expanded in accordance with the Boffa Miskell or Council officer recommendations, and should not be reduced to the extent in the notified plan or any further. Considers the evidence and analysis in the section 32 reports provides a sufficient basis to identify and apply character precincts as a qualifying matter and to a wider area than in the notified plan.</p>	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.50	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZPREC01	Oppose	<p>Removal of Character precincts is strongly opposed. The NPSUD makes provision for "any other matters" determined by the Council to be a qualifying matter. Character Precincts are vital to protect the character & heritage of Wellington, NZ's capital city. Removal is not warranted for reasons of capacity. There are better alternatives available to concentrate high density development rather than the scattergun approach through inner-city suburbs.</p>	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.90	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.45	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Considers that the status quo of housing typologies such as character housing does not serve the diverse needs of our communities. Many students live in character housing which are often damp, cold, uninsulated and in general disrepair.	Not specified.
Jocelyn Ng	130.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Supports the Newtown Character house protection submission which proposes at a minimum the Officers' Recommended plan is re-instated into the PDP.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to reinstate the Officers' Recommended Plan in the Proposed District Plan.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission that seeks a character protection extension for Owen Street.	Allow
Grant Buchan	143.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	<p>Considers that "special character" as it exists in the PDP is an entirely aesthetic consideration. The preference for some people for the aesthetics of wooden houses of a certain era is in itself harmless. However their insistence that others be held to uphold that preference by force of law is not harmless especially given Wellington has one of the worst housing shortages in the country.</p> <p>In parts of Wellington, older, single or two storey detached houses are prolific and there is no serious prospect that future generations will be deprived of the opportunity to see living examples of this house type.</p> <p>Considers that it would be better for the wellbeing of residents if old buildings that lack insulation and have a high level of dampness were replaced with housing of greater density and more modern construction.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Seeks that old buildings that lack insulation and have a high level of dampness were replaced with housing of greater density and more modern construction.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Matthew Gibbons	148.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers there should be increased densification throughout Wellington, including in Character Precincts.</p> <p>Considers that 'Character protections' should be removed to allow more high density housing. This will be good for the environment, and for housing affordability. Currently most of my students are paying almost all their income in rent, and this is not good for their health or education. Increased density will make Wellington a more attractive place to live and will be good for the economy.</p> <p>As an economist, considers that improved infrastructure (better railway lines and more frequent bus services) will follow intensification.</p>	Seeks that 'character protections' are removed to allow more high density housing.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.91	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	154.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	Recognises the council has a distinction between character and heritage, where heritage achieves a higher bar and then requires a higher degree of protection.	Not specified.
Vivienne Morrell	155.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports the proposed Character Precincts but believe they should be bigger.	Amend the extent of the area covered by the Character Precincts to encompass all the dwellings identified in the 2019 Boffa Miskell report on character areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports the Character Precincts as notified. The Character Precincts should not be expanded beyond what is currently proposed.	Retain the Character Precincts as notified.
Jocelyn Brandon	158.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the area immediately around Wesley Road contains many historic houses of a character that deserve to be preserved, as in other areas like Mt Victoria, Thorndon and Te Aro.	Seeks that Wesley Road is recognised as a Character Precinct. [Inferred decision requested].
John Schiff	166.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the inner city suburbs, such as Mt Victoria, are an integral part of Wellington's character. Considers that reducing the protection of these character areas by 71% would see the demolition of many character homes in the inner city suburbs to be replaced by six storey apartment blocks. This would adversely affect many of the dwellings in these areas through loss of sun, views and amenity, let alone the character of these areas. The submitter believes that the need for an increase in the housing stock can be achieved without reducing the character precincts as proposed in the PDP.	Seeks that the extent of the area encompassed by Character Precincts is increased.
Michelle Leonie Rose	167.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Notes that Donald McLean Street was mentioned in the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area review. The beautiful old homes and gardens/trees add to the history of Wellington. 30 Donald McLean Street, as far as the submitter knows, was built in 1888 and altered in the 1940s, and the back garage was first used as a stables, judging by appearance.	Amend the extent of the Character Precincts to include Donald McLean Street. [Inferred decision requested].
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.41	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts in Newtown.	Allow
Zaffa Christian	174.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the character areas should be reinstated in accordance with the recommendations in the Officers' Recommended Plan.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to reinstate the Officers Recommended Plan.
Jon Gaupset	175.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the character areas should be reinstated in accordance with the recommendations in the Officers' Recommended Plan.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to reinstate the Officers Recommended Plan.
Historic Places Wellington	182.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports the general idea of proposed Character Precincts and the rules and design regime for them.	Retain the Character Precincts and provisions with amendment.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.104	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	All inner Residential suburbs should be MDZ Exemption from upzoning Importance of character areas Character Precincts, rules & design regime Extended Character Precincts in line with Boffa Miskell Demolition be a restricted activity for pre-1930 buildings New viewshaft for views of St Paul's	Allow
Historic Places Wellington	182.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers the description of Character Precincts and their rules are insufficient and do not recognise the important heritage entwined with those early, native timber, colonial neighbourhoods	Amend the provisions of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include provisions that promote the adaptive re-use of existing buildings as a lower emissions alternative to demolition and rebuilding.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington	182.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers the description of Character Precincts and their rules are insufficient and do not recognise the important heritage entwined with those early, native timber, colonial neighbourhoods	Amend the provisions of MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) to specifically acknowledge that the inner city suburb character is in part derived from heritage.
Historic Places Wellington	182.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers the description of Character Precincts and their rules are insufficient and do not recognise the important heritage entwined with those early, native timber, colonial neighbourhoods	Amend the provisions of MRZ-PREC01 (Character precincts) to limit the scope of non-residential uses to prevent the loss of character houses which can seriously undermine the character of an area.
Historic Places Wellington	182.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the creation within the suburb of separate development areas which themselves include many quality character houses and will have no character controls should be avoided.	Amend the extent of Character Precincts to be one large character area or precinct over the heritage suburb.
Historic Places Wellington	182.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports the proposed application of a qualifying matter, to exempt from intensification, sites in the proposed Character Precincts.	Retain Character Precincts and related provisions with amendment.
Historic Places Wellington	182.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts should be extended in line with the recommendations of the Boffa Miskell Character Report.	Seeks the extension of the MRZ-PREC01 (Character precincts) areas to include the sites coloured olive and blank in Appendix 4 of the Boffa Miskell Character report.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.105	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	All inner Residential suburbs should be MDZ Exemption from upzoning Importance of character areas Character Precincts, rules & design regime Extended Character Precincts in line with Boffa Miskell Demolition be a restricted activity for pre-1930 buildings New viewshaft for views of St Paul's	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.81	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ – PREC01	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is concerned about the potential loss in intensification opportunities if the proposed relief is granted.	Disallow
Ros Bignell	186.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Lawrence Street includes houses of architectural heritage that contribute to the overall character of the Newtown precinct. The street has several "anchor" houses including 11A Lawrence Street. The "streetscape" of Lawrence is one of the most attractive in Newtown and the positioning of the current housing could be considered sympathetic to the natural topography of the hillside. Considers that Council Officers who are not personally invested in Lawrence Street have considered the qualities of housing and character in Newtown and seen fit to recommend the boundaries and protections of the Newtown character precinct are extended to a further 300 buildings including those of Lawrence Street.	Amend the extent of area covered by the Character Precincts in Newtown to include Lawrence Street.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ros Bignell	186.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that Council Officers who are not personally invested in Lawrence Street have considered the qualities of housing and character in Newtown and seen fit to recommend the boundaries and protections of the Newtown character precinct are extended to a further 300 buildings including those of Lawrence Street.</p> <p>Considers that there is a need to be careful that the current character of the precinct is not destroyed; removal of existing heritage character buildings or infilling with housing that is not complementary to the precincts character and topography will slowly erode that character. Once gone, the Newtown precinct's character will be changed irrevocably for future generations.</p>	Amend the extent of the area covered by the Character Precincts to ideally include the 300 houses recommended by Council Officers and/or adopt a site by site character analysis as proposed by the Boffa Miskell Report 2019.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow
Jonothan and Tricia Briscoe	190.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan largely ignores the heritage value of the whole area of Mount Victoria, by choosing instead a piecemeal approach (of individual buildings that have "character"), that is highly likely to destroy this important heritage area.</p> <p>Considers that character in Mount Victoria derives from its historic heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the character areas in Mount Victoria should be considerably larger based on evidence from expert Council officers, Boffa Miskell consultants, and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga assessment.</p> <p>Considers that a critical mass is required to preserve character and the PDP creates small, disconnected blocks. There is a mismatch between WCC's statement that the Plan "protects areas of special character" in "some of the City's original settlements" and its designation of small, discrete areas of Mt Victoria as Character Precincts.</p> <p>Mount Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings. Legislation and a number of key WCC documents make clear the value of heritage and heritage buildings and areas.</p> <p>Considers that the inner suburbs have more than enough housing capacity to meet demand over the next 30 years under the existing Operative District Plan.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the extent of the area covered by the Character Precincts in Mount Victoria to encompass Boffa Miskell's Primary/Contributory Character area (Boffa Miskell, Pre-1930 Character Area Review) and Heritage New Zealand recommendations.
Jonothan and Tricia Briscoe	190.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the east side of Lipman Street should be a Character Precinct.	Seeks that the east side of Lipman Street is made a Character Precinct.
Jane Beale and Lisa Terreni	191.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that Green Street and Emmett Streets should be a Character Precinct as they were identified as contributing to the streetscape in the Pre-1930s character area review and are well maintained.</p> <p>Considers that greater housing density will destroy the character, the community and the safety of these streets.</p>	Seeks that Green Street and Emmett Street made a Character Precinct.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission that seeks Green Street to be a character precinct/heritage area.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dennis Foot	193.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission.]	Seeks that inner city heritage and character housing is retained.
Michael O'Rourke	194.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the heritage area of Newtown should be extended by 30% to 50%	Seeks that the heritage area of Newtown be extended from 30% to 50% of the existing heritage area.
Peter Nunns	196.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports the reduction in the area covered by the MRZ-PREC01 in Berhampore. Considers that the remaining special character areas seem much better targeted towards areas that have a contiguous look and feel.	Retain the MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) mapping in Berhampore as notified.
Angus Hodgson	200.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the PDP reduces Mt Cook Character areas to about 50% of what they were, and 10 minute walking catchment will mean that the missing areas can become high density. Considers that decision making on this issue was political and ignored evidence in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report. Considers that the requirements for consents before demolition is a reasonable expectation and the submitter is concerned that without this step, pre 1930's buildings will be unjustifiably lost.	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) is amended to include Myrtle Crescent.
Angus Hodgson	200.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the PDP reduces Mt Cook Character areas to about 50% of what they were, and 10 minute walking catchment will mean that the missing areas can become high density. Considers that decision making on this issue was political and ignored evidence in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report. Considers that the requirements for consents before demolition is a reasonable expectation and the submitter is concerned that without this step, pre 1930's buildings will be unjustifiably lost.	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) is amended to include Rolleston Street.
Angus Hodgson	200.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the PDP reduces Mt Cook Character areas to about 50% of what they were, and 10 minute walking catchment will mean that the missing areas can become high density. Considers that decision making on this issue was political and ignored evidence in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report. Considers that the requirements for consents before demolition is a reasonable expectation and the submitter is concerned that without this step, pre 1930's buildings will be unjustifiably lost.	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) is amended to include Hargreaves Street.
Angus Hodgson	200.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the PDP reduces Mt Cook Character areas to about 50% of what they were, and 10 minute walking catchment will mean that the missing areas can become high density. Considers that decision making on this issue was political and ignored evidence in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report. Considers that the requirements for consents before demolition is a reasonable expectation and the submitter is concerned that without this step, pre 1930's buildings will be unjustifiably lost.	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) is amended to include Lower Hankey Street.
Angus Hodgson	200.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports the exclusion of Wallace Street from proposed character precincts. Considers that Wallace Street is a mass transit route, is effectively a gully and is therefore well suited to high density residential development.	Seeks that the exclusion of Wallace Street from Character Precincts is retained as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Avryl Bramley	202.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Extend the character precincts to their extent in the operative district plan. [Inferred decision requested]
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the extent to the Character Precincts is extended to match the Boffa Miskell report 2019 and Site by site character analysis in Newtown is Applied to 1277 or 70 percent of the 1600 houses surveyed in the report.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Character Precincts are extended to that recommended by Council officers for the Final Spatial Plan.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Character Precincts are extended to include Green and Emmett Streets.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Craig Forrester	210.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports the Character precinct controls applying to Moir street (being within the Medium Density Residential Zone).	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character precincts), with Moir Street as part of the Mt Victoria Character Precinct, as notified.
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Heritage is the most significant characteristic which must be considered in deciding 'character' and this has largely been ignored in deciding the extent of character precincts in Mt Victoria	Seeks that heritage is recognised as the most important characteristic in deciding the extent of the character precincts. [Inferred decision requested]
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.68	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that there is strong evidence that the character areas in Mt Victoria should be considerably larger than they are.</p> <p>Considers that Boffa Miskell's house-by-house analysis resulted in the definition of a clear Primary/Contributory character area which should be the minimum extent of Character Precincts. Therefore, even the WCC Officers' Final Spatial Plan Recommendation (pre-Council amendment 24 June 2021) area represents a political compromise, not justified by the evidence WCC, itself, commissioned.</p> <p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan creates small, disconnected blocks where the character can be destroyed by high-density development around, for little housing gain on a city-wide scale.</p> <p>Considers that Mt Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings. It is important to both for its accessibility and visibility, and for the cultural, social and economic stories it tells about the development of Wellington.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Boffa Miskell Primary/Contributory Character sub-area; and 2. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's recommendations. <p>[As illustrated in original submission]</p>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.69	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sam Stocker & Patricia Lee	216.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that far too much historic character areas have been left out of the Newtown and Berhampore areas which will destroy quality of life for their community.</p> <p>The land is not needed to help cope with Wellingtons increasing population.</p> <p>Land values will soar and will lead to unpayable rates bills and loss of sunlight access.</p> <p>New builds more than three storeys high are expensive and won't provide low-cost housing.</p> <p>Average residents will either be forced away or live in ghetto conditions. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that any areas that include pre-1935 buildings be included as character precincts.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.50	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission that seeks character precinct extensions in Newtown.	Allow
Eva Brodie	217.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that the Boffa Miskell 2019 report identified Lower Kelburn as an area that warranted further consideration for it's contributions to Thorndon Character Areas.</p> <p>Lower Kelburn is a similar age to Thorndon and Mt Victoria and has well maintained, functioning old homes with ancient local timbers built by traditional craftsmen.</p> <p>Placement of even one tall building in this neighbourhood would degrade surrounding homes.</p> <p>Developments built to the edge of zones in the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Lower Kelburn will mean losses of privacy, sun, views, and access.</p> <p>The area is on the fault line, steep and is already dependent on many retaining walls, making it unsuitable for large, heavy buildings.</p>	Seeks that Lower Kelburn (Area with boundaries of the Botanic Gardens and Bolton Street Cemetery, motorway and cable car track) should be classified as a Character Precinct.
Mike Camden	226.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended to encompass all dwellings identified as being "Positive, contributing or neutral" in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review from Boffa Miskell.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Opposes high density development with no constraints or right of appeal in character areas	Not specified.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to recognise that character is in part derived from heritage in pre-1930s character areas.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to add demolition controls in the pre-1930s character areas while identifying areas of particular character within these to enable a more granular level of control over demolition.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Lower Kelburn should be a character precinct for the reasons set out in the submission.	Seeks that Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood is recognized as a special character area.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports the character precincts and corresponding rules in the PDP, but considers that the extent of these should be increased to cover all areas identified in the Boffa Miskell character report as having 'primary' or 'contributory' character streetscape values, or areas omitted from analysis in this report..	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) as notified, with an increase to the extent of these areas in line with the recommendations in the Boffa Miskell Character Report.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.92	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings 10min walkable catchment Specific heritage identification and assessment Views contributing to sense of place and identity Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell Boffa Miskell streetscapes Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings CCZ encroachment on residential zones Old St Pauls height controls Preserve viewshalfs	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that a qualifying matter applies in the areas identified as having primary/contributory character streetscape values in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report, which is supported by NZ Pouhere Taonga's submission on the draft spatial plan and the WCC officers final recommendations on the spatial plan from 24 June 2021.	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended to encompass all areas identified in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report as having primary/contributory character streetscape values.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.93	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings 10min walkable catchment Specific heritage identification and assessment Views contributing to sense of place and identity Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell Boffa Miskell streetscapes Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings CCZ encroachment on residential zones Old St Pauls height controls Preserve viewshalfs	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that evidence from the Hay Street Heritage Report (July 2021) supports Hay Street being a Character Precinct and/or a Heritage Area. [Refer to Hay Street Heritage Report (July 2021) provided with submission for details].	Seeks that Hay Street area is amended to be a Character Precinct and/or a Heritage Area.
Alan Fairless	242.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that character and heritage can be considered as part of the community dialogue. Not every old building needs to be retained, but neither are people's sense of connection and place disposable commodities. [Inferred reason given].	Seeks that it is recognised that character is in part derived from heritage (as set out in the Operative Plan) in pre-1930s character areas (as defined in the Operative Plan).
Alan Fairless	242.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Wellington's liveability, and its character and heritage, can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Considers that character and heritage can be considered as part of community dialogue. Not every old building needs to be retained, but neither are people's sense of connection and place disposable commodities. [Inferred reason given].	Seeks that the District Plan use a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter under the National Policy Statement-Urban Development.
Alan Fairless	242.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Wellington's liveability, and its character and heritage, can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Considers that rather than wholesale deregulation and the widespread removal of protections, the District Plan needs to better recognise and provide for the protection of heritage from inappropriate development and better take into account the need to maintain and enhance amenity values.	Seeks that areas of particular character within the pre-1930s character areas are identified (for example as recommended in the revised Draft Spatial Plan) to enable a more granular level of control over demolition.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Cheryl Crooks	243.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that the subsequent Officers Recommended plan should be reinstated.</p> <p>Supports the reinstatement of 300 houses that meet the requirement of "character" as defined in the Boffa Miskell report.</p> <p>The 300 houses need to be reinstated as they are important to the preservation of the social history of part of the original city of Wellington.</p> <p>Some of the houses were built as early as 1875. Newtown was a suburb of working families, and maintains a rich demographic. Green and Emmett streets were the locations of open air political meetings of trade unions early in the movement, and Peter Fraser would speak to constituents, Council and union representatives in these streets - sometimes before leading marches to Trades Hall.</p> <p>The owners of the Newtown houses stood for Council and believed in building a city that cared for the rights of people to live and work within the city.</p> <p>Green and Emmett streets, as well as other parts of Newtown could become even more vibrant with the introduction of a character precinct in these streets. Similar to other historic precincts, such as The Rocks in Sydney they could be come a significant tourist attraction, as well as supporting the local hospitality industry.</p> <p>Thoughtful, modern housing can be incorporated into the character areas, as it has been at The Rocks - while maintaining important aspects of Wellington history.</p>	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include previously identified character precinct areas in Newtown.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.52	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission because it supports character extensions in Newtown. Green and Emmett Streets.	Allow
Cherie Jacobson	251.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	<p>Considers that Character is given inadequate weight in the PDP.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence indicating that the existing heritage and character provisions in the District Plan are affecting the housing market in Wellington.</p> <p>Heritage and character can make a significant contribution to Wellington's climate change goals by reducing emissions and waste through sustainable resource use.</p>	Not specified.
Cherie Jacobson	251.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that reducing the size of character areas in Wellington means that the more vernacular or everyday values of Wellington's most well-known suburbs will be vulnerable to loss.</p> <p>Considers that the expert advice and community's views on heritage and character were largely ignored in the development of the Spatial Plan and now again in the PDP.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended.
Generation Zero Inc	254.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	<p>GZ Inc supports PDP's identification of areas with high concentrations of character (i.e. areas with a predominance of primary classified buildings).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain the extent of the character precincts as notified which only include properties that have been identified as having high concentrations of character (i.e. areas with a predominance of primary classified buildings).
Pauletta Wilson	257.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Inferred support for Yale road being in a character precinct.	<p>Retain Yale road as within a character precinct.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jim & Christine Seymour	262.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	Considers that character areas could be designed by approved architects to ensure consistency in these areas as has been done in other jurisdictions.	Seeks that new buildings in character precincts be designed by one or more approved architects.
Mike Robbers	264.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that there are a large number of character homes on Lawrence Street, some of the homes have Māori names in stained glass on the front of the properties. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Character Precincts are extended to encompass Lawrence Street, Newtown.
Everard Aspell	270.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Opposes loss of character protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP. Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the character areas within Mount Victoria.
Everard Aspell	270.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Opposes loss of character protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP. Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the character areas within Mount Cook.
Everard Aspell	270.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Opposes loss of character protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP. Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the character areas within Thorndon.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.108	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Part of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Everard Aspell	270.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Opposes loss of character protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the character areas within Aro Valley.
Everard Aspell	270.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Opposes loss of character protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the character areas within Newtown.
Everard Aspell	270.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Opposes loss of character protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the character areas within Berhampore.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	<p>Retain the character precincts with amendment.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Opposes extent of the character precincts to the extent that they do not include areas that are currently protected by the pre-1930s demolition control in the operative district plan.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Extend the extent of the character precincts to that of the operative district plan.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Bernard Palamountain	278.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks that 75 - 80% of the character protections proposed by the Boffa Miskell report, and those adopted by the Auckland City Council, are added to the Proposed District Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Bernard Palamountain	278.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks that at least 50% of the character area protections recommended by the 2021 Officers Recommended Plan are added to the Proposed District Plan.
Laura Gaudin	279.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports character precincts and considers that these could be extended.	Retain character precincts as notified.
Laura Gaudin	279.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks that a mechanism is added to allow for character precincts to be extended, with protections given to viewshafts within any given extension.
Eldin Family Trust	287.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that the rezoning of Selwyn Terrace would be a dramatic change and would enable activities that conflict with the current primary use of Selwyn Terrace as a distinct enclave of residential dwellings.</p> <p>Considers that the Council is incorrect to say that Selwyn Terrace already has a mixture of land uses.</p> <p>Does not agree that a land use change is necessary to support a mixture of activities and growth, considering the street is very narrow and steep access, with a single carriageway for much of its length. A change to a commercial zoning would place unreasonable demand on vehicle and pedestrian access.</p> <p>Considers that Selwyn Terrace has a high concentration of pre-1930s character as evidenced by the 2019 Pre-1930s character area review report.</p> <p>Considers that 9 Selwyn Terrace is an excellent example of the work of one of Wellington's pre-eminent architects of the 20th Century, William Gray Young.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace has special historic context as a reminder of the original suburb prior to the construction of the Wellington Motorway.</p> <p>Considers the plan provides sufficient development capacity without needing to change planning settings in Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Selwyn Terrace, Thorndon is included as a Character Precinct.
Eldin Family Trust	287.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that numbers 15, 16, 17 and 18 Selwyn Terrace should be considered as primary contributors of character.	Seeks that numbers 15, 16, 17 and 18 Selwyn Terrace should be considered as primary contributors of character.
Matthew Plummer	300.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports Character Precincts in Wellington's inner city.	Retain Character Precincts in Wellington's inner city.
Matthew Plummer	300.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Boffa Miskell's Pre-1930 Character Area Review has been ignored by councillors.	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Matthew Plummer	300.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that WCC officers' recommendations for Character Area expansion (2021) have been ignored by councillors. The Proposed District Plan in its current form will not incentivise development of affordable homes.	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Council officers' recommendations.
Matthew Plummer	300.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	Considers that petitions with significant community support for Character Area enlargement have been ignored by Councillors, namely the Mount Victoria petition. The Proposed District Plan in its current form will not incentivise development of affordable homes.	Not specified.
Roland Sapsford	305.44	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	Considers that the 10 minute walkable catchments have resulted in a reduction in the extent of Aro Valley included in the character precincts. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that further consideration is given to the unique characteristics of Aro Valley. [Inferred decision sought]
Roland Sapsford	305.45	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	The extent of Character Precincts should be extended to match pre-existing demolition control for pre-1930s character areas under the Operative Plan. Areas of particular character within these should be identified to enable a more granular level of control over demolition and redevelopment. Considers that the plan needs to create a more coherent and connected set of sites covered by the character protections in Aro Valley. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended to encompass those in the operative district plan.
James Coyle	307.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that character zones in the spatial plan need to be re-assessed. Political affiliations may have worked to reduce the extent of character zones. There was a lack of independent voices at the table, ones that could see the opportunity of qualifying matters and advocate for a specific design and an appropriate response to Wellington.	Seeks that Character Precincts be re-assessed with independent voices involved.
Penelope Borland	317.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria should be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review. Extending Character Precincts will not affect future housing capacity. The Council's own growth figures indicate that Mount Victoria's contribution is small and likely to be achieved even with the current pre-1930s demolition rule fully in place. Therefore, the qualifying matters of character and heritage should be applied as they were envisaged under the NPS-UD in the Proposed District Plan MRZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review.
Penelope Borland	317.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria should be extended to encompass Heritage New Zealand's recommendations, specifically Earls Terrace, Lower Hawker Street, Port Street and Stafford Street. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's recommendations.
Penelope Borland	317.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria should be extended with the WCC officer's recommendation as a baseline starting point.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) in Mount Victoria to encompass Council officers' recommendations.
Penelope Borland	317.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	PREC01 should be amended to include all houses on Earls Terrace, as recommended by Heritage New Zealand. (Option A)	Amend the extent of MRZ- PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include all houses on Earls Terrace.
Penelope Borland	317.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	PREC01 should be amended to include all houses on Stafford Street, as recommended by Heritage New Zealand. (Option A)	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include all houses on Stafford Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Penelope Borland	317.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	PREC01 should be amended to include 1, 3,4 and 8 Port Street, as recommended by Heritage New Zealand. (Option A)	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include 1, 3,4 and 8 Port Street.
Penelope Borland	317.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	PREC01 should be amended to include 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26 and 30 Hawker Street, as recommended by Heritage New Zealand. (Option A)	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26 and 30 Hawker Street.
Hilary Watson	321.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports Character Precincts, but seeks an extension of Newtown's Character Precincts.	Retain Character Precincts with amendments.
Hilary Watson	321.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that PREC01 should be extended to include additional properties in Newtown. The balance between upzoning areas for increased density, and retaining valuable character areas has not been struck appropriately in the Proposed District Plan (PDP), and needs to be changed. A list of properties specifying the addresses of the additional properties that should be added to the Character Precinct has been provided in Appendix One. These properties were included in the Councillor Recommended Spatial plan from July 2021, the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Review and WCC officer recommendations. [See Appendix 1 to original submission for full list of properties]	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include additional properties in Newtown. [See Appendix 1 to original submission for full list of properties]
Hilary Watson	321.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Newtown's Character Precincts should be extended to preserve the precious green coverage across private properties that acts as a corridor from Zealandia across the city. These trees also prevent surface water runoff from overloading the pipe system in times of flooding events. Every neighbourhood should have a 30 percent tree canopy and everyone should live less than 300meters away from a green space. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Newtown's Character Precinct be extended to preserve green coverage from private properties.
Richard Murcott	322.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Character Precinct Area over the Hobson Street block in Thorndon should be restored, based upon Boffa Miskell's report.	Seeks that Character Precincts in Thorndon be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.49	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Character Precinct Area in Thorndon be restored to reflect WCC planners recommendations in the pre-approved version of the Spatial Plan (18 June 2021). Dwellings in the Thorndon area have character attributes and quality that should be recognised.	Seeks that Character Precincts in Thorndon be extended to encompass WCC officers' recommendations in the Spatial Plan.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.50	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Thorndon suburb makes a significant contribution to Wellington's identity and should be classified as Character Precinct. Most of Thorndon's larger wooden houses are of superior build quality, from native timbers, making them a very valuable part of Wellington's history and part of the unique story of Wellington and its heritage.	Seeks that Thorndon be classified as Character Precinct.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Murcott	322.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace residential enclave should be a Character Precinct.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include the residential area of Selwyn Terrace.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.51	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the residential area of Portland Crescent should be a Character Precinct.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include the residential area of Portland Crescent.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.53	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the residential area of Hawkestone Street should be a Character Precinct.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include the residential area of Hawkestone Street.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.54	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the High Density Residential Zone block bounded by Hobson St, Davis St, Moturoa St, Murphy St, Turnbull St, and Fitzherbert Tce in Thorndon be classified as a Character Precinct. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include the residential block bounded by Hobson St, Davis St, Moturoa St, Murphy St, Turnbull St, and Fitzherbert Tce in Thorndon.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.55	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Craig Erskine	325.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	MRZ- PREC01 (Character Precincts) is opposed as there is insufficient evidence or justification to exempt such large areas from the overall intent of the new rules. There needs to be more assessment and refinement of these areas before they can be properly considered as qualifying matters.	Remove MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) in its entirety, and replace with justified provisions.
Craig Erskine	325.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	MRZ- PREC01 (Character Precincts) should be reassessed and replaced with justified provisions. There needs to be more assessment and refinement of these areas before they can be properly considered as qualifying matters.	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) be reassessed and replaced with justified provisions.
Khoi Phan	326.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove Berhampore from Character Precincts.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Khoi Phan	326.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove Newtown from Character Precincts.
Khoi Phan	326.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove Mt Cook from Character Precincts.
Khoi Phan	326.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove Mt Victoria from Character Precincts.
Khoi Phan	326.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove Aro Valley from Character Precincts.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	The extent of Character Precincts in Mt Cook is incorrect and should be amended. Areas of significant character value in Mt Cook identified by Boffa Miskell's Pre-1930 Character Area Review should align with Character Precincts in the PDP. Retaining character protection over further parts of Mt Cook would not prevent an adequate supply of housing in future, and will help keep the character and diversity of the suburb. Boffa Miskell provided evidence justifying the inclusion of Myrtle Crescent, Hargreaves Street, Wallace Street, Rolleston Street and the lower section of Hankey Street, which has been set aside. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Cook be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, specifically Myrtle Crescent, Hargreaves Street, Wallace Street, Rolleston Street, and the lower section of Hankey Street.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.100	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Thorndon Flat and the Hobson St residential precinct should be classified as Character Precincts. The area neighbours the Parliamentary Precinct and has a unique residential character and heritage context in NZ. The Hobson Precinct, in particular, warrants application of a qualifying matter such as the Character Precinct Area designation, as applied to other parts of residential Thorndon.	Amend the extent of Character Precincts in Thorndon to include the Thorndon flat and the Hobson Street Residential precinct consistent with the maps appended to the submission. [Refer to original submission]
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone , and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission. [Refer to original submission]
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone , and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission. [Refer to original submission]
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Goring Street, along Grant Road and Park Street, should be a Character Precinct. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include Goring Street. [Refer to original submission for schematic]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that 220-235 Tinakori Road should be included in MRZ-PREC01 similar to the adjacent character precincts. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include 220-235 Tinakori Road.
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that 106 and 110 Hill Street should be included in MRZ-PREC01. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include 106 and 110 Hill Street.
Kerry Finnigan	336.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports Character Precincts in Newtown.	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) with amendment.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.35	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts.	Allow
Kerry Finnigan	336.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	The extent of Character Precincts in Newtown should be amended to include areas identified by the Boffa Miskell study.	Seeks that Character Precincts in Newtown be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.36	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts.	Allow
Property Council New Zealand	338.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports character precincts as a qualifying matter. The principle of protecting pre-1930s character housing within character precincts is important when properly balanced with unlocking additional development capacity for Wellington.	Not specified.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Mount Victoria should be included in the Character Area from Cambridge Terrace to the ridge, Tangi the Keo. This will provide a consistent approach to planning in a well-defined coherent area. Consistent treatment of an already dense area will also allow for sympathetic building design.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include all of Mount Victoria.
Carolyn Stephens	344.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the plan should recognise that character is in part derived from heritage in pre-1930s character areas as set out in the Operative Plan.	Seeks that character be recognised as being derived from heritage in pre-1930s Character Areas.
Carolyn Stephens	344.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that character precincts should be extended to match pre-existing demolition control for pre-1930s character areas under the Operative Plan. Areas of particular character within these should be identified to enable a more granular level of control over demolition and redevelopment.	Reinstate the Operative Plans' pre-1930s demolition controls.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the present number of character homes protected from demolition should be increased in Lower Kelburn. The submitter notes that it is reported that the 5500 dwellings with character protection is less than 6% of Wellington's current housing stock, and all of it is in Aotearoa's oldest built suburbs, like Lower Kelburn, Thorndon and Mount Victoria. The submitter considers that character homes are an important special feature that define Wellington. In areas such as Lower Kelburn, they consist predominantly of well-maintained pre-1900 wooden homes with some built pre-1930. They are very effective and valuable ways of continuing to store carbon and provide residents with tangible experiences of beautiful design and craftsmanship. The submitter notes that the threat of potential destruction is unjustified and adds a significant uncertainty to the market value of houses.	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include further areas of character. [Inferred decision requested]. [See original submission for further detail].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.91	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the North Bolton St Character Area should be expanded to include Wesley Road as a Character Precinct. Notes that the 2019 Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Area Character Review concluded that the Wesley Rd area needed to be further investigated as a potential Character Area. This area had not been studied in detail for the Report as had other areas such as Thorndon and Mt Victoria. Therefore many submissions were made to WCC in the previous round from ninety concerned Lower Kelburn residents, adding to our earlier written and oral submissions that had provided strong evidence that this area should have Character Precinct status, and not be kept as high density with a 21 m height limit. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendix]	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include Wesley Road. An 11 meter height limit should be in place.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.92	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the tall houses at the top of Abel Smith Street at 43 and 45 Palmer Street, with their "pigeon box" roofs are unique in Wellington and are clearly an important part of the heritage character of the area as well. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include 43 and 45 Palmer Street.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the plan should recognise that character is in part derived from heritage in pre-1930s character areas as set out in the Operative Plan.	Seeks that character be recognised as being derived from heritage in pre-1930s Character Areas.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that character precincts should be extended to match pre-existing demolition control for pre-1930s character areas under the Operative Plan. Areas of particular character within these should be identified to enable a more granular level of control over demolition and redevelopment.	Reinstate the Operative Plans' pre-1930s demolition controls.
Sue Kedgley	387.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Opposes the proposals in the PDP that would see a 71% reduction in the protections for character areas in Wellington, especially in Wellington's inner city suburbs such as Mt Victoria, Aro Valley, Thorndon, Mount Cook, and Newtown. These suburbs are already some of the most densely housed areas in Wellington. They are full of Victorian and Edwardian wooden houses which are an important part of our heritage, our history and our sense of place, and as such they are some of the most unique, distinct and liveable areas of Wellington. The densely located houses in these unique inner-city suburbs provide a wonderful sense of neighbourhood and community and provide coherence and interest to the Wellington city scape.	Opposes MRZ-PREC01 (Character precincts) and seeks amendments.
Sue Kedgley	387.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Opposes the proposals in the PDP that would see a 71% reduction in the protections for character areas in Wellington, especially in Wellington's inner city suburbs such as Mt Victoria, Aro Valley, Thorndon, Mount Cook, and Newtown. These suburbs are already some of the most densely housed areas in Wellington. They are full of Victorian and Edwardian wooden houses which are an important part of our heritage, our history and our sense of place, and as such they are some of the most unique, distinct and liveable areas of Wellington. The densely located houses in these unique inner-city suburbs provide a wonderful sense of neighbourhood and community and provide coherence and interest to the Wellington city scape.	Seeks that the existing, inner city heritage Character Precincts in Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Aro Valley and Thorndon are retained and increase the extent of character precincts so that, at the very minimum, 50% of existing character areas are allowed to remain under the pre-1930s demolition rule.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports the proposed Character Precincts.	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) as notified, subject to increasing the extent of the area encompassed by Character Precincts.
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts should be bigger in spatial area in order to protect the specific character and heritage of Wellington.	Amend the extent of the area encompassed by the Character Precincts to be increased.
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts in Mount Victoria should be joined together in a larger block as proposed by the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021.	Seeks that the Character Precincts in Mount Victoria are joined together in a larger block as proposed by the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.315	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose in part	Considers that the introduction of Character Precincts including, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct and Oriental Bay Height Precinct, within the Medium Density Residential Zone should be reviewed in full, including their spatial extent. The S32 analysis has not sufficiently addressed the matters in s77L of the RMA and therefore may not meet threshold to be applied as qualifying matter as currently proposed.	Seeks that Character Precincts and their extent are reviewed to assess whether they meet Qualifying Matter thresholds from s77L of the RMA.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	The review or elimination of MRZ-PREC-03 and policies and rules and standards relating to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct are opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).	Disallow
Jackie Pope	FS8.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Denis Foot	FS10.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments. [Inferred reference to submission point 391.315]	Disallow
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place.	Disallow
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.</p> <p>Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.</p>	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Jenny Gyles	FS53.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.	Disallow
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.14	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>The WCC summary reads: The Introduction to the MRZ is generally supported, in particular the provision of medium density housing to give effect to the NPS-UD and the Act. But amendments are sought relating to the introduction of Character Precincts and different provisions related to the construction of 4 or more residential units. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters.</p> <p>Special character precincts enable rigorous, targeted, sustainable urban planning regulation, and a role for community engagement in future changes.</p> <p>TRA specifically oppose 391.318 which seeks to delete Objective UFD-08 and rejects its recognition of "special character" at the strategic level of the Plan.</p> <p>The TRA supports Character precincts because they comply with the NPS-UD, and are an important qualifying matter under the RMA.</p>	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council.</p> <p>Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.</p>	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZPREC01	Oppose	Character precincts do not have to be reviewed to see whether they meet Qualifying Matter thresholds from S77L of the RMA. The NPSUD makes provision for "any other matters" determined by the Council to be a qualifying matter. Character Precincts are important to protect the character and heritage of Wellington City	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	FS117.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Character precincts do not have to be reviewed to see whether they meet Qualifying Matter thresholds from S77L of the RMA. The NPSUD makes provision for “any other matters” determined by the Council to be a qualifying matter. Character Precincts are important to protect the character and heritage of Wellington City.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.316	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that a full review of Character Precincts is needed and if it is found that there is a need to continue to manage such values, then the PDP should introduce a Character chapter that will apply as an overlay as a Districtwide matter. [Refer to Appendix 3 for proposed Character Area Overlay]	Seeks that Character Precincts not be referenced in the plan and be instead focused into a Character Areas Overlay Chapter in the ‘District-wide – General matters’ section of the Plan. [Refer to original submission for full details]. [Refer to Appendix 3 for proposed Character Area Overlay].
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People’s propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O’ Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Kāinga Ora’s submission that seek to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora’s submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.15	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	The WCC summary reads: The Introduction to the MRZ is generally supported, in particular the provision of medium density housing to give effect to the NPS-UD and the Act. But amendments are sought relating to the introduction of Character Precincts and different provisions related to the construction of 4 or more residential units. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters. Special character precincts enable rigorous, targeted, sustainable urban planning regulation, and a role for community engagement in future changes. TRA specifically oppose 391.318 which seeks to delete Objective UFD-08 and rejects its recognition of “special character” at the strategic level of the Plan. The TRA supports Character precincts because they comply with the NPS-UD, and are an important qualifying matter under the RMA.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O’ Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.317	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Character Precincts be removed in areas with Heritage classification.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.318	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	It is considered that MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) does not fulfil the matters of national importance as set out under section 6(f) and the requirements under section 77L and 77R of the RMA, and therefore do not meet the threshold to be applied as a qualifying matter to restrict height and density. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into Districtwide matters.	Delete MRZ-PREC-01 (Character Precincts) in its entirety.
Jaqui Tutt	FS35.7	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Removal of character precincts is opposed. The NPSUD makes provision for "any other matters" determined by the Council to be a qualifying matter. Character Precincts are important to protect the character and heritage of Wellington. A character overlay will not achieve the same outcome.	Disallow
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	The character of Character Precincts derives from their historic/heritage qualities and therefore do meet the requirements for a qualifying matter.	Disallow
Phil Kelliher	FS57.5	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Removal of Character precincts is strongly opposed. Reason: The NPSUD makes provision for "any other matters" determined by the Council to be a qualifying matter. Character Precincts are vital to protect the character & heritage of Wellington, NZ's capital city. Considers that the Boffa Miskell assessment of the Inner-city suburbs character areas covering circa 74% of pre-1930 properties defined as either Primary or Contributory should be considered as a Qualifying Matter and be designated Character Precincts in the District Plan. Further reasons for opposing: 1) EXCESS HOUSING CAPACITY OVER THE NEXT 30Y 2) TOTALLY INADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE 3) STRONG COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR CHARACTER & HERITAGE including renters 4) HOUSING MARKET CONDITIONS HAVE CHANGED DRASTICALLY ie housing deficit fully eroded, house price crash, declining population. 5) BETTER ALTERNATIVES to concentrate high density development rather than the scattergun approach through inner-city suburbs.	Disallow / Seeks the following decision: "Increase the size of the inner-city suburb's Character Precincts in the District Plan to the circa 74% of the pre-1930's properties defined as either Primary or Contributory" as recommended by Boffa Miskell who were commissioned by the WCC to conduct a Pre-1930 Character Area Review (2019).
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Submitter opposes submission by Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities which seeks to delete objective UFD-08 and rejects recognition of 'special character' at the strategic level of the plan. The submitter supports character precincts because they comply with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and are an important Qualifying matter under the Resource Management Act 1991.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>The WCC summary reads: The Introduction to the MRZ is generally supported, in particular the provision of medium density housing to give effect to the NPS-UD and the Act. But amendments are sought relating to the introduction of Character Precincts and different provisions related to the construction of 4 or more residential units. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters.</p> <p>Special character precincts enable rigorous, targeted, sustainable urban planning regulation, and a role for community engagement in future changes.</p> <p>TRA specifically oppose 391.318 which seeks to delete Objective UFD-08 and rejects its recognition of "special character" at the strategic level of the Plan.</p> <p>The TRA supports Character precincts because they comply with the NPS-UD, and are an important qualifying matter under the RMA.</p>	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.65	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZPREC01	Oppose	Removal of character precincts is opposed. The NPSUD makes provision for "any other matters" determined by the Council to be a qualifying matter. Character Precincts are important to protect the character and heritage of Wellington City A character overlay will not achieve the same outcome.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Removal of character precincts is opposed. The NPSUD makes provision for "any other matters" determined by the Council to be a qualifying matter. Character Precincts are important to protect the character and heritage of Wellington City. A character overlay will not achieve the same outcome.	Disallow
Murray Pillar	393.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports the proposed Character Precincts and the rules for them.	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) as notified, subject to increasing the extent of the area encompassed by Character Precincts.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.80	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	<p>Boffa Miskell - adoption</p> <p>Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all</p> <p>Add Character Precincts to areas missed</p> <p>10min walkable catchment</p> <p>Character precincts and rules</p> <p>Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M.</p> <p>Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings</p>	Allow
Murray Pillar	393.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts should be amended to include all the dwellings identified in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report on character areas, specifically to cover each site that was identified as being "positive, contributing or neutral" in the report.	Amend the extent of the area encompassed by the Character Precincts to include all the dwellings identified in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report on character areas, specifically to cover each site that was identified as being "positive, contributing or neutral" in the report.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.81	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	<p>Boffa Miskell - adoption</p> <p>Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all</p> <p>Add Character Precincts to areas missed</p> <p>10min walkable catchment</p> <p>Character precincts and rules</p> <p>Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M.</p> <p>Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Murray Pillar	393.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that new Character Precinct areas should be established in areas missed out altogether in the PDP, such as Wesley Road.	Add a new Character Precinct area for Wesley Road in MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts).
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.82	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Boffa Miskell - adoption Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all Add Character Precincts to areas missed 10min walkable catchment Character precincts and rules Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M. Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings	Allow
Murray Pillar	393.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that new Character Precinct areas should be established in areas missed out altogether in the PDP, such as Bolton Street.	Add a new Character Precinct area for Bolton Street in MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts).
Murray Pillar	393.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that new Character Precinct areas should be established in areas missed out altogether in the PDP, such as Aurora Terrace.	Add a new Character Precinct area for Aurora Terrace in MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts).
Murray Pillar	393.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that new Character Precinct areas should be established in areas missed out altogether in the PDP, such as Talavera Terrace in Lower Kelburn.	Add a new Character Precinct area for Talavera Terrace in Lower Kelburn in MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts).
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.46	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has qualities, including visibility which should qualify it as a character area. The submitter considers that Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has a particularly charming ambience and modification to the houses has generally been in keeping with the Mt Victoria architecture.	Seeks that Earls Terrace, Port Street and Stafford Street are included in the PDP as a character area.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.71	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Considers that there is a lack of evidence to support the character content of the PDP.	Not specified
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.72	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Considers that the lifting of demolition controls in existing character areas, will unnecessarily sacrifice heritage, character and liveability, while not achieving the desired affordable housing outcomes. [See original submission for full reasons]	Not specified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.73	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the character precincts should be as mapped in the existing district plan because of the lack of evidence upon which the reduction in scale is based including the flawed analysis by Boffa Miskell and the information in the HBA. [See original submission for further detail including appendices]	Seeks that the character precincts be extended to that in the operative district plan.
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the current height control areas in the Newtown Character Precincts are too high to achieve good urban design and to create a well-functioning livable environment.	Seeks that the 11m Height Control Area in Newtown Character Precincts is decreased. [Inferred decision requested].
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.59	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Wellington's liveability, and its character and heritage, can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Not every old building needs to be retained, but neither are people's sense of connection and place disposable commodities. Rather than wholesale deregulation and the widespread removal of protections, heritage and character can be considered as part of community dialogue, while new construction focuses first on under-utilised land.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to recognise that character is in part derived from heritage (as set out in the Operative Plan) in pre-1930s character areas (as defined in the Operative Plan), and use a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter under the National Policy Statement Urban Development.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Wellington's liveability, and its character and heritage, can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Not every old building needs to be retained, but neither are people's sense of connection and place disposable commodities. Rather than wholesale deregulation and the widespread removal of protections, heritage and character can be considered as part of community dialogue, while new construction focuses first on under-utilised land.	Seeks that demolition controls generally in the pre-1930s character areas (as defined in the Operative Plan) while identifying areas of particular character within these (for example as recommended in the revised Draft Spatial Plan) to enable a more granular level of control over demolition.
Kat Hall	430.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	The extent of Character Precincts should be amended to include areas identified in the 'Officer's Recommended Plan'. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended to encompass the extent recommended in the 'Officer's Recommended Plan' - ie approximately 50% increase in character precincts.
Kat Hall	430.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	The extent of Character Precincts should be amended to include areas identified by the Boffa Miskell Pre- 1930 Character Area Review. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review.
Kat Hall	430.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	The extent of Character Precincts should be amended to include areas identified by Heritage New Zealand in their submission on the the Spatial Plan in 2021. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended to encompass Heritage New Zealand's recommendations in the Spatial Plan 2021.
Kat Hall	430.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Character Precincts should be extended in Newtown to match the recommendations from the Boffa Miskell report (p. 18-21) which identifies 83% of properties predating 1930 that are primary character contributory and include similar architectural style, lot size, and building type. These properties within the character area are located within two relatively discrete areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Character Precinct in Newtown in extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations.
Kat Hall	430.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that intensification needs to deliver additional housing while retaining character and cohesion in a suburb such as Newtown. This could be achieved by developing along commercial spines (refer to Hanley and Kemble Welch's 'Red Desing' concept plans). Intensification along the main streets, and mostly within existing Suburban Centres zoning, could provide up to 2,000 or more new dwellings, which exceeds the current projections of the Draft Spatial Plan for the Newtown area.	Seeks that intensification and development be focused along main streets in Local and Neighbourhood Centre Zones.
Peter Fordyce	431.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Heritage chapter should have a provision to protect original windows with stained and decorative glass on buildings within the character precincts, and heritage structures. As the chapter stands, provisions have little protection for the windows of heritage buildings, particularly stained and decorative glass, and there is a significant risk that this will be lost with the push for double glazing. Where possible, original window frames should be retained, and new or modified windows must contain the original decorative glass.	Add a new rule in the MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) providing protection of original windows and stained and decorative window glass on buildings within the character precincts. [Inferred decision requested - note: relief sought refers to heritage structures and character precincts]
Peter Fordyce	431.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that there should be wider coverage for the rules preventing demolition of pre-1930s dwellings in areas with that protection.	Seeks that the character precincts are extended.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Garvin Wong	432.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Character Precincts in Thorndon are opposed. Some old properties under character protection in Thorndon are over 100 years old. Renovating these properties will be more expensive than building new ones, as most of them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have rotten weatherboards and borer holes in their structure frames, - have been left "as is", - are cold and damp in winter and costly to warm up, - were built very close to each other and get very little sunlight, - have sunken foundations. <p>It is expected that the life span of a newly built property is 50 years and houses built 100 years ago should not be expected to last longer.</p>	Opposes Character Precincts in Thorndon.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.39	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>WCC Summary reads: Considers that Character Precincts should not be a qualifying matter. Seeks that the extent of Character Precincts be amended to remove properties in Thorndon.</p>	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.57	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Considers Thorndon character precincts protect significant heritage and character values.</p>	Disallow
Garvin Wong	432.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Character Precincts in Thorndon are opposed. Some old properties under character protection in Thorndon are over 100 years old. Renovating these properties will be more expensive than building new ones, as most of them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have rotten weatherboards and borer holes in their structure frames, - have been left "as is", - are cold and damp in winter and costly to warm up, - were built very close to each other and get very little sunlight, - have sunken foundations. <p>It is expected that the life span of a newly built property is 50 years and houses built 100 years ago should not be expected to last longer.</p>	Seeks that the extent of Character Precincts be amended to remove properties in Thorndon.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.40	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>WCC Summary reads: Considers that Character Precincts should not be a qualifying matter. Seeks that the extent of Character Precincts be amended to remove properties in Thorndon.</p>	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.58	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Considers Thorndon character precincts protect significant heritage and character values.</p>	Disallow
Miriam Moore	433.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	<p>Oppose the extent of the character protected areas. The inaccessibility of the City's character housing stock forces out older populations, if our ageing population can age in place in their home suburbs like Mount Victoria, this will free up more affordable land in the fringe suburbs</p>	Seeks to reduce the extent of the character precincts.
Anna Kemble Welch	434.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that the Character Precincts should be increased through the application of character as a qualifying matter.</p>	Seeks that the extent of the character precincts is increased.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Anna Kemble Welch	434.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Character Precincts in Newtown should be increased to reflect Boffa Miskell's recommendations in their Pre-1930 Character Area Review. The Newtown Character Precinct should include all the houses in Emmett Street and Green Street, Normanby St east of the suburban centre, Donald Mclean St north side, east of the suburban centre, all of Harper Street and Regent St, Daniell St to number 138 on the west side and 171 on the east, Lawrence St , Wingate Tce, Balmoral Tce, and Owen St from 1 to 173 on the east and 66 to 192 on the west. A WCC character area story map is provided to support this point. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachment]	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) to include the area in Newtown recommended by Boffa Miskell's Pre-1930 Character Area Review.
Kirsty Woods	437.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Supports the current character areas identified, but considers that the character precinct should be extended to Newtown.	Seeks an amendment to MRZ-PREC01 (Character precincts) that the extent of the character precinct in Newtown is increased.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Character Precincts are fully supported, but could be extended. Character as a Qualifying Matter is supported, as it permits the modification of building heights and other matters that would be required under the NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) as notified.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Boffa Miskell's Pre-1930 Character Area Review identified 5 sub-areas on the eastern side of Newtown and another 3 on the west side as having particularly noticeable coherence of character, which should be included in MRZ-PREC01. (Option A)	Seeks that Character Precincts in Newtown be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell's recommendations in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review (Primary & contributing).
Newtown Residents' Association	440.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Character Precincts should include all areas of Newtown and Berhampore described in the Boffa Miskell report as having a noticeable degree of cohesion. (Option B)	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended to encompass areas of Newtown and Berhampore described as having a noticeable degree of cohesion in the Pre-1930 Character Area Review from Boffa Miskell, with the addition of Green St, Emmett St, Wilson St, 74 Daniell St to 171 Daniell St, and Regent St.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Character Precincts should be extended to match the areas recommended by the Council Officers in the pre-approved Spatial Plan, June 2021. (Option C) [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Character Precincts be extended to encompass Council Officers' recommendations in the pre-approved 2021 Spatial Plan.
Kathryn Lethbridge	442.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that WCC should be including character / heritage recognition for the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway). The zone is a jewel in the Wellington character / heritage crown and appropriate houses in the area should be protected to prevent unnecessary loss to this key cultural asset for the city.	Seeks that Hobson Street (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) is included within a character precinct.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.71	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	WCC summary reads: The zone is a jewel in the Wellington character / heritage crown and appropriate houses in the area should be protected to prevent unnecessary loss to this key cultural asset for the city. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Allow
Dale Mary McTavish	448.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the Newtown housing stock is mostly around 100 years which says a lot about the quality and resilience. Newtown is already high density on a human scale and is well-placed for sun and green spaces. People enjoy living here and there is the pleasure of 19th century views. Every single house has a story. The most recent infill housing is a blot on the landscape. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the Character Precinct areas in Newtown are extended to include the Council Officers Recommended Plan areas. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Lee	454.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Opposes the removal of the pre-30s demolition consent from Mt Victoria.	Seeks to add Operative District Plan rule relating to Pre-1930s demolition. [Inferred decision requested]
David Lee	454.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	Considers that 'Character' areas should all be renamed heritage areas because character is a subjective term, unlike 'heritage' which has a legal force in the RMA.	Seeks that 'Character' areas should all be renamed heritage areas.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Agree that 'Character' areas should be renamed heritage areas because character is a subjective term, unlike 'heritage' which has a legal force in the RMA. The character only derives from the heritage.	Allow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Suports submission seeking all character areas should be relabelled to Heritage Areas.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.159	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Renaming Character Precincts as heritage recognises that all character precincts fundamentally protect heritage from inappropriate subdivision or development in accordance with s.6 RMA, and as such is a qualifying matter under s.77L RMA exempting those areas and sites from mandatory intensification, and from demolition without specific analysis of the heritage values at risk of being lost.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.44	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Ellice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow
David Lee	454.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	Considers Mt Victoria's Victorian/Edwardian houses, constructed of irreplaceable native timber, contribute immensely to Wellington's character and that this has been recognised internationally.	Not specified.
Rachel Underwood	458.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers the plan should give more protection for older, heritage, wooden buildings because upgrading existing houses is more sustainable than demolition and replacing with concrete structures. Considers that it is unacceptable that planning should allow high-rise buildings that deprive older houses of sunlight and air flow and intensify dampness in living conditions.	Seeks to alter the Character Precincts to reflect the recommendations of the Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report 2019.
Rachel Underwood	458.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers further character protection is needed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that new areas of character precinct be established in areas missed out altogether, such as Wesley Rd, Bolton St and Aurora Terrace; and Talavera Terrace in lower Kelburn.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports the creation of Character Precincts.	Retain the MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts), with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the area encompassed by the Character Precincts is expanded to include all inner city suburbs not covered by the Priority Development Areas.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Requests that 11 Vogel Street is included in the Mount Victoria Character Precinct. Notes that the Boffa Miskell character report classified the property as having contributory character but was ultimately excluded from the overlay. Notes that 11 Vogel Street is the only property south of Hawker Street that within the Townscape Precinct but not within the Character Precinct. While the Townscape Precinct offers certain protections, the Character Precinct would be better suited to protecting the character values of the property. [see original submission for further details and maps]	Include 11 Vogel Street in the Mount Victoria Character Precinct.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Notes that there are a cluster of a dozen properties on McFarlane Street that are not included in the Mount Victoria Character Precinct that should be included [see original submission for maps and images identifying these properties]. Notes that any redevelopment of these sites may make the area less conforming to the general pattern of development and that the hillside location makes these properties visible from the City. Notes that the whole hillside face where these properties are located needs to be treated as one cohesive block under one set of consistent rules, and valued as a whole.	Include a cluster of up to a dozen properties on McFarlane Street in the Mount Victoria Character Precinct. [see original submission for maps and images identifying these properties].
Christina Mackay	478.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers the proposed district plan does not promote enough character houses.	Seeks that the extent of the character precincts be amended consistent with: 1. Boffa Miskell report of February 2019; 2. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) submission on the draft spatial plan; and 3. WCC officers recommended final spatial plan of 24 June 2021.
Christina Mackay	478.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports the overall concept of Character Precincts and rules, including new in-fill housing, but rules appear too loose. I recommend the guidance and direction of a Urban Design panel.	Supports in parts provisions for Character precincts, but seeks amendments.
Christina Mackay	478.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Supports the overall concept of Character Precincts and rules, including new in-fill housing, but rules appear too loose. I recommend the guidance and direction of a Urban Design panel.	Amend the Character Precinct rules to be more stringent with advice from an urban design panel.
Catharine Underwood	481.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to protect more Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings. Reducing the protection of character areas (particularly Mt Vic) by 71% through the pre 1930s demolition rule will irreversibly and adversely affect the liveability (attractiveness/sunlight, shading/bulk) of the inner city suburbs. It will change the sense of place of these suburbs and lead to the loss of valuable historic heritage that is part of Wellington's story.	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) be extended to more areas in Thorndon, Mount Victoria, Mount Cook, Aro Valley and within the central city.
Catharine Underwood	481.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the balance between upzoning areas for increased density and retaining character has not been appropriately agreed between the council and the residents and needs to be changed. For the character of Wellington to be maintained it takes more than 1 or two houses to be retained. Considers large buildings will be interspersed with smaller ones.	Seeks that the balance between upzoning areas for increased density and retaining character be more appropriately agreed on.
Catharine Underwood	481.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers the decision of councillors to not increase the size of character areas from the draft spatial plan was incorrect.	Seeks that officers recommendations for character precincts in the recomended spatial plan be adopted
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.54	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	Supports in principle the provision of Character Precincts. It is important that our city continues to have areas that have their own distinct character. It is also important to retain, where possible, the context for some of our historic buildings (e.g. Katherine Mansfield House).	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.99	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Provision of medium density housing zones Provision of Character Precincts. Tall buildings create wind and shade problems	Allow
Jonathan Markwick	490.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that restrictive rules protecting Character Precincts should not be a priority and is morally wrong when we are experiencing a massive shortage of housing and a housing crisis.	Seeks that the coverage of the Mount Victoria Character Precincts are reduced to match the boundaries of the SCHED3 - Heritage Areas.
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	The area is difficult and steep terrain which would impeded large scale development. The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians / cyclists pass through the area. The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery. Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition. Limited sun hours are available. The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Add a Character Precinct that encompasses the Lower Kelburn area (Easedale St; Kinross St; Bolton St; Wesley Rd; Aurora Terrace; Clifton Terrace; San Sebastian Rd; Everton Terrace; Onslow Terrace, Talavera Terrace; Clermont Terrace; Salmont Place; Salamanca Road (as far as Kelburn Park), Gladstone Terrace and Rawhiti Terrace near the cable car).
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians/cyclists pass through the area. The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery. Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition. Limited sun hours are available. The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Add a Character Precinct that encompasses the area of west of Kinross Street and Clifton Terrace, broadly bounded by San Sebastian Road, Wesley Road and Bolton Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians/cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition.</p> <p>Limited sun hours are available.</p> <p>The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Add a Character Precinct that encompasses the area broadly centred around Clifton Terrace and Talavera Terrace.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Oppose	<p>Considers that the current provision for Council to notify neighbours regarding demolition, new builds, and major alterations was a strong control over keeping Wellington's Character.</p> <p>In the case of Mount Victoria, downgrading the current controls will lead to the development of small disconnected blocks where its character will progressively be destroyed by high density and "affordable" cheaply built housing.</p>	Seeks that the current (operative District Plan) provisions relating to notifying neighbours with respect to demolition, new builds and major alterations remain.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Not specified	Considers that giving developers a fairly open book with regard to the Character of Mount Victoria will encourage them to utilise simple design and cheaper materials.	Not specified.
Owen Watson	51.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MRZ-PREC02 as notified.
Judith Graykowski	80.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Support	Supports the Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct.	Retain the Mount Victoria North Precinct as notified.
Kirsty Wood	109.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Amend	Considers that in the MRZ-PREC02, where a site is also in MRZ-PREC01, the stronger provisions of the MRZ-PREC01 should govern decisions and not the more lenient MRZ-PREC02 provision.	Clarify that the MRZ-PREC01 (Character precincts) provisions override the MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) provisions, where a site is within both precincts.
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Amend	Considers that in the MRZ-PREC02, where a site is also in MRZ-PREC01, the stronger provisions of the MRZ-PREC01 should govern decisions and not the more lenient MRZ-PREC02 provision.	Clarify that the MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) provisions override the MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) provisions, where a site is within both precincts.
Gael Webster	114.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Support	Supports the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct (MRZ-PREC02) to protect the iconic view Mount Victoria.	Retain MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) as notified.
Gael Webster	114.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Not specified	Considers that where the Character Precinct is overlaid on the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct, the stronger provisions of Character Precincts govern decisions, not the more permissive Mt Victoria North Townscape provisions.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Vivienne Morrell	155.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Support	Supports the Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct.	Retain the Mount Victoria North Precinct as notified.
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Support	Supports the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct to protect the iconic view Mount Victoria.	Retain MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) as notified.
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission.]	Clarify MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) so that where the Character Precinct is overlaid on the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct, the stronger provisions of Character Precincts govern decisions, not the more permissive Mt Victoria North Townscape provisions.
Glen Scanlon	212.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Amend	No reasons beyond decision requested. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct is extended to encompass Earls Terrace, Port Street and Stafford Street.
Penelope Borland	317.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Amend	PREC02 should be amended to include all houses on Earls Terrace. (Option B)	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) to include all houses on Earls Terrace.
Penelope Borland	317.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Amend	PREC02 should be amended to include all houses on Stafford Street. (Option B)	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) to include all houses on Stafford Street.
Penelope Borland	317.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Amend	PREC02 should be amended to include 1, 3,4 and 8 Port Street. (Option B)	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) to include 1, 3,4 and 8 Port Street.
Penelope Borland	317.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Amend	PREC02 should be amended to include 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26 and 30 Hawker Street. (Option B)	Amend the extent of MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) to include 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26 and 30 Hawker Street.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.319	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Oppose	It is considered that MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) does not fulfil the matters of national importance as set out under section 6(f) and the requirements under section 77L and 77R of the RMA, and therefore do not meet the threshold to be applied as a qualifying matter to restrict height and density. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters.	Delete MRZ-PREC-02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.100	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Oppose	Considers the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct has significant amenity value to Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZPREC02	Oppose	The Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct is in place to protect an iconic view associated with Wellington. This is of importance to Wellington and New Zealand and warrants protection under the RMA. Retaining this is protection is unlikely to impact on KO activities.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Oppose	The Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct is in place to protect an iconic view associated with Wellington. This is of importance to Wellington and New Zealand and warrants protection under the RMA. Retaining this is protection is unlikely to impact on KO activities.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Amend	Considers that a height limit of 11m in the Townscape Precincts will lead to a loss of character as most dwellings within the precinct, specifically properties on the Mt Victoria northern slopes, are two storeys. Notes that the current Pre-1930s Design Guide mentions most dwellings are two storeys.	Amend the rules so that a height limit of 8m is applied to the Townscape Precinct. Provide the ability to apply for Resource Consent for structures that are appropriately sympathetic to the character of the area.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove the height to boundary control exemption for multi-unit developments in the Townscape Precinct.
Gareth Morgan	18.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Tall towers darken the landscape and the Oriental Bay Height Precinct will prevent this in Oriental Bay.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) provisions as notified [inferred decision requested]
Joanne Morgan	19.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	There has been significant investment by successive generations of Oriental Bay residents to preserve and restore the character of the area. The regulation to establish a height limit over the Oriental Bay area has prevented the further construction of tall buildings. This has helped maintain the vista which is part of the experience of visiting Oriental Bay and its special character and heritage.	Seeks that the spirit of the regulated Oriental Bay Height Precinct is respected. Retain General MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified [Inferred decision requested].
Ann Mallinson	81.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Considers that the height limits within the MRZ-PREC03 are appropriate, given these heights were set by decisions of the Environmental Court.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.
Oriental Bay Residents Association Inc	128.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 in its entirety. The height controls are long standing and reflect detailed cost/benefit and legal investigation.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.
Oriental Bay Residents Association Inc	128.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the proposed height restrictions of 11m in MRZ-PREC03 (or lower heights) because of qualifying matters that apply to Oriental Bay residential side streets including Hay Street and Baring Street. There are many qualifying matters relating to the steep cliff side streets which render higher levels of development inappropriate. Those matters include safety to pedestrians on unformed paths, restricted access for emergency vehicles and a long history of slips and instability of the coastal cliffs. Furthermore, the area has a special character and historic values, and comprises an iconic landscape of very high public significance.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.
Jennifer Mary Gyles	147.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 in its entirety. The height controls are long standing and reflect detailed cost/benefit and legal investigation.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.
Jennifer Mary Gyles	147.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the proposed height restrictions of 11m in MRZ-PREC03 (or lower heights) because of qualifying matters that apply to Oriental Bay residential side streets including Hay Street and Baring Street. There are many qualifying matters relating to the steep cliff side streets which render higher levels of development inappropriate. Those matters include safety to pedestrians on unformed paths, restricted access for emergency vehicles and a long history of slips and instability of the coastal cliffs. Furthermore, the area has a special character and historic values, and comprises an iconic landscape of very high public significance.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.83	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Oppose point 147.3 for a height control area of 11m for residential side streets off Oriental Parade. Residential side streets are not a Qualifying Matter. Qualifying Matters are set out & listed in s771 (a through j) of Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Wellington has determined what Qualifying Matters apply to the City in in the Proposed District Plan. Steep cliff side streets, pedestrians & vehicle access, & land stability are matters to be addressed in Assessment of Environmental Effects, as required by s88 RMA report. MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) is an appropriate precinct for recognising the aspects that have been tested before the courts. Any expansion to this precinct fails to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Disallow
Tore Hayward	170.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the proposed maintenance of the existing Oriental Bay Height Area (MRZ-PREC03) along Oriental Parade. Considers that increasing the height limits above this would detract significantly from the public amenity for those who visit Oriental Parade and use Oriental Bay beach. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.
Scott Galloway & Carolyn McLean	171.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 in its entirety. The height controls are long standing and reflect detailed cost/benefit and legal investigation.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 - Oriental Bay Height Precinct and its long standing site by site height limits for Oriental Bay Parade sites.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay) as notified.
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 - Oriental Bay Height Precinct and its long standing site by site height limits for Oriental Bay Parade sites and reflects detailed cost/benefit and legal investigation of local environmental effects.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.320	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	MRZ-PEC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) is opposed and it is sought that the Council reviews the methods adopted to manage the identified townscape values in the proposed Oriental Bay Height Precinct. It is considered that an option would be to create and identify a viewshaft managing those significant public views to the monastery and the maunga (Mt Victoria).	Seeks that MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) is reviewed, so that the Council's adopted methods to manage the identified townscape values in the proposed Oriental Bay Height Precinct are reconsidered.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The review or elimination of MRZ-PREC-03 and policies and rules and standards relating to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct are opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).	Disallow
Jackie Pope	FS8.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Denis Foot	FS10.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments. [Inferred reference to submission point 391.320]	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.5	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place.	Disallow
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Pukepueke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.10	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Jenny Gyles	FS53.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.101	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Considers the Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant amenity value and character in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.10	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.102	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Considers the Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant amenity value and character in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.21	Part 3 / Residential I Zones / Medium Density Residential I Zone / General MRZPREC03	Oppose	A Character Overlay would not provide the necessary protection for the Oriental Bay precinct.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	A Character Overlay would not provide the necessary protection for the Oriental Bay precinct.	Disallow
Richard Tweedie	392.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the current height controls proposed in the Oriental Bay Precinct. Considers that the height controls are long standing and accepted. The height controls should be set no greater than 11m. The area is very steep, prone to slips, has poor and congested access, and limited safety for pedestrians at present. Furthermore it is a unique character area with historic values and has a very special view from Oriental Bay.	Retain the building height controls in MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Precinct) as notified.
Tim Bright	75.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a setback of more than 1m should be required to allow for more of a transition zone between Heritage Areas or Character Precincts.	Seeks that a setback of more than 1m is required from boundaries in or adjoining Character Precincts in the Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Scots College Incorporated	117.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Opposes the removal of the Educational Precincts and that educational activities on established school campuses will not be able to occur without resource consent. Considers that the PDP fails to "roll over" more permissive ODP provisions for educational activities on the Scots College Campus. This will expose the College to risks and constraints. It is the College's experience that the requirement for the College to have to apply for resource consent for new educational buildings that comply with the building standards of the ODP has not added any value or benefit to either the College or to residential neighbours.	Seeks that a permitted activity rule is added for Educational Activities where the activity is within an identified school campus as follows: <u>MRZ-R11 Educational Activities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where: The activity is on a school campus identified on the Plan maps.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Scots College Incorporated	117.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that building work on identified school campuses that complies with the MRZ building height, bulk and location standards should be enabled (i.e. a permitted activity).</p> <p>Building work on identified school campuses that does not meet the MRZ building height, bulk and location standards should require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>The rule requiring resource consent on identified school campus sites should include a clause precluding public notification.</p>	<p>Seeks that a rule is included for building work at identified Educational Precincts as follows:</p> <p><u>MRZ-18 Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings on identified school campuses.</u></p> <p><u>MRZ18.1 Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where: Compliance is achieved with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 and MRZ-S5.</u></p> <p><u>MRZ18.2 Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where: Compliance is achieved with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 and MRZ-S5.</u></p> <p><u>Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of MRZ-18.2 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p>
Anne Lian	132.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Olivier Reuland	134.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Grant Buchan	143.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Stephen Minto	FS100.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submtter 157 proposes the encouragement of ‘Pop-up public realm’ for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. ‘Closing time drink up ya tea’. That just doesn’t match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It’s simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it’s just bad luck.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 157.9]</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Patrick Wilkes	173.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Pete Gent	179.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
James Harris	180.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it. [Refer to original submission for full details].	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that Medium Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
James Harris	180.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that Medium Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
Historic Places Wellington	182.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a policy similar to that requiring new development to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ-P7) by ensuring that development responds to the site context, particular where it is located adjacent to a scheduled site of significant to Māori, heritage buildings, structures or areas, character precincts, and other areas should be added.	Add a policy with equivalent wording to NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) to the Medium Density Residential Zone.
Anne Lian	198.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Alan Fairless	242.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in ALL Residential Zones.	Seeks that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in Medium Density Residential Zones.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.167	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities' for the reasons set out in the previous feedback point on the proposed definitions of 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that FENZ is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. FENZ considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Add new MRZ rule: <u>MRZ-RX:</u> <u>Emergency Service Facilities.</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Phillippa O'Connor	289.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that commercial activities should be able to establish within the residential zones, and that the list of permitted activities is too small and should have a baseline of 100m2 for dairies, restaurants and cafes.	Add a new rule as follows: <u>MRZ-R11 – Dairies, cafes and restaurants</u> <u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The maximum GFA is 100m2</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. Infrastructure and servicing</u> <u>2. Effects on neighbourhood character, residential amenity, safety and the surrounding residential area from building scale, form and appearance; traffic; noise; lighting; and hours of operation</u>
Johanna Carter	296.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a privacy rule should be included for developments that overlook each other or face each other as the PDP outlook provisions do not appear to achieve this and in some instances will have adjoining neighbours directly looking into each others' sites.	Seeks that a new standard for privacy is added.
Johanna Carter	296.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the PDP is the only document that can protect light and sunlight reaching a property. Considers there should be a rule that encourages passive solar design by maximising solar access to homes.	Seeks that a new standard for solar access to homes is added. [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.101	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however the objectives of the MDRS need to be incorporated as drafted under the Enabling Housing Act. Considers that a consequential amendment will be needed to specify the purpose of the MRZ is to provide for predominately residential activities.	Retain MRZ-O2 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.102	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however the objectives of the MDRS need to be incorporated as drafted under the Enabling Housing Act. Considers that a consequential amendment will be needed to specify the purpose of the MRZ is to provide for predominately residential activities.	Seeks addition of new objective (see change sought to MRZ-O1) as follows: MRZ-OX Purpose The Medium Density Residential Zone accommodates predominantly residential activities and a range of compatible non-residential activities.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.103	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the mandatory objectives of the Act are required to be included in the Proposed Plan as drafted in the MDRS. Objective 1 of the Act has not been integrated into the Proposed Plan.	Add new "Well-functioning urban environment" objective into the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter to ensure that mandatory Objective 1 of the Act is provided for in alignment with its intended direction and interpretation: <u>MRZ-OX Well-functioning urban environment</u> <u>A well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.104	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites and a policy recognising the changing nature of communities should be integrated into the District Plan.	Add the following Policies into the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter: <u>RZ-PX Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u> <u>RESZ-PX Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.105	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that it would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments for the reasons set out in the submission above.	Add new "Role of density standards" policy into the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter: <u>MRZ-PX Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the proposed standards for permitted residential activities do not provide for rubbish/recycling storage. It is proposed that a standard be provided to allow for appropriate storage of a minimum standard.	Seeks that a new standard be added in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter allowing for appropriate rubbish and recycling storage of a minimum standard.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new policy providing for popup open spaces for houses that are shaded by new development.
Stephen Minto	FS100.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submtter 378 proposes the encouragement of 'Pop-up public realm's for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. 'Closing time drink up ya tea'. That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 378.15]</p>	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.322	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a new Objective should be added to the MRZ chapter to address provisional provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services. (Option B)	Add a new Objective to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Medium density zones should not become high density zones by default; this requirement would make nonsense of the zoning.</p> <p>Do not allow increased height and density in Medium Density Residential zones.</p>	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.109	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Considers the submission point is overly directive, and the current notified framework of objectives and policies strikes an appropriate balance.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	The proposal to add a new Objective to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services is opposed. Due to Wellington's topography this would affect large areas and has not been adequately socialized.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	The proposal to add a new objective to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services is opposed. Due to Wellington's topography this would affect large areas and has not been adequately socialized.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.323	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a new Policy should be added to the MRZ chapter to address provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services. (Option B)	Add a new Policy to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Medium density zones should not become high density zones by default; this requirement would make nonsense of the zoning. Do not allow increased height and density in Medium Density Residential zones.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.110	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Considers the submission point is overly directive, and the current notified framework of objectives and policies strikes an appropriate balance.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Add a new Policy to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services is opposed. Due to Wellington's topography this would affect large areas and has not been adequately socialized.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Adding a new policy to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services is opposed. Due to Wellington's topography this would affect large areas and has not been adequately socialized.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.324	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that there should be a new Rule to make heavy industry a Non-Complying activity which is consistent with other zone provisions and appropriate given the level of adverse effects which could be generated by heavy industrial activities. Consequential amendments to rule numbering will be required.	Add a new Rule to the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as follows: <u>Industrial Activities</u> <u>1. Activity status: Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The activity is not a heavy industrial activity.</u> <u>2. Activity Status: Non-complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with the requirements of MRZ-RX.1 cannot be achieved</u> <u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-RX.2.a must be publicly notified.</u>
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new policy providing for popup open spaces for houses that are shaded by new development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stephen Minto	FS100.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submtter 394 proposes the encouragement of ‘Pop-up public realm’'s for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. ‘Closing time drink up ya tea’. That just doesn’t match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It’s simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it’s just bad luck.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 394.14]</p>	Disallow
David Cadman	398.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new policy providing for popup open spaces for houses that are shaded by new development.
Stephen Minto	FS100.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submtter 398 proposes the encouragement of ‘Pop-up public realm’'s for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. ‘Closing time drink up ya tea’. That just doesn’t match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It’s simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it’s just bad luck.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 398.13]</p>	Disallow
Ministry of Education	400.93	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the MRZ objectives do not sufficiently provide for additional infrastructure/ educational facilities. Therefore, the submitter supports the inclusion of a new objective as sought.	<p>Add new objective to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as follows:</p> <p><u>MRZ-OX</u></p> <p>Non-Residential activities</p> <p><u>Non-residential activities are in keeping with the amenity of the Medium Density Residential zone and provide for the community’s social, economic, and cultural wellbeing.</u></p>
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Support	Considers that a blanket statement on non-residential activities opens up to any non-residential activity which the submitter would like disallowed. The submitter however supports non-residential educational activities.	Amend / Seeks that only non-residential educational activities are allowed but not any non-residential activities.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.
Stephen Minto	FS100.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 472 proposes the encouragement of 'Pop-up public realm's for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. 'Closing time drink up ya tea'. That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck.</p>	Disallow
Joanna Newman	85.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PRECO1	Amend	<p>Considers that there should be a presumption of non-demolition for pre-1930s buildings, for the following reasons:</p> <p>Heritage values need to be given stronger weighting in deciding whether a building may be demolished. Using a criteria of "The level of visibility of the existing building from surrounding public spaces" does not take into account that in many places the original houses are set back from the street and only partly or barely visible from the street. This is, however, one of the unique characteristics of Mt Victoria's historic building patterns that needs to be preserved.</p> <p>The criteria that "the building is consistent in form and style with other pre-1930 buildings that contribute positively to the character of the area", risks ignoring the value of original buildings that are not consistent in form and style, whereas the mix of worker's cottages, single-storey villas and larger two-storey villas, often side by side, is one of the unique characteristics of the pattern of housing in Mt Victoria.</p> <p>No. 3 under this provision is only acceptable if the Council also takes action to prevent 'demolition by neglect', a strategy many property owners are known to resort to.</p> <p>If the extent of character 'overly' in Mt Victoria is to be reduced to only 30% from the area covered by the current pre-1930s demolition rule, more needs to be done to protect what remains.</p> <p>Considers that buildings can be restored to close to their original frontage (at least) by interested new owners.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-PRECO1.P2 (Restrictions on demolition) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. It can be demonstrated that the contribution of the building to the character of the area is low, with reference to:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>f. whether the building is an original dwelling on the site and an important element in the wider heritage context of the area.</u></p> <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Gael Webster	114.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ- PREC01	Amend	<p>Supports the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review.</p> <p>Considers that the character areas in Mount Victoria should be considerably larger based on evidence from expert Council officers, Boffa Miskell consultants, and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga assessment.</p> <p>Decisions about 'Character Precincts' in Mount Victoria were based on allowing more housing and ignored heritage values and character, and the well-being of residents to receive sufficient light and sunshine.</p> <p>Acritical mass is required to preserve character and the PDP creates small, disconnected blocks.</p> <p>Mount Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the extent of the area covered by the Character Precincts in Mount Victoria to increase it to encompass Boffa Miskell's Primary/Contributory Character area (Boffa Miskell, Pre-1930 Character Area Review).
Alexander Hockley	153.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ- PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that the extent of the character precincts should be increased because of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased development could be located in other parts of the city such as Kent and Cambridge terraces. - New development would block sunlight. - The visibility and coherence of the inner city suburbs are an important part of Wellington's identity, and often appear in promotional material. - That the reduction in the extent of character precincts from the Operative District Plan will irrevocably and adversely affect the liveability of the inner city suburbs, sense of place, as well as loss of historic heritage. - There is the ability to adjust the character settings significantly while still meeting housing capacity requirements. - Wellington's character suburbs are finite in the sense that dwellings made from native timber, built in a particular style and workmanship of the age, cannot be fully recreated. - Character is derived from critical mass and this is not provided for in the plan as it has small disconnected blocks where remaining sense character can be easily compromised destroyed by high-density development around it. - The extent of the character precincts is not consistent with public sentiment as evidenced by recommendations made by Council officers on the Spatial Plan and a survey commissioned by the Submitter. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the extent of the character precincts are amended based on three options:</p> <p>Option 1. Extended to those areas recommended by council officers in the spatial plan decision in June 2021 (Least preferred).</p> <p>Option 2. Include Heritage New Zealand recommendations in addition to option 1.</p> <p>Option 3. Include buildings that were identified in the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review, 23.1.2019 as Primary/Contributory recommendations, in addition to Options 1 and 2 (Most preferred).</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	154.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the introductory paragraphs for Character Precincts should recognise the important role of dwelling age in determining character.	Amend the Introduction to the Character Precincts (MRZ-PREC01) as follows: The purpose of the Character Precincts is to provide for the management of effects on character values within specifically identified residential areas of the City. ... The Character Precincts do not seek to protect historic heritage values. While some areas may also be identified as heritage areas in the District Plan, the majority of the Character Precincts seek to identify existing concentrations of consistent character and prevent its further erosion. This character is a product of the <u>age of buildings, building materials, architectural styles, size and shape</u> architectural values of the dwellings in these areas, patterns of subdivision and the resultant streetscape. The Character Precincts have been identified and mapped based on the consistency and coherence of character of the houses in these areas. ...
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Support	Extend character precincts in the mapping. Improve the definition of character. Avoid erosion of character, especially in Thorndon; the city's (& NZ's) oldest suburb lost much when the urban motorway was carved through it. What remains is of significant cultural and other values. Significant and superior residential character on the eastern side of the suburb, though small in area, should be zoned as Character Precincts because they contribute significantly to the appeal, character and liveability of Thorndon. What remains is of significant cultural and other values. Significant and superior residential character on the eastern side of the suburb, though small in area, should be zoned as Character Precincts because they contribute significantly to the appeal, character and liveability of Thorndon. Inadequate infrastructure, and resilience to natural disasters are additional factors to account for. The natural vulnerabilities should restrain intensification within Thorndon. Thorndon is already a relatively intensely subdivided suburb (compared, say, to equivalent inner suburbs in Auckland).	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	154.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that the extent of the character precincts should be increased because of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The visibility and coherence of the inner city suburbs are an important part of Wellington's identity, and often appear in promotional material. - That the reduction in the extent of character precincts from the Operative District Plan will irrevocably and adversely affect the liveability of the inner city suburbs, sense of place, as well as loss of historic heritage. - There is the ability to adjust the character settings significantly while still meeting housing capacity requirements. - Wellington's character suburbs are finite in the sense that dwellings made from native timber, built in a particular style and workmanship of the age, cannot be fully recreated. - Character is derived from critical mass and this is not provided for in the plan as it has small disconnected blocks where remaining sense character can be easily compromised destroyed by high-density development around it. - The extent of the character precincts is not consistent with public sentiment as evidenced by recommendations made by Council officers on the Spatial Plan and a survey commissioned by the Submitter. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the extent of the character precincts are amended based on three options:</p> <p>Option 1. Extended to those areas recommended by council officers in the spatial plan decision in June 2021 (Least preferred).</p> <p>Option 2. Include Heritage New Zealand recommendations in addition to option 1.</p> <p>Option 3. Include buildings that were identified in the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review, 23.1.2019 as Primary/Contributory recommendations, in addition to Options 1 and 2 (Most preferred).</p>
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Support	<p>The LIVE Wellington submission provides the rationale to extend residential character precincts and provides an extensive explanatory narrative.</p> <p>The preferred LIVE WELLington option submitted is:</p> <p>Option 3. Include buildings that were identified in the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review, 23.1.2019 as Primary/Contributory recommendations, in addition to Options 1 and 2 (Most preferred).</p>	Allow
Zaffa Christian	174.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Supports other individual proposals to protect the heritage, character, and streetscape of the houses in Newtown.	Not specified.
Jon Gaupset	175.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Supports other individual proposals to protect the heritage, character, and streetscape of the houses in Newtown.	Not specified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.30	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Support	Considers that the affordability and wellbeing benefits from densification and development are on balance more important than preserving large swathes of pre-1930's housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character precincts) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that there should be a presumption of non-demolition for pre-1930s buildings, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heritage values need to be given stronger weighting in deciding whether a building may be demolished. Using a criteria of "The level of visibility of the existing building from surrounding public spaces" does not take into account that in many places the original houses are set back from the street and only partly or barely visible from the street. This is, however, one of the unique characteristics of Mt Victoria's historic building patterns that needs to be preserved. - The criteria that "the building is consistent in form and style with other pre-1930 buildings that contribute positively to the character of the area", risks ignoring the value of original buildings that are not consistent in form and style, whereas the mix of worker's cottages, single-storey villas and larger two-storey villas, often side by side, is one of the unique characteristics of the pattern of housing in Mt Victoria. - No. 3 under this provision is only acceptable if the Council also takes action to prevent 'demolition by neglect', a strategy many property owners are known to resort to. - If the extent of character 'overly' in Mt Victoria is to be reduced to only 30% from the area covered by the current pre-1930s demolition rule, more needs to be done to protect what remains. <p>Considers that buildings can be restored to close to their original frontage (at least) by interested new owners.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-PREC01.P2 (Restrictions on demolition) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. It can be demonstrated that the contribution of the building to the character of the area is low, with reference to:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>f. whether the building is an original dwelling on the site and an important element in the wider heritage context of the area.</u></p> <p>...</p>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.70	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Anna Jackson	222.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports the retention of special character zones and the protections in place for historic housing that once lost can never be restored.	<p>Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Mike Camden	226.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) with amendment.
Cherie Jacobson	251.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that the historic heritage values of the character areas were frequently raised in submissions on the draft plan and this has been inadequately addressed.</p> <p>Much of the character areas are likely to meet the threshold for scheduling as historic heritage for their historical and physical significance.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan should apply the Greater Wellington Regional Council 'Guide to historic heritage identification' to assess the value of areas of character.
Cherie Jacobson	251.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Support	Supports the currently listed Character Precincts.	Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Supports an extension of character precincts to include all the houses in the Officers Recommended Plan from June 19, 2021.</p> <p>The site-by-site analysis found that some 300 houses contributed sufficiently to the character and streetscape of Newtown. These houses also passed the test established by the officers as Qualifying Matters for exemption from the NPS-UD and MDRS.</p> <p>Considers that these houses therefore should be exempt from intensification, and be covered by Character Precinct rules, in particular the pre-1930 demolition rule.</p> <p>Almost all of the houses identified by the ORP are deemed to be primary or contributory by Boffa Miskell. In addition, these houses all demonstrate assemblages of consistent character streetscape.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend Character Precincts to match that of the Officer Recommended Spatial Plan which include the following sites:</p> <p>Balmoral Terrace - 3, 5, 7, 9, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10.</p> <p>Blucher Avenue - 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10.</p> <p>Coromandel Street - 1, 1A, 5, 7, 9, 11, 11, 13, 15, 17, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 127, 135, 137, 139, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 22, 90, 92, 96, 100, 102, 104, 106.</p> <p>Daniell Street - 147, 149, 157, 159, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, 92, 94, 124, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134, 136, 162.</p> <p>Harper St 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20.</p> <p>Lawrence St 7, 9, 11, 11A, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24.</p> <p>Owen St 1, 5, 7A, 9/11A. 15, 77, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 121A, 121C, 123, 125, 127, 127A, 129, 131, 133, 135, 137, 139, 141, 143, 154, 20, 22, 24B, 26, 28, 30, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 46, 48, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 70, 74, 76, 78, 88, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 102, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 156, 158, 160, 162, 164.</p> <p>Stoke St 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 33, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 31, 33, 35, 37.</p>
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	<p>Considers that these properties not included in the Officers Recommended Plan are classified as Character Precincts.</p> <p>The sites identified have streetscape appeal and are intact pre-1900 houses in many cases. 50% of the sites identified have a primary categorisation within the Boffa Miskell analysis.</p> <p>Donald Maclean and Normanby streets are over 75% primary or contributory.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Amend the extent of the Character Precincts to include the following sites:</p> <p>Emmett St 6, 8, 10A, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20.</p> <p>Green St 1, 5, 7, 7A, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 2, 2A, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20.</p> <p>Donald Maclean St 16, 24, 28, 30, 36, 38, 17, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37.</p> <p>Normanby St 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 30, 32, 34, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41.</p>
Waka Kotahi	370.265	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Not specified	<p>[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision]</p> <p>Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.</p>	<p>Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.</p>
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.48	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Support	<p>Supports the MRZ-PREC01 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.</p> <p>The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.</p>	<p>Retain MRZ-PREC01 (Character Precincts) as notified.</p>
VicLabour	414.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that character precincts restrict space for development and are a hindrance for the proposed mass rapid transit route.</p> <p>Considers that many owners will choose not to sell their homes to be developed given how valuable many are in their current state. Those that are less appealing will be more likely to be sold for development which is considered a good outcome.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Seeks that character precincts be removed from the plan. [Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Josephine Smith	419.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to recognise that character is in part derived from heritage in pre 1930's character areas.
Josephine Smith	419.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Support	Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Considers that the demolition controls in pre-1930s areas (as defined in the Operative District Plan) should be retained, while identifying areas of particular character within these (for example as identified in the revised draft Spatial Plan) to enable a more granular level of control over demolition. [See original submission for full reasons]	Supports the controls on the demolition of pre-1930s dwellings in the Character Precincts.
Josephine Smith	419.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Support	Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Considers that the demolition controls in pre-1930s areas (as defined in the Operative District Plan) should be retained, while identifying areas of particular character within these (for example as identified in the revised draft Spatial Plan) to enable a more granular level of control over demolition. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the character precincts are extended to encompass the areas in Appendix 1 of the Operative District Plan.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the proposed district plan is amended to recognise that character is in part derived from heritage in pre 1930's character areas.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Wellingtons liveability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks the addition of the pre-1930's demolition controls from the operative district plan.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that Wellingtons liveability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks the addition of a mechanism to identify areas of particular character within the pre-1930's character areas to enable a more granular level of control over demolition.
Catharine Underwood	481.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers the decision of councillors to not increase the size of character areas from the draft spatial plan was incorrect.	Seeks that the operative district plan character areas be reinstated.
Tim Bright	75.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Support	Supports the Mount Victoria North Precinct.	Retain the Mount Victoria North Precinct as notified.
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC02 as notified.	Retain MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Amend	Considers that this has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	Seeks amendment to MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Vic North) for the removal of any rules permitting building along boundary lines.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Avryl Bramley	202.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Amend	Considers that this has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	Seeks amendment to MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Vic North) for the reinstatement of side yards.
Avryl Bramley	202.35	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Amend	Considers that these are already densely built areas of considerable charm and amenity and intensification will increase the disaster risk in the central area.	Amend MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Vic North) to remove any provisions that allow demolition of pre 1930's buildings, with an exception for safety that is subject to demolition rules and protocols.
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Support	Supports the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct.	Retain MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) as notified.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.71	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that where there's conflict between MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) and MRZPREC-01 (Character Precincts), provisions in MRZ-PREC01 take priority.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.72	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC02	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.266	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.49	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC02 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) as notified.
Jonathan Markwick	490.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Oppose	Considers that MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) should be removed to allow for six storey high density residential buildings where SCHED 3 - Heritage Areas do not apply (such as McFarlane Street). Restrictive rules protecting Character Precincts should not be a priority and is morally wrong when we are experiencing a massive shortage of housing and a housing crisis.	Delete MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct).
Ruapapa Limited	225.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03	Support	Considers that the height controls are long standing and reflect detailed cost/benefit and legal investigation.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay) as notified.
Victoria Stace	235.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the Oriental Bay Height Precinct.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Martin	244.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the Oriental Bay Height Precinct, as they have been in place for a long time and are appreciated by Wellingtonians.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.267	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03	Support in part	Policy MRZ-PREC03 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Policy MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) and seeks amendment.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.50	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.
Oranga Tamariki	83.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Support	Oranga Tamariki support this objective. Oranga Tamariki homes are encompassed by the residential activities definition. If the nesting recommendation for supported residential care is accepted, this objective will be further strengthened.	Retain MRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Leeanne Templer	206.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that MRZ-O1 does not respond to Rama Crescents planned urban built character, as the MRZ is not in line with the mainly 2 storey, protected views and diplomatic residential neighbourhood. Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification. There is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views. There needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough. Ambassadorial residencies on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.	Seeks that Rama Crescent and streets above Rama Crescent are exempt from the building height increases and intensification in the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.48	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.180	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Support	Supports MRZ-O1 (noting it reflects that required under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(1) of the RMA) in that it recognises a range of residential activities and housing types.	Retain Objective MRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Khoi Phan	326.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend Objective MRZ-O1 to allow up to 6-storey buildings.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.106	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however the objectives of the MDRS need to be incorporated as drafted under the Enabling Housing Act. Considers that a consequential amendment will be needed to specify the purpose of the MRZ is to provide for predominately residential activities.	Retain MRZ-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.107	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however the objectives of the MDRS need to be incorporated as drafted under the Enabling Housing Act. Considers that a consequential amendment will be needed to specify the purpose of the MRZ is to provide for predominately residential activities.	Amend MRZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <p>Purpose Residential density</p> </div> The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: ...
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.109	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.319	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Support	Increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.	Retain MRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.325	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Support in part	Objective MRZ-O1 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective MRZ-O1 (Purpose) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.326	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that Objective MRZ-O1 should be amended to provide for additional height and density in areas in the MRZ with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services. (Option A)	Amend Objective MRZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: 1. Housing needs and demand; and 2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3 storey buildings <u>and additional height and density in areas of high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.32	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZO1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Oppose	The submission to introduce additional height limits to the MRZ is opposed. While these may be appropriate in some circumstances, it is more appropriate to require notification for additional height in these residential areas.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Oppose	The submission to introduce additional height limits to the MRZ is opposed. While these may be appropriate in some circumstances, it is more appropriate to require notification for additional height in these residential areas.	Disallow
Metlifecare Limited	413.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 requires that the Proposed Plan include certain objectives, including the following objective: a relevant residential zone provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to— (i) housing needs and demand; and (ii) the neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings. MRZ-O1 does not accurately reflect the wording required in the Amendment Act.	Amend MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) to reflect Objective 2 as in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Metlifecare Limited	413.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Oppose in part	Considers the objective does not align with the required objectives in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Metlifecare Limited	413.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O1	Amend	Considers the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 requires that the Proposed Plan include the following objective: "a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future".	Amend MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) to reflect Objective 2 as in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
Leeanne Templer	206.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Amend	Considers that MRZ does not contribute positively to a changing and well-functioning urban environment in Rama Crescent, as per MRZ-O2. Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification. There is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views. There needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough. Ambassadorial residencies on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.	Seeks that Rama Crescent and streets above Rama Crescent are exempt from the building height increases and intensification in the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Amend	Considers that Wellington City is at risk from multiple natural hazards, and it is important that intensification developments do not increase the public's exposure to natural hazard risks. Considers that any development should adequately account for natural hazard risk at the site, to not significantly increase exposure through poor land use decisions.	Amend MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as follows: Land within the Medium Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: <u>1. Increases housing supply and choice; and</u> <u>2. Contributes positively to a changing and well-functioning urban environment; and</u> <u>3. Does not increase exposure to natural hazard risk, and is not located within a high ranked hazard area.</u>
Pukepūke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-O2	Support	Considers that the submitter raises an important issue. This is relevant to and supports the further submitter's submission points around the vulnerability of some sites in Hay Street and the 'Hay Street Extension' to earthquakes and slippage. The further submitter notes in this context and support the comments of the ICNZ on 23 November 2022 that councils should do more to stop development in high hazard zones.	Allow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.49	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.181	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Support in part	Considers that within the Medium Density Residential Zone existing qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. Considers while the policy directive is supported, the submitter supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development.	Retain Objective MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land), subject to amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.182	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Amend	Considers that within the Medium Density Residential Zone existing qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. Considers while the policy directive is supported, the submitter supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development.	Amend Objective MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as follows: MRZ-O2 Efficient use of land Land within the Medium Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; and 2. Contributes positively to a changing and well-functioning urban environment; <u>while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as specified by the relevant qualifying matter area provisions.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which seeks to introduce 'avoid' into an objective that seeks to enable urban development.	Disallow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.108	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-O2 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Retain MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) and seeks amendment as follows: Land within the Medium Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; and 2. Contributes positively to a changing and well-functioning urban environment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.110	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.320	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Support	Increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.	Retain MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.327	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Support	Objective MRZ-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.168	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Supports the objective as it promotes safe and accessible living environments.	Retain MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible, and attractive environments) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.50	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.183	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Supports MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) in that it recognises safe living environments. Considers the management of activities within proximity of the National Grid gives effect to the objective in providing safe environments.	Retain Objective MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.109	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. In addition, notes that MRZ-O3 makes reference to 'accessible living environments'. Opposes regulation of internal environments as retirement village operators are best placed to understand the accessibility requirements of their residents and access is addressed by the Building Act.	Seeks to amend MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) to delete reference to "accessible living environments".

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.111	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.321	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Increased density needs to be done well: this objective gives an important signal to ensure that this is achieved.	Retain MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.328	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Objective MRZ-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.46	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-O1	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts - Purpose) as notified.	Seeks that character housing is not protected or prioritised over new non-character residential dwellings.
LIVE WELLington	154.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-O1	Support	Considers that given the finite nature of the character precincts (they are a product of materials and architectural style that cannot be fully and successfully imitated) it is important to manage them to minimise their erosion and to work to maintain or enhance them.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Purpose) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.35	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02	Support	WCC Summary reads: Considers that given the finite nature of the character precincts (they are a product of materials and architectural style that cannot be fully and successfully imitated) it is important to manage them to minimise their erosion and to work to maintain or enhance them.	Allow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-O1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.268	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-O1	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Purpose) retained subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.322	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-O1	Support	Considers that the character of parts of Wellington's suburbs that is an integral part of the city's identity is important to preserve, whilst enabling changes and adaptations in land use over time. This objective to prevent erosion of this character is necessary	Retain MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Purpose (Character)) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.329	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-O1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-O1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete Objective MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-O1	Oppose	The submission to delete character precincts is strongly opposed. Character precincts are a justifiable means of protecting unique Wellington areas of Victorian and Edwardian native timber housing, that is of a cohesive style and form. Many of these areas are iconic to Wellington.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-O1	Oppose	The submission to delete character precincts is strongly opposed. Character precincts are a justifiable means of protecting unique Wellington areas of Victorian and Edwardian native timber housing, that is of a cohesive style and form. Many of these areas are iconic to Wellington.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.51	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-01	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-01 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Avryl Bramley	202.36	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to MRZ-PREC02-01.4 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) to narrow discretion and clarify meaning.
Waka Kotahi	370.269	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-01	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Seeks that MRZ-PREC02-01 (Purpose) retained subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.330	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-01	Oppose	MRZ-PREC02-01 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete Objective MRZ-PREC02-01 (Purpose) as notified.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.26	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC02-01	Oppose	Character precincts are a justifiable means of protecting unique Wellington areas of Victorian and Edwardian native timber housing, that is of a cohesive style and form. Many of these areas are iconic to Wellington.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC01-01	Oppose	Character precincts are a justifiable means of protecting unique Wellington areas of Victorian and Edwardian native timber housing, that is of a cohesive style and form. Many of these areas are iconic to Wellington.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.52	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-01	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC02-01 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-01	Amend	Considers that MRZ-PREC02-01 may need to be amended if MRZ-PREC02-P1 (Maintenance of townscape values) is amended to include the requirement that "Applicants must demonstrate that the provisions of this Design Guide have been acknowledged and interpreted and their objectives satisfied" (as suggested by this submission)..	Amend MRZ-PREC02-01 (Purpose) by adding an objective statement concerning the "protecting against further erosion of what is sought to be protected".
Waka Kotahi	370.270	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-01	Not specified	Submitter takes a neutral position on MRZ-PREC03-P1. Notes that relief sought to MRZ-PREC03 applies to this policy.	Not specified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.331	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-01	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-01 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete Objective MRZ-PREC03-01 (Purpose) as notified.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.27	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC03-01	Oppose	Character precincts are a justifiable means of protecting unique Wellington areas of Victorian and Edwardian native timber housing, that is of a cohesive style and form. Many of these areas are iconic to Wellington.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	FS117.26	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-O1	Oppose	Character precincts are a justifiable means of protecting unique Wellington areas of Victorian and Edwardian native timber housing, that is of a cohesive style and form. Many of these areas are iconic to Wellington.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.53	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-O1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-O1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Oranga Tamariki	83.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support	Oranga Tamariki support this policy, in particular the specific inclusion of supported residential care activities in (4). Supported residential care homes are considered to encompass Oranga Tamariki homes.	Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Scots College Incorporated	117.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support in part	Considers that educational activities on the Scots College, Samuel Marsden College, Queen Margaret College and St Marks Church School campuses should be provided with permitted activity status to reflect their essential role in meeting the educational needs of residents of the City and so that they are treated by the District Plan similarly to public schools. The "Educational Precincts" in the Operative District Plan should be retained in the PDP. The PDP fails to "roll over" more permissive ODP provisions for educational activities on the Scots College Campus. This will expose the College to risks and constraints. It is the College's experience that the requirement for the College to have to apply for resource consent for new educational buildings that comply with the building standards of the ODP has not added any value or benefit to either the College or to residential neighbours.	Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: ... <u>7. Educational activities on school campuses identified in the District Plan Maps.</u>
Avryl Bramley	202.37	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	Considers that these provisions allow the creeping commercialisation of these suburbs. There is no limit as to the number of these businesses that may be established in a suburb and a single business could begin to operate over a number of adjacent sites.	Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: ... 2. Visitor Accommodation 4. Supported Residential 5. Childcare Services ...
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Oppose in part	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain MRZ-P1.4 (Enabled activities) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.169	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support in part	Considers emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community. As such, FENZ seeks an amendment to MRZ-P1 to enable the establishment of emergency service facilities in the Medium Density Residential zone.	Supports MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.170	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	Considers emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community. As such, FENZ seeks an amendment to MRZ-P1 to enable the establishment of emergency service facilities in the Medium Density Residential zone.	Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including: 1. Home Business; 2. Boarding Houses; 3. Visitor Accommodation; 4. Supported Residential Care; 5. Childcare Services; and 6. Community Gardens. <u>7. Emergency service facilities</u>
Phillippa O'Connor	289.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support in part	Considers the scope of activities enabled in the Medium Density Residential zone are limited and do not align with current rule MRZ-R10 or proposed new rule MRZ-P11.	Retain Policy MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	Considers the scope of activities enabled in the Medium Density Residential zone are limited and do not align with current rule MRZ-R10 or proposed new rule MRZ-P11.	Amend Policy MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including: 1. Home Business; 2. Boarding Houses; 3. Visitor Accommodation; 4. Supported Residential Care; 5. Childcare Services; and 6. Community Gardens.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.51	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Khoi Phan	326.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including: 1. Home Business; 2. Boarding Houses; 3. Visitor Accommodation; 4. Supported Residential Care; 5. Childcare Services; and 6. Community Gardens; <u>and</u> <u>7. Commercial Activities</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.110	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Oppose	<p>Considers that the policy appears to identify / support the permitted activities of the MDR Zone - being some residential activities (e.g. boarding houses, visitor accommodation and supported residential care), and some non-residential activities (e.g. home businesses, childcare services and community gardens). Considers that retirement villages are residential activities that should be permitted in the residential zones. Rather than listing retirement villages in this policy, considers that an enabling retirement village-specific policy (MRZ-P6) is more appropriate.</p> <p>Considers that while the policy is seeking to 'enable' the permitted activities in the zone, the phrasing of the policy qualifies this enabling provision by reference to a scale and intensity that is 'consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone'. Considers this part of MRZ-P1 conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act for the MRZ.</p> <p>Considers that MRZ-P1 appears to summarise provisions provided elsewhere in the chapter, but in a confusing manner that does not provide any additional guidance for consent applicants or other users of the District Plan.</p>	Delete MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) in its entirety as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.112	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.332	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support in part	MRZ-P1 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.333	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	Considers that NOISE-P3 should be clarified to better recognise the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect.	<p>Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values values anticipated <u>and planned built form of</u> for the Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Home Business; 2. Boarding Houses; 3. Visitor Accommodation; 4. Supported Residential Care; 5. Childcare Services; and 6. Community Gardens.
Metlifecare Limited	413.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Oppose	<p>The policy is being introduced as part of the P1 Sch1 process but is inconsistent with the mandatory policies in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 which seek to enable a variety of housing typologies regardless of their use.</p> <p>It should therefore be limited to "other activities".</p>	Seeks to remove this policy.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Metlifecare Limited	413.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Oppose	The policy is being introduced as part of the P1 Sch1 process but is inconsistent with the mandatory policies in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 which seek to enable a variety of housing typologies regardless of their use. It should therefore be limited to "other activities".	Seeks to amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including: 1. Home Business; 2. Boarding Houses; 3. Visitor Accommodation; 4. Supported Residential Care; 5. Childcare Services; and 6. Community Gardens.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.52	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports the inclusion of a policy enabling a variety of housing typologies within the zone.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports policy MRZ-P2. Notes that Disabled people currently lack housing choices due to the traditional design of housing not enabling accessibility. Concepts, such as Universal Design, need to be incorporated into the design of all new builds and this can be done with a wide range of housing designs. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.111	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports MRZ-P2 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.113	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.334	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support in part	MRZ-P2 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.335	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P2 should be amended to provide for additional height and density in areas in the MRZ with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services. (Option A)	Amend MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as follows: Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments <u>up to 5 storeys in areas of in areas of high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.</u>
Metlifecare Limited	413.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports this policy on the basis it is required by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.53	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.

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

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.116	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.339	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Support	MRZ-P5 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.
Metlifecare Limited	413.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Support	Supports this policy on the basis it is required by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.36	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Amend	Considers that Council's scope is too broad under this policy as it would allow Council to change any aspect of a proposal.	Amend MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) to: Provide for developments not meeting permitted activity status, while encouraging high-quality <u>developments buildings</u> .
Stratum Management Limited	249.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	<p>Considers that policy MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) seeks to provide for multi-unit housing where the development can demonstrate four factors. The first matter relates to 'fulfilling' the intent of the residential design guide. The residential design guide, as notified, contains 137 individual guidelines. It is unclear how, or what point, any given multi-unit development can fulfil the intent of the design guide given that a design guide assessment is inherently a subjective assessment. Is the intent of the design guide fulfilled when a proposal is considered to achieve more than 50% of the applicable design guides for example? The approach to this matter is also inconsistent with the approach adopted by the City Centre zone. In that zone, the reference to the design guide is made within the matters for discretion of, for example, Rule CCZ-R20. It also omits reference to 'fulfilling the intent of' the design guide. This approach is preferred. The second matter requires the provision of a minimum area of private or shared open space. In the context of this policy, a multi-unit development that does not meet the minimum area standard should not be provided for.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that non-compliance with the standard can be considered through a resource consent process. Matter 3 requires the provision for on site management of waste storage and collection. This matter is also considered through the design guide. Stratum invites further consideration of the appropriate means to achieve this and suggests that there may be duplication across the policy and design guide.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:</p> <p>Delete matters (1);</p> <p>Delete the words 'a minimum area of' from matter (2);</p> <p>Consider whether the policy needs to address matters relating to waste storage and collection.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.171	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for multi-unit housing and retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development can be adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure, or can address any constraints on the site.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support in part	Considers that Reference to the Design Guide as a matter of discretion (by virtue of referring to Policy MRZ-P6 in the matters of discretion for activities requiring consent under MRZ-R14) is challenged and deletion sought accordingly. Given the prescriptive, yet subjective, nature of the assessment, elevating this Guide to a statutory requirement for compliance or assessment is not considered appropriate or commensurate in respect of a restricted discretionary activity assessment.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Phillippa O'Connor	289.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that Reference to the Design Guide as a matter of discretion (by virtue of referring to Policy MRZ-P6 in the matters of discretion for activities requiring consent under MRZ-R14) is challenged and deletion sought accordingly. Given the prescriptive, yet subjective, nature of the assessment, elevating this Guide to a statutory requirement for compliance or assessment is not considered appropriate or commensurate in respect of a restricted discretionary activity assessment.	Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 1. 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 2. 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 3. 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.56	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports the inclusion of a policy providing for multi-unit housing in the Medium Density Residential Zone, and the reference to the Residential Design Guide (as this supports papakāinga).	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.39	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P6 should be amended, as multi-unit housing and other non-residential activities and building cannot require car parking as set out in the NPS-UD. Developments should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking to align with infrastructure and transport objectives in the PDP.	Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. <u>5. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for cycle and micromobility parking and charging;</u> <u>6. Adequate cycle facilities are accessible, secure, and covered (protected from weather)</u>
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports policy MRZ-P6. Notes that disabled people need to be accommodated in all types of housing, including in multiunit housing which will only grow in number as housing intensification increases. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	<p>Considers that as it stands, the PDP will enable the construction and use of three dwellings on properties that share a common boundary with the Z on Constable Street, with a maximum height of 11m and more permissive building recession planes, as a permitted activity. In addition, resource consents may be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity to construct buildings on these properties up to 25m in height with no limit to the number of residential units (i.e.: density). These greater residential densities and more permissive building standards are likely to generate greater potential for reverse sensitivity effects that may affect the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of Z facilities which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.</p> <p>Several of Z Energy's service stations either directly adjoin or are located in close proximity. The proposed changes to the residential zone provisions and consequential increase in development potential on these surrounding sites have the potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects including nuisance effects (e.g. noise, lighting and odour displacement) and amenity effects. For instance, an occupier on a third storey apartment building is more likely to perceive noise and visual effects compared to an occupier of single storey dwelling which is less elevated and, more than likely, screened by a fence and landscaping. [Refer to original submission, including table of Z sites]</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. <u>5. Manages reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.155	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / MRZP6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought relating to recognition of reverse sensitivity in matters of discretion due to potential impacts on residential intensification.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.271	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support in part	Policy MRZ-P6 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Policy MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.272	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that multi-unit housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	<p>Amend Policy MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <p>...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; <u>and</u> <u>5. Where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), buildings for noise sensitive activities are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects to occupants.</u> <u>6. For higher density developments, options to incorporate mixed-uses such as commercial activities have been explored.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.117	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support in part	MRZ-P6 is partially supported, but amendments are required for proposed residential developments that adjoin or are in close proximity to lawfully established non-residential activities where reverse sensitivity effects might occur.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.

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

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.253	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.253	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.74	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports MRZ-P6 as enabling the collection of all kinds of waste, this will be beneficial in reducing waste pollution and enable more sustainable living.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.172	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for multi-unit housing and retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development can be adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure, or can address any constraints on the site.	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as notified.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.57	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement Villages) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.116	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Oppose in part	<p>Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific policy in the Proposed Plan; however, considers that some of the clauses of this policy are inappropriate for the reasons set out in this submission, including that they conflict with the MDRS. References Clause 1 of MRZ-P7 seeks to 'fulfil the intent of the Residential Design Guide' - The Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs).</p> <p>Considers that the 'intent' of the Residential Design Guide is not identified within the Proposed Plan, or the Design Guide itself, and as such no guidance is provided as to how to measure a development against this intent. Considers high quality developments can be encouraged through other mechanisms. It is noted that an additional clause (Clause 5 –consistency of intensity, scale and design with zone amenity values) is applicable to the retirement village policy (MRZ-P7) to those applicable to multi-unit housing (MRZ-P6).</p> <p>Considers that recognising that retirement villages and multiunit housing developments are assessed against the same provisions in many places throughout the Proposed Plan, and that they can be and frequently are constructed at similar scales, it is unclear why retirement villages are subject to additional provisions. The RVA considers this clause is inconsistent with the MDRS and should be deleted.</p> <p>Considers that MRZ-P7 does not appropriately provide for / recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents.</p>	Opposes MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.117	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Amend	<p>Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific policy in the Proposed Plan; however, considers that some of the clauses of this policy are inappropriate for the reasons set out in this submission, including that they conflict with the MDRS. References Clause 1 of MRZ-P7 seeks to 'fulfil the intent of the Residential Design Guide' - The Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs).</p> <p>Considers that the 'intent' of the Residential Design Guide is not identified within the Proposed Plan, or the Design Guide itself, and as such no guidance is provided as to how to measure a development against this intent. Considers high quality developments can be encouraged through other mechanisms. It is noted that an additional clause (Clause 5 –consistency of intensity, scale and design with zone amenity values) is applicable to the retirement village policy (MRZ-P7) to those applicable to multi-unit housing (MRZ-P6).</p> <p>Considers that recognising that retirement villages and multiunit housing developments are assessed against the same provisions in many places throughout the Proposed Plan, and that they can be and frequently are constructed at similar scales, it is unclear why retirement villages are subject to additional provisions. The RVA considers this clause is inconsistent with the MDRS and should be deleted.</p> <p>Considers that MRZ-P7 does not appropriately provide for / recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <p>1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide;</p> <p>2. Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village;</p> <p>3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development;</p> <p>4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site;</p> <p>and</p> <p>5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone.</p> <p><u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p><u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p><u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p>
Waka Kotahi	370.273	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support in part	Policy MRZ-P7 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Policy MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.274	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that multi-unit housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development including retirement villages. Considers that retirement villages should be suitably located to ensure that they are not car-centric developments. Consideration of location, access to services for residents with varying degrees of mobility should be included in any development proposal.	<p>Amend Policy MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <p>...</p> <p>5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone.; <u>and</u></p> <p><u>6. Is suitably located and designed to enable multi-modal connectivity; and</u></p> <p><u>7. Where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), buildings for noise sensitive activities are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects to occupants.</u></p>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.214	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose the submission point under (6) in principle, but due to the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages, The RVA considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Disallow submission point relating to MRZ-P7 (6), and allow relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-P7 in its primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.214	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose the submission point under (6) in principle, but due to the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages, Ryman considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Disallow submission point relating to MRZ-P7 (6), and allow relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-P7 in its primary submission.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.119	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as notified..
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that the collection of waste from retirement villages needs the waste storage areas to be accessed by rubbish trucks or conveniently walked to the kerb for pickup. Specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks needs to be ensured.	Seeks that specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks be ensured in MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.342	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support in part	MRZ-P7 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.343	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ-P7 should be amended to remove direct reference to the design guide, as design guides should be removed from the Plan and treated as a non-statutory tool outside of the District Plan. Amendments are therefore sought to articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner that is easy to follow.</p> <p>The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seek the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; <u>Achieves the following urban design outcomes:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u> <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u> Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village; Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; Is adequately able to be <u>adequately able to be</u> serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values <u>amenity values anticipated and planned built form</u> for the Zone. <p><u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within Council's Design Guidelines.</u></p>
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks that the improved design guides in the Proposed District Plan as notified are retained.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.134	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Oppose	The RVA supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however The RVA opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.134	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Oppose	Ryman supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however Ryman opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Metlifecare Limited	413.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support in part	Supports the provision of a specific policy for retirement villages.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.118	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Oppose in part	Considers it is not clear whether MRZ-P8 applies to retirement villages, given MRZ-P7 is a more specific policy. The RVA seeks that this policy does not apply to retirement villages.	Opposes MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.119	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Amend	Considers it is not clear whether MRZ-P8 applies to retirement villages, given MRZ-P7 is a more specific policy. The RVA seeks that this policy does not apply to retirement villages.	Amend MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) to clarify that it does not apply to retirement villages.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.120	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.324	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Amend	Notes that an effect of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill is that more development is enabled further away from the City, with the bulk of Wellington's residential areas now zoned 'medium density'. To help mitigate this, the submitter seeks that there also be a need to ensure multi-unit developments reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle when considered for consenting.	Amend MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) to add an additional point, as follows: "Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle"
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.344	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Support	MRZ-P8 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.
Trelissick Park Group	168.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P9 is too vague and should be amended to require at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Amend MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) to require neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.
Tyers Stream Group	221.72	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) so that the level of permeable surface should be proportionate to the extent of hard surface increase from the development.
Wellington City Council	266.132	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Oppose in part	Considers that given this is not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this policy in the THW chapter. Note: MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) and MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface) are to be relocated to THW – see new THW-P6 and THW-R7.	Delete MRZ-P9 (Permeable Surface) in its entirety. Consequential renumbering and amendments to updated policy references for MRZ-P10 to MRZ-P15 to reflect change in numbering.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.59	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.121	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.325	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Support	The policy will assist with reducing the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Retain MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.345	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Support in part	MRZ-P9 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.346	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P9 should be amended to relate to sufficient permeable surface provision rather than a minimum. There may be instances where stormwater runoff effects can be mitigated by a lower level of permeable surface area and the policy should recognise this.	Amend MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as follows: Require development to provide a <u>minimum level of sufficient permeable surface area</u> to assist with reducing the rate and amount of storm water run-off.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.88	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Oppose	Greater Wellington support the requirement for minimum permeable surface area and consider 'sufficient' to be too uncertain. We also note that multi-unit housing is excluded from HRZ-S10 and MRZ-S10 which the submitter supports. Amending the policy for all development is therefore not necessary.	Disallow / Seeks that the policy is retained as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.73	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that new 'landscaping' should be required, not just 'sought'.	Amend MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as follows: Encourage the retention of existing vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected, and where vegetation is proposed to be removed, seek <u>require</u> new landscaping of equal or better quality to help integrate new development into the surrounding environment and minimise hard surfacing.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.174	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support in part	Supports the policy as it takes account of vegetation removal as a measure for the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life. It is important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property	Support MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.175	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Amend	Supports the policy as it takes account of vegetation removal as a measure for the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life. It is important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property	Amend MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as follows: Encourage the retention of existing vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected, <u>except where it poses fire risk to the environment and the health and safety of people</u> , and where vegetation is proposed to be removed, seek new landscaping of equal or better quality to help integrate new development into the surrounding environment and minimise hard surfacing).
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.60	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.
Hilary Watson	321.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that Newtown's vegetation and trees, including in private backyards, should be preserved as they are essential connectors for birdlife between the city's flourishing green belts and Zealandia. The trees on private properties and in parks also act as the components of the natural sump system in times of flooding, and prevent surface water runoff. The established Doctor Margaret Stanley also proposed a 30-300 rule, which states everyone should be able to see three trees from their house, every neighbourhood should have a 30 percent tree canopy and everyone should live less than 300 meters away from a green space.	Amend MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as follows: <u>To</u> encourage the retention of existing vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected, and where vegetation is proposed to be removed, seek new landscaping of equal or better quality to help integrate new development into the surrounding environment and minimise hard surfacing.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.120	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Oppose in part	Considers that the requirement to provide "equal or better quality" vegetation where existing vegetation is removed is unlikely to be feasible alongside residential intensification.	Opposes MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) and seeks amendment to encourage new landscaping but delete reference to "equal or better quality".
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.122	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.326	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support	The policy will assist with reducing unnecessary loss of vegetation, with benefits to biodiversity, pleasantness and amenity, as well as helping reduce the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Retain MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.81	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support	Supports the use of policy which encourages the retention of existing vegetation (including native vegetation) that would otherwise be unprotected under the Proposed District Plan.	Retain MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.347	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Oppose	MRZ-P10 is opposed as it may have the effect of applying blanket protections to non-indigenous vegetation and therefore seeks the deletion of this policy.	Delete MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) in its entirety.
Metlifecare Limited	413.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Oppose	Supports the provision of high quality landscaping to enhance the built environment, however the proposed policy MRZ-P10 goes much further than this, and is likely to be counter to the requirement in the NPS-UD to enable intensification.	Seeks to delete MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping).
Metlifecare Limited	413.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Oppose	Supports the provision of high quality landscaping to enhance the built environment, however the proposed policy MRZ-P10 goes much further than this, and is likely to be counter to the requirement in the NPS-UD to enable intensification.	Seeks add amend MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) to add as follows: <u>Encourage the provision and maintenance of landscaping to enhance the built environment.</u>
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.61	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.121	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	Supports MRZ-P11 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.275	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	Policy MRZ-P11 is supported.	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.123	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.327	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	The policy will assist with improving liveability and attractiveness - designing for safety is highly important in built environments.	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.
Prime Property Group	256.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Oppose	Spenmoor area defined in the district plan restricts any multi residential development in this area by seeking further assessments with respect to traffic. Considers that the street is no worse than others in Newlands that do not have a specific policy focussed on traffic effects and roading capacity. Works are scheduled which negate the need for the policy and further assessment of traffic effects [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Delete provision MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area).
Waka Kotahi	370.276	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Support	Policy MRZ-P12 is supported.	Retain MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Prime Property Group	FS93.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZP12	Oppose	<p>Roading improvements in this area are planned by Prime Property Group.</p> <p>Prime Property Group considers that this road also does not significantly differ than the surrounding areas where no specific roading reports are required. It is also worth noting that Waka Kotahi are not requiring other similar streets to have their roading capacity identified before a subdivision/development can occur.</p>	Disallow
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.124	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area) as notified.
Rongotai Investments Ltd	FS93.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZP12	Oppose	Considers that there is no given reason to why the original submitters support the given provision. Roading improvements in this area are planned by Prime Property Group. This road also does not significantly differ than the surrounding areas where no specific roading reports are required.	Disallow / Remove the Spenmoor Street area provision
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.348	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Support in part	MRZ-P12 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area) with amendment.
Prime Property Group	FS93.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZP12	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports the Spenmoor Street Roading Provisions. Roading improvements in this area are planned by Prime Property Group. Prime Property Group considers that this road also does not significantly differ than the surrounding areas where no specific roading reports are required.	Disallow / Remove the Spenmoor Street area provision
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.349	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P12 should be amended to delete the reference to 'multi-unit housing' consistent with the rest of the submission.	<p>Amend MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area) as follows:</p> <p>Only allow multi-unit housing more than three residential units per site where it can be demonstrated that the local roading network has the capacity to accommodate any increase in traffic associated with the new development, and that the safety and efficiency of the roading network will be maintained.</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.134	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZP12	Oppose	Considers the signalled direction in the introduction would be more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow
Prime Property Group	FS93.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZP12	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports the Spenmoor Street Roading Provisions. Roading improvements in this area are planned by Prime Property Group. Prime Property Group considers that this road also does not significantly differ than the surrounding areas where no specific roading reports are required.	Disallow / Remove the Spenmoor Street area provision
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Support in part	Supports (in large) the inclusion of a provision which directs the development of their land, but would like it amended to be more enabling for the anticipated use of the land.	Retain MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga), but seeks amendment
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Amend	Supports (in large) the inclusion of a provision which directs the development of their land, but would like it amended to be more enabling for the anticipated use of the land.	<p>Amend MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) as follows:</p> <p>Facilitate Enable the integrated development of the Tapu Te Ranga land in a manner that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identifies and appropriately addresses any geo-technical and contamination issues; 2. Incorporates planting and landscaping to provide visual screening and integrate development into the surrounding environment; and 3. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide and Papakāinga Design Guide where relevant and applicable; and 4. <u>Supports the long-term development aspirations for the site including Nohokāinga/Papakāinga, Marae, Urupā extension, Kāinga, and community buildings.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.125	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.93	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Amend	Seeks clarification of the use of papakāinga.	Amend MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) to the following: 3. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide and Papakāinga Papakāinga Design Guide where relevant and applicable. [Inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.350	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Support in part	MRZ-P13 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.351	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P13 should be amended to delete Design Guides within the District Plan. Kāinga Ora considers Design Guides to be too broad to be used as an assessment matter. A limited range of design criteria should be utilised instead and the focus for assessment should be effects beyond those anticipated by the zone in accordance with Policy 6 of the NPSUD.	Amend MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) to delete reference to the Residential Design Guide and Papakāinga Design Guide and replace with the key design principles from these guides.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.82	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Oppose	The submitter seeks for MRZ-P13 to be amended so that design guides, including the papakāinga design guide, are deleted from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout Te Whanganui a Tara.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.75	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Support in part	Supports reference to papakainga design guide.	Retain MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.126	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	MRZ-P14 is supported as it will encourage the diversion of waste appropriately. The definition for community gardens does not allow for composting of food waste specifically, which may preclude the undertaking of food waste composting.	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.328	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	Considers that the policy will help compensate for residents having less available green space, and provide for community building and public health, as well as potential infrastructure for green waste recycling at a local scale.	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.352	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	MRZ-P14 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.
VicLabour	414.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	Supports provision for community gardens and urban agriculture and considers a green city and more community spaces is needed.	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Avryl Bramley	202.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Oppose	Considers that this provision is too wide and allows commercial usage creep.	Delete MRZ-P15 (Non residential activities and buildings) in it's entirety.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.278	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Amend	Considers that mixed-use activities should be encouraged in MRZ-P15 and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend Policy MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that: ... 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site, <u>and</u> <u>7. Are integrated into residential developments where possible.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.127	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.329	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support	The policy will help enable facilities and services that support urban living.	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.353	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support in part	MRZ-P15 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.89	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Oppose	Greater Wellington support the requirement for minimum permeable surface area and consider 'sufficient' to be too uncertain. We also note that multi-unit housing is excluded from HRZ-S10 and MRZ-S10 which the submitter supports. Amending the policy for all development is therefore not necessary.	Disallow / Seeks that the policy is retained as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.354	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P15 should be amended to clarify that servicing may change as a result of development. Changes are also sought to better recognise the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect.	Amend MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that: 1. Support the needs of local communities; 2. Are of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values <u>amenity values anticipated and planned built form</u> for the Zone; 3. Contribute positively to the urban environment and achieve attractive and safe streets; 4. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle; 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 6. Are adequately able to be <u>adequately able to be</u> serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.
Ministry of Education	400.94	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support in part	Supports MRZ-P15 in part as it provides for non-residential activities in the MRZ.	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.95	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Amend	Seeks MRZ-P15 be amended to ensure that additional infrastructure (including educational facilities) are explicitly recognised and provided for within the MRZ.	Amend MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that: ... 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. <u>7. Provides additional infrastructure to support the needs of the community</u>
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.47	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-PREC01-P1 (Character Precincts - Maintenance of character) as notified. The provision does not allow for more modern housing or work towards warmer or drier homes and instead maintains the status quo.	Opposes MRZ-PREC01-P1 (Character Precincts - Maintenance of character) as notified. Seeks that the high standard of safety, accessibility, and warmth of dwellings is prioritised instead.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.93	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P1 (Maintenance of character) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.279	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P1 (Maintenance of character) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.330	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Support	MRZ-PREC01-P1 is supported as it is considered that it clearly signals an intent to ensure alterations and developments in character precincts are done in a way that preserves the character that is an integral part of the city's identity	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P1 (Maintenance of character) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.355	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-P1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-P1 (Maintenance of character) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.66	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.54	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-P1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P1 (Maintenance of character) as notified.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Amend	Considers that the provisions are insufficient to manage the Mount Vicotira North Character Area. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that MRZ-PREC02-P1 (Maintenance of townscape values) is amended to require developers to conform to minimum standards specified in the design guide.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Amend	Developers should be required to conform to "Guiding principles" specified in the design guide. As worded, the policies present more of an advisory note than a mandatory requirement. All developers should be required to conform to the "Guiding principles".	Amend Policy MRZ-PREC01-P1 (maintenance of character) to require developers conform to the "Guiding Principles" specified in the Design Guide.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.7	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Oppose	Inconsistent with the RVA's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as the RVA is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.7	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P1	Oppose	Inconsistent with Ryman's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as Ryman is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Owen Watson	51.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Support	Supports the presumption of non-demolition for pre-1930's buildings.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P2 provisions relating to demolition of pre-1930s buildings as notified.
Tim Bright	75.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Not specified	No details supplied	[Not specified]
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	Considers that heritage values need to be given stronger weighting in considering whether demolition is appropriate. Considers that no. 3 under this policy is only acceptable if more is done to prevent 'demolition by neglect'. [refer to original submission for further reasons]	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) is amended to take into account the status of a building in the wider heritage context of the character precinct and Mount Victoria.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.48	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Oppose	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-P2 and related rules should be set aside as the protection of character prevents access to modern homes, or warmer and drier housing.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.94	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC01-P2	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.49	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-P2 should be amended to include post-1930s buildings as they may also meet the threshold of low contribution to the area and poor condition for demolition.	Amend MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) to include post-1930s buildings (to allow for their demolition), if this is not deleted.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.95	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC01-P2	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	154.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Support	Supports restrictions on demolition of pre-1930s buildings as stated in the proposed District Plan. Considers that requiring a resource consent for this activity allows input and review of the value of the building and whether it should be demolished.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.36	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC01-P2	Support	WCC Summary reads: Supports restrictions on demolition of pre-1930s buildings as stated in the proposed District Plan. Considers that requiring a resource consent for this activity allows input and review of the value of the building and whether it should be demolished.	Allow
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	Considers that heritage values need to be given stronger weighting in deciding whether a building may be demolished. Considers that MRZ-PREC01-P2.2. (Restrictions on demolition) is only acceptable if the WCC also takes action to prevent 'demolition by neglect', a strategy many property owners are known to resort to.	Seeks that the WCC and District Plan do not support 'demolition by neglect' and that there should be a presumption of non-demolition for pre-1930s buildings.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jonothan and Tricia Briscoe	190.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Not specified	<p>Considers that the criteria referring to consistency in form and style with other pre-1930 buildings risks ignoring a unique characteristic of Mt Victoria's historic building patterns where original buildings are not consistent in form and style with their neighbours.</p> <p>Considers that the criteria referring to the level of visibility does not take into account that a unique characteristic of Mt Victoria's historic building patterns is houses set back or barely visible from the street.</p>	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) takes into account the status of a building in the wider heritage context of the Character Precinct and Mt Victoria.
Jonothan and Tricia Briscoe	190.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Not specified	Considers that if the extent of character 'overlay' in Mt Victoria is to be reduced to only 30% from the area covered by the current pre-1930s demolition rule, more needs to be done to protect what remains.	Not specified.
Mike Camden	226.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Demolition) be expanded to include consideration of environmental effects of demolition or removal and salvage.
Alan Fairless	242.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington's liveability, and its character and heritage, can be protected at the same time as new housing is added.</p> <p>Considers that rather than wholesale deregulation and the widespread removal of protections, the District Plan needs to better recognise and provide for the protection of heritage from inappropriate development and better take into account the need to maintain and enhance amenity values.</p>	Reinstate the Operative Plan's demolition controls in the pre-1930s character areas.
Alan Fairless	242.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	<p>Considers that rather than wholesale deregulation and the widespread removal of protections, character and heritage can be considered as part of community dialogue.</p> <p>The District Plan needs to better recognise and provide for the protection of heritage from inappropriate development and better take into account the need to maintain and enhance amenity values.</p>	Seeks that the District Plan clearly identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the demolition controls (as revised by this submission) for pre-1930s character areas.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	<p>The site-by-site analysis found that some 300 houses contributed sufficiently to the character and streetscape of Newtown. These houses also passed the test established by the officers as Qualifying Matters for exemption from the NPS-UD and MDRS.</p> <p>Considers that these houses, if not Character Precincts, should be covered by the pre-1930's demolition rules.</p> <p>Almost all of the houses identified by the ORP are deemed to be primary or contributory by Boffa Miskell. In addition, these houses all demonstrate assemblages of consistent character streetscape.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>If the following sites are not classified under a character precinct:</p> <p>Seeks that MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) is amended to apply to the following sites:</p> <p>Balmoral Terrace - 3, 5, 7, 9, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10.</p> <p>Blucher Avenue - 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10.</p> <p>Coromandel Street - 1, 1A, 5, 7, 9, 11, 11, 13, 15, 17, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 127, 135, 137, 139, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 22, 90, 92, 96, 100, 102, 104, 106.</p> <p>Daniell Street - 147, 149, 157, 159, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, 92, 94, 124, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134, 136, 162.</p> <p>Harper St 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20.</p> <p>Lawrence St 7, 9, 11, 11A, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24.</p> <p>Owen St 1, 5, 7A, 9/11A, 15, 77, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 121A, 121C, 123, 125, 127, 127A, 129, 131, 133, 135, 137, 139, 141, 143, 154, 20, 22, 24B, 26, 28, 30, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 46, 48, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 70, 74, 76, 78, 88, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 102, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 156, 158, 160, 162, 164.</p> <p>Stoke St 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 33, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 31, 33, 35, 37.</p>
Khoi Phan	326.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	<p>Only allow the demolition of pre-1930s buildings, including the demolition or removal of architectural features from the primary elevation of any pre-1930 building, where either:</p> <p>1 It can be demonstrated that the contribution of a building to the character of the area is low, with reference to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The level of visibility of the existing building from surrounding public spaces; Whether the building is consistent in form and style with other pre-1930 buildings that contribute positively to the character of the area; The extent to which the existing building retains its original design features relating to form, materials, and detailing and the extent to which those features have been modified. whether the building is an integral part of a row of buildings that are consistent in form, scale, and siting; and Whether the building represents a rare or unique example of pre-1930s architecture; <p>2. The building is shown to be in a poor condition, particularly in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Its structural integrity, so that its retention is impractical or economically unviable; Whether the building presents a hazard; and Whether the building presents a risk to life in the event of an earthquake. 	Amend MRZ-PREC-01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) to replace 1930 with 1950.
Khoi Phan	326.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Clarify MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) to define "poor condition".
Waka Kotahi	370.280	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Not specified	<p>[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision]</p> <p>Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.</p>	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.331	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-P2 clearly signals an intent to ensure re-use rather than demolition of buildings in character areas - important as part of reducing wastage, as well as preserving the character that is an integral part of the city's identity.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.356	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-P2 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) in its entirety.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities wishes to remove reference of Demolition throughout the PDP. TRA are mindful that the greenest buildings are those timber buildings that are already built. There's an accumulative benefit from not demolishing older native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.67	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.29	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Oppose	The amendment to delete restrictions on demolition is opposed. Restrictions on demolition are needed to ensure maintenance of heritage and character provisions.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.28	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Oppose	The amendment to delete restrictions on demolition is opposed. Restrictions on demolition are needed to ensure maintenance of heritage and character provisions.	Disallow
Murray Pillar	393.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	Considers that there should be much wider coverage of the rule requiring a resource consent for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings in areas currently with that protection.	Seeks that there is much wider coverage of the MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) provisions that require a resource consent for demolishing pre-1930s buildings. [Inferred decision requested].
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.83	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Support	Boffa Miskell - adoption Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all Add Character Precincts to areas missed 10min walkable catchment Character precincts and rules Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M. Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings	Allow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.55	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-P2 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.75	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	Considers that the character areas should seek to preserve pre-1930 character, not original character as many buildings have had modifications prior to 1930 that are not original. [See original submission for full reasons]	Amend MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) as follows: Only allow the demolition of pre-1930 buildings, including the demolition or removal of architectural features from the primary elevation of any pre-1930 building, where either: 1. It can be demonstrated that the contribution of the building to the character of the area is low, with reference to: ... c. The extent to which the existing building retains its original pre-1930 design features relating to form, materials, and detailing and the extent to which those features have been modified;
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P2	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC01-P2 in its entirety. Considers that these provisions are well thought through.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.50	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-P3 with regards to 'provided that it does not detract from the character' poses further limits on what can be built in the area.	Seeks that the consideration 'provided that it does not detract from the character' is removed from MRZ-PREC01-P3 (Intensification). [Inferred decision requested]
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Oppose	Allowing greater intensification in Character Precincts by removing the wording "provided it does not detract from the character and amenity" effectively removes the character protection. This rule is important to protect the character and heritage of Character Precincts and to remove it would effectively remove character protection.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.96	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P3 (Intensification) as notified.
Khoi Phan	326.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove the criteria in PREC01-P3 (Intensification) in its entirety.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.332	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-P3 enables intensification in a way that preserves character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P3 (Intensification) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.357	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-P3 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-P3 (Intensification) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.68	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.56	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-P3 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P3 (Intensification) as notified.
VicLabour	414.30	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P3	Oppose	Opposes the provision as the submitter considers that the protection of Character should not be cast over the need for higher density housing.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-P3 (Intensification)
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P4 (Ongoing use and repair and maintenance) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.333	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P4	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-P4 supports sustainable use of buildings in character areas.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P4 (On-going use and repair and maintenance) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.358	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P4	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-P4 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-P4 (On-going use and repair and maintenance) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.69	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P4	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.57	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P4	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-P4 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P4 (On-going use and repair and maintenance) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P5 (Car parking and accessory buildings) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.281	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P5	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P5 (Car parking and accessory buildings) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.334	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P5	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-P5 important as character can be adversely impacted by poorly designed car parking and garaging.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P5 (Car parking and accessory buildings) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.359	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P5	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-P5 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-P5 (Car parking and accessory buildings) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.70	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC01-P5	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.58	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P5	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-P5 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P5 (Car parking and accessory buildings) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P6	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P6 (Special features) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.282	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P6	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P6 (Special features) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.335	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P6	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-P6 is important, as these features contribute to the character of the area just as buildings do.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P6 (Special features) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.59	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-P6	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-P6 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-P6 (Special features) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.283	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-P1	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-P1 (Maintenance of townscape values) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.360	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-P1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC02-P1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC02-P1 (Maintenance of townscape values) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.71	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC02-P1	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.60	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-P1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC02-P1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-P1 (Maintenance of townscape values) as notified.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-P1	Amend	Considers that the provisions are insufficient to manage the Mount Victoria North Character Area. [See original submission for full reasons]	Amend MRZ-PREC02-P1 (Maintenance of townscape values) is amended to include the following requirement that "Applicants must demonstrate that the provisions of this Design Guide have been acknowledged and interpreted and their objectives satisfied".
Waka Kotahi	370.284	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-P1	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-P1 (Managing development) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.361	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-P1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-P1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-P1 (Managing development) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.72	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC03-P1	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.61	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-P1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-P1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-P1 (Managing development) as notified.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R1	Amend	Considers #64 Kelburn Parade should have provision for non-residential activities on the ground floor because it is close to the university. [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that provision is made for small scale non-residential activity on the ground floor of 64 Kelburn Parade.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.336	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R1	Support	Considers that the rule will help compensate for residents having less available green space, and provide for community building and public health, as well as potential infrastructure for green waste recycling at a local scale.	Retain MRZ-R1 (Community gardens) as notified.
VicLabour	414.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R1	Support	Supports provision for community gardens and urban agriculture and considers a green city and more community spaces is needed.	Retain MRZ-R1 (Community gardens) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support	Supports the inclusion of this rule and recognition of Tapu-te-Ranga land and the identification of specific matters relevant to the development of the site. These matters are all relevant and are addressed individually above.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.185	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Amend	Considers that on the basis the National Grid is a qualifying matter, MRZ-R2 should be amended to clarify activities subject to the rule are subject to the qualifying matter area provisions. Considers the note would assist with plan interpretation and application.	Amend Rule MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows: MRZ-R2 Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. No more than three residential units occupy the site, except in MRZ-PREC03 where there is no limit. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with MRZ-R2.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5 and MRZ-P6; 2. For any site within the Spenmoor Street Area: the matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6 and MRZ-P12; and 3. For the Tapu Te Ranga land: the matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6 and MRZ-P13. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R2.2.a is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. Note: <u>Activities subject to MRZ-R2 shall comply with, and are subject to, the relevant provisions for qualifying matter areas.</u>
Khoi Phan	326.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. No more than three <u>six</u> residential units occupy the site, except in MRZ-PREC03 where there is no limit.
Waka Kotahi	370.285	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support	Rule MRZ-R2 is supported.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.337	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support	Considers that MRZ-R2 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.362	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support in part	MRZ-R2 is partially supported but amendments are sought.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) with amendment.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.286	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Support in part	Submitter supports the permitted activity standards for home business as it limits potential traffic effects on the roading network. Submitter also supports the restricted discretionary activity status for where the standards are not met.	Retain Rule MRZ-R3 (Home business) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.287	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Submitter has sought changes to standards that apply to the permitted rule of MRZ-R3.	Seeks to amend Rule MRZ-R3.1 (Home business) to align with requested changes to the referenced standards in the rule.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.338	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Support	Considers that MRZ-R3 will help enable businesses that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R3 (Home business) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.366	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Support in part	MRZ-R3 is generally supported, particularly the preclusion of public notification but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R3 (Home business) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.367	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R3 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPSUD.	Amend MRZ-R3.2 (Home business) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. 2. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. ...
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.30	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Oppose	Considers amenity is important and must be retained.	Disallow
Craig Palmer	492.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R3 (Home business) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
Craig Palmer	492.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Support in part	Supports MRZ-R3 (Home business) facilitating individuals being able to conduct a business from their principal place of residence.	Retain Supports MRZ-R3 (Home business) with amendment.
Craig Palmer	492.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R3 (Home business) should be amended to reduce the proposed numbers working and those visiting as they are out of proportion to a home-based business. Considers that the MRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Amend MRZ-R3.1.b. (Home Business) as follows: ... b. No more than four <u>three</u> people in total work in the home business at any one time, and the maximum number of people on site associated with the home business does not exceed 10 <u>6</u> people at any one time;
Craig Palmer	492.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the HRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Seeks that MRZ-R3 (Home Business) is amended to include the mandatory notification and consultation provisions of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 need to be added as a caveat.
Craig Palmer	492.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the MRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Craig Palmer	492.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates should be considered.	Seeks that MRZ-R3.2 (Home Business) is amended to include the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates as a matter of discretion [inferred decision requested]
Oranga Tamariki	83.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Support	Oranga Tamariki support the Permitted activity status for supported residential care activities. It provides flexibility for Oranga Tamariki to establish homes (up to 10 residents) in residential zones. Residential zones are considered an appropriate zone for Oranga Tamariki homes.	Retain MRZ-R4.1 (Supported residential care activities) as notified.
Oranga Tamariki	83.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Support	Oranga Tamariki support the Restricted Discretionary activity status for supported residential care activities exceeding 10 residents. Oranga Tamariki consider it acceptable for Council to consider the effects on the amenity values of the wider area as a result of the intensity and scale of the activity. Oranga Tamariki also support the preclusion of public notification for supported residential care activities exceeding 10 residents.	Retain MRZ-R4.2 (Supported residential care activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Oppose in part	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.
Khoi Phan	326.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10-20 residents.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.339	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Support	Considers that MRZ-R4 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.368	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Support in part	MRZ-R4 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.369	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R4 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPS-UD, and to preclude both public and limited notification as the activity is residential in nature and anticipated within the zone.	Amend MRZ-R4.2 (Supported residential care activities) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R4.2.a is precluded from being <u>either publicly or limited</u> notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	FS96.30	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Oppose	The proposal to delete the term 'amenity' from this point is opposed, along with all other attempts to remove 'amenity' from the Plan.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.29	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Oppose	The proposal to delete the term 'amenity' from this point is opposed, along with all other attempts to remove 'amenity' from the Plan.	Disallow
Craig Palmer	492.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
Khoi Phan	326.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) as follows: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 49 <u>20</u> guests per night.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.340	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Support	Considers that MRZ-R5 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.370	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Support in part	MRZ-R5 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.371	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R5 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPS-UD, and to preclude both public and limited notification as the activity is residential in nature and anticipated within the zone.	Amend MRZ-R5.2 (Boarding houses) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R5.2.a is precluded from being <u>either publicly or limited</u> notified.
Craig Palmer	492.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
Airbnb	126.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Support	Supports the approach to visitor accommodation in the residential zone.	Retain MRZ-R6 (Visitor Accommodation) as notified.
Khoi Phan	326.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: 2. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 49 <u>20</u> guests per night.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.372	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Support in part	MRZ-R6 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.373	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R6 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Amend MRZ-R6.2 (Visitor accommodation) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. ..
Craig Palmer	492.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
Waka Kotahi	370.288	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Support in part	The submitter supports the permitted activity status for childcare service activities for up to 10 children, the effects of larger scale activities of this nature should be assessed through a resource consent and the RD activity status for childcare activities exceeding 10 children at a time is considered appropriate.	Retain Rule MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.289	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Amend	Considers that traffic effects should be added as a matter of discretion as childcare activities can generate high volumes of traffic. Considers that in urban areas, childcare services should be located and designed to facilitate alternative transport modes – e.g located in densely populated areas with good walking connections. In addition, considers a matter of discretion should be included to support multi-use development, provision to include childcare facilities into residential developments where possible	Amend Rule MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with MRZ-R7.1.a or MRZ-R7.1.b cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity may adversely impact on the amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood; <u>and</u> 2. <u>The extent to which childcare facilities are integrated into residential development;</u> 3. <u>Expected traffic generation and effects on the road network; and</u> 4. <u>How alternative modes will be supported.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.341	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Support	Considers that MRZ-R7 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.374	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Support in part	MRZ-R7 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.375	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R7 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Amend MRZ-7.2 (Childcare services) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. ...
Ministry of Education	400.96	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Support	Supports that the District Plan continues to outline exclusions for childcare facilities in relevant rules in residential zones.	Retain MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Craig Palmer	492.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.122	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) and seeks amendments as outlined below.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.123	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.124	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Amend MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as follows: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u> Matters of discretion are: The matters in MRZ P2, MRZ P3 and MRZ P7. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ R8.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.125	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.126	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Amend MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as follows: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u> Matters of discretion are: The matters in MRZ P2, MRZ P3 and MRZ P7. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ R8.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.290	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support in part	Supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for retirement villages.	Retain Rule MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.291	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Amend	Supports provided earlier submission point on MRZ-P7 is implemented.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement Village) as notified, provided changes to MRZ-P7 are made as per earlier submission point.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.342	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support	Considers that MRZ-R8 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.376	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support	MRZ-R8 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as notified.
Metlifecare Limited	413.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter states that a retirement village use requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion are policies MRZ-P2 (housing supply and choice), P3 (Housing needs) and P7 (Retirement Villages). Each of these policies relates to the provision of housing and the design of the housing development (in this case a retirement village).</p> <p>The construction of a retirement village also requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion are broader but also include policies MRZ-P2, P3 and P7.</p> <p>This means that when a resource consent is required for a retirement village, an applicant will be required to apply for a resource consent to enable both the construction and use of a retirement village. It is unnecessary to require two consents to be obtained that require consideration of the same criteria. It is also unclear why the use should require resource consent.</p> <p>Retirement villages should be a permitted activity (while their construction remains a restricted discretionary activity). The applicant will still need to provide the same information for a new retirement village development and it will be assessed against the same criteria.</p>	Seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages to: Permitted and Delete the matters of discretion and notification status.
Craig Palmer	492.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Oppose	<p>Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.</p> <p>Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.</p>	Seeks that MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.292	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule MRZ-R9 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Rule MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.293	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Amend	Considers that commercial activities should be included as a restricted discretionary activity in MRZ-R9. Considers that access to appropriately located and scaled commercial activities improves amenity for residents in urban environments and creates walkable environments. Supports this rule provided that commercial services are included and MRZ-P15 is revised to include provision for integrated residential developments.	Amend Rule MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as follows: Community facility, <u>commercial activity</u> health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.343	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Support	Considers that MRZ-R9 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.377	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Support	MRZ-R9 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.97	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Support in part	Supports MRZ-R9 in part.	Retain MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.98	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Amend	Seeks MRZ-R9 be amended. The submitter seeks to replace 'education facilities' with 'educational facilities' to keep definitions consistent throughout the plan.	Amend MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as follows: Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, educational facility (excluding childcare services) 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: The matters in MRZ-P15. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R9.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.
Craig Palmer	492.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
Anne Lian	132.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.
Ingo Schommer	133.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.
Olivier Reuland	134.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.
Grant Buchan	143.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.
Braydon White	146.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Amos Mann	172.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.
Patrick Wilkes	173.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.
Pete Gent	179.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.
Peter Nunns	196.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.
Andrew Flanagan	198.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity. These activities could and do bring life and charm to all parts of the city.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.
Richard W Keller	232.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.42	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MRZ-R10 (All other activities) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.294	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Support	Rule MRZ-R10 is supported.	Retain Rule MRZ-R10 (All other activities) as notified.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.
David Cadman	398.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) of Discretionary be changed to Permitted, or Controlled, or Restricted Discretionary.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jonathan Markwick	490.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary. [Inferred decision requested]
Craig Palmer	492.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R10 (All other activities) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.177	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Support	Supports the rule as the maintenance and repair of buildings and structures within the MRZ is a permitted activity.	Retain MRZ-R11 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.378	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Support	MRZ-R11 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-R11 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Craig Palmer	492.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R11 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.178	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Support	Supports the policy as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the MRZ is a permitted activity.	Retain MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.250	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.251	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.379	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Support	MRZ-R12 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Craig Palmer	492.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Monique Zorn	205.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Oppose	<p>Considers that the removal of front yard standards reduces the ability to meet the objectives and policies in the MRZ.</p> <p>11m high developments on front boundaries are more appropriate in central city, centres and inner residential areas.</p> <p>Construction of buildings on the front boundary of a property creates risks and hazards for footpath users, such as doors opening onto streets and garages opening directly onto paths.</p> <p>Buildings on the front boundaries undermines the streets amenity.</p> <p>The residential design guide leans positively towards a landscaped and active front yard, not an absence of a front yard.</p> <p>The side yard standard has the effect of allowing 11m maximum height to be closer to the neighbouring property, reducing neighbours residential amenity.</p> <p>The removal of the side yard standard also reduces the practical utility area in which to put rubbish bins, bikes or household goods, rear property access, maintenance of side properties without trespassing and may reduce emergency service access.</p> <p>The removal of side yard standards changes the way utilities can be configured and laid.</p> <p>The removal of this side yard standard of 1m across all residential zones will compromise residential amenity and good neighbourly relations.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to the extent that front and side yards are not required and seeks amendment,

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Khoi Phan	326.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that apartment buildings should permit up to 15 units per site without resource consent.	Amend the title of MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three <u>fifteen</u> residential units occupy the site
Bruce Rae	334.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R13 should be amended to include two omitted relevant matters in qualifying matters. The first matter is that there is no indication of a minimum site size to which this rule applies, or how cross leases are to be treated - Many once ample sites have been subdivided, some into areas 300 m2 or even less. The addresses 85, 85A, 87, 87A & 89 marine parade in Seatoun (ignoring other overlays) are considered as an example. 85 & 85A have been subdivided, 85 is 812m2, with a smaller front site of 392m2 at 85A 87 & 87A are 2 houses on one cross leased site with an area of 926m2 89 appears to have had an area for an additional house subdivided from the rear of the site, but retains an area of 2852m2. The second matter is that no account is taken of the effects of topography, the most severe of these is shading and overlooking from sites on a south-facing slope.	Amend MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: <u>a. The site is of a minimum area of 400m2 and</u> <u>b. The site does not have a south-facing slope of steeper than 15° and</u> <u>c. a Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.295	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Support in part	Support permitted activity status of MRZ-R13 to construct up to three dwellings that comply with standards, provided that further weighting assessment is done on restrictions on character precincts, mount Victoria north townscape precinct and oriental bay height precinct as well, and provided that changes are made to standards as per our submission points.	Retain MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
Waka Kotahi	370.296	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Support permitted activity status of MRZ-R13 to construct up to three dwellings that comply with standards, provided that further weighting assessment is done on restrictions on character precincts, mount Victoria north townscape precinct and oriental bay height precinct as well, and provided that changes are made to standards as per our submission points.	Retain MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.344	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that it should be evident that the Residential Design Guide applies to all residential buildings.	Amend the matters of Discretion under MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to add a new matter of discretion: <u>"The Residential Design Guide"</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.380	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Support in part	MRZ-R13 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.381	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R13 should be amended to allow the rule to apply to all buildings not just those associated with no more than three residential units on a site. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.	Amend MRZ-13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site 1. Activity Status: Permitted where: <u>a. There are no more than three residential units on a site; and</u> <u>b. Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u> ... 2. Activity status Restricted Discretionary where: <u>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of MRZ-R13.1.a and MRZ-R13.1.b cannot be are not achieved.</u> Matters of discretion are: 2. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P8, MRZ-P9, MRZ-P10 and MRZ-P11; <u>and</u> <u>3. where compliance with MRZ-R13.1.a is not achieved, the matters in MRZ-P6.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.117	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that for health and safety reasons, a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary is sought. KiwiRail seek that the railway corridor be identified as a qualifying matter and be applied to require a building setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary. KiwiRail seek amendment to this rule to ensure compliance with the requested rail corridor boundary setback standard (MRZ-S4) is required.	Amend HRZ-R13.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i. MRZ-S1; ii. MRZ-S3; iii. MRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard <u>and rail corridor</u> boundary setbacks; iv.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.118	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. This amendment is sought in addition to the amendment sought in relation to MRZ-R13.1.	Amend MRZ-R13.2 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirement of MRZ-R13.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. ... 2. ... <u>3. The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.32	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rachel Underwood	458.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Considers inappropriate to include the standards for setbacks and side yards when implementing MRZ-R13 .	Seeks to amend MRZ-R13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Compliance with the following standards is achieved: MRZ-S1; MRZ-S3; MRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard boundary setback ; MRZ-S5... [inferred decision requested].
Craig Palmer	492.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
Stratum Management Limited	249.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	The non-notification statement for this rule precludes public notification. Given that any multi-unit development is subject to this rule, and that it specifies a range of standards that apply to multi-unit development, where a proposal meets these standards, it should be processed on a non-notified basis.	Amend the notification status under MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) by adding the following: <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 that meets the standards specified is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.209	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.209	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.
Wellington City Council	266.133	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers the notification clauses for 4 or more household units need to align with Sch 3A, cl 5 of the RMA. This also needs to reflect the building standards	Amend the notification clause of MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 which results from non-compliance with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 or MRZ-S5, is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 which results from non-compliance with MRZ-S12, MRZ-S13 or MRZ-S14, is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.107	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZR14	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendments as other standards should also be precluded from notification. Standards 7 to 11 largely relate to impacts internal to sites, such as outlook space and permeable surfaces, so should also be considered for notification preclusion.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.241	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.241	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Khoi Phan	326.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that apartment buildings should be allowed to be maintained and fixed without the need of resource consents.	Amend MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Permitted ... Retain MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.127	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Oppose in part	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards. However, considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to MRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Supports MRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Act Considers that a retirement village that is compliant with MRZ-S2 – MRZ-S5 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Retain MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.128	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards. However, considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to MRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Supports MRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Act Considers that a retirement village that is compliant with MRZ-S2 – MRZ-S5 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Amend MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard: i. MRZ-S2; ii. MRZ-S3; iii. MRZ-S4; iv. MRZ-S5; v. MRZ-S12 for multi-unit housing only; vi. MRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing only; and vii. MRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing only; and 2. For multi-unit housing, the matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P7, MRZ-P8, MRZ-P10 and MRZ-P11. 3. For retirement villages: i. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; ii. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length; iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; iv. When assessing the matters in 1(i) – (iv), and 3(i) – (iii), consider: a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. v. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a retirement village where compliance is achieved with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 and MRZ-S5 is precluded from being limited notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.129	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Support in part	<p>Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards. However, considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to MRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management.</p> <p>Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.</p> <p>Supports MRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Act Considers that a retirement village that is compliant with MRZ-S2 – MRZ-S5 should also be precluded from limited notification.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard:</p> <p>i. MRZ-S2; ii. MRZ-S3; iii. MRZ-S4; iv. MRZ-S5; v. MRZ-S12 for multi-unit housing only; vi. MRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing only; and vii. MRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing only; and</p> <p>2. <u>For multi-unit housing, the matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P7, MRZ-P8, MRZ-P10 and MRZ-P11.</u></p> <p>3. <u>For retirement villages:</u></p> <p><u>i. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>ii. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> <u>iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>iv. When assessing the matters in 1(i) – (iv), and 3(i) – (iii), consider:</u> <u>a. The need to provide forefficient use of larger sites; and</u> <u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>v. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village where compliance is achieved with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 and MRZ-S5 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>
Waka Kotahi	370.297	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Support in part	Support restricted discretionary activity status for multi-unit housing or a retirement village – if changes are made to standards as per our submission points.	Retain MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and make changes to standards as per earlier submissions.
Waka Kotahi	370.298	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Support restricted discretionary activity status for multi-unit housing or a retirement village – if changes are made to standards as per our submission points.	Retain MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and make changes to standards as per earlier submissions.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.382	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Support in part	MRZ-R14 is partially supported, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Amendments are sought to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards.	Retain MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.383	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R14 should be amended to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards. The inclusion of multi-unit housing is opposed, as this can be managed through MRZ-R13 in accordance with the amendments sought to that rule.	Amend MRZ-14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: MRZ-R14 Construction of buildings for multi-unit housing or a retirement village 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the follow standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard: i. MRZ-S2; ii. MRZ-S3; iii. MRZ-S4; iv. MRZ-S5; v. MRZ-S12 for multi-unit housing only; vi. MRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing only; vii. MRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing only; 2. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6 , MRZ-P7, MRZ-P8, MRZ-P10 and MRZ-P11 Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14 that complies with the relevant standards is precluded from public and limited notification.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.135	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where this aligns with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.135	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission where this aligns with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Metlifecare Limited	413.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Support in part	Supports the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity because it recognises that retirement village development is compatible with residential environments.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Metlifecare Limited	413.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Supports the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity because it recognises that retirement village development is compatible with residential environments.	Amend MRZ-R14 as follows: Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard: i. MRZ-S2; ii. MRZ-S3; iii. MRZ-S4; iv. MRZ-S5; ... 2. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6 <u>(for multi-unit housing only)</u> , MRZ-P7 <u>(for retirement villages only)</u> , MRZ-P8 <u>(for multi-unit housing only)</u> , MRZP10, and MRZ-P11, <u>MRZ-P[X], and MRZ-P[Y] (for retirement villages only).</u>
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.37	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that since this rule makes all multi-unit housing a RD activity and refers back to broad policies as matters of discretion, Council's scope is too broad for an RD activity. Considers this may risk failing to meet S77B, and Council is already required to consider relevant policies under 104(1)(b).	Amend MRZ-R14 to: 2. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P7, MRZ-P8 , MRZ-P10 and MRZ-P11

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that preclusion from public notification only does not comply with Clause 5(2) of Schedule 3A, which requires both limited and public notification be excluded for any resource consent for 4+ units that comply with the MDRS.	Amend MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to: Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being limited notified where the proposal complies with MRZ-S2 to MRZ-S9.</u> <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being limited notified where the proposal complies with MRZ-S2 to MRZ-S5 and MRZ-S12 to MRZ-S14.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.211	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.211	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.
Craig Palmer	492.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Craig Palmer	492.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R15	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R15 (Fences and standalone walls) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R15	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R15	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.300	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Amend	Considers that amendments to Rule MRZ-R16 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Amend MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where the legal road is controlled by Waka Kotahi, written approval has been provided from Waka Kotahi authorising the building or structure. Matters of discretion are: ...
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.384	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Support	MRZ-R16 is supported.	Retain MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.
Craig Palmer	492.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents. Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.181	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Support	Supports the policy as the addition or alteration to buildings and structures within the MRZ is provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity. FENZ has existing stations in the Medium Density Residential Zone which may require future extension or alteration.	Retain MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.130	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Support in part	Supports additions and alterations to retirement villages being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R17. Considers the matters of discretion need to align with those for new retirement villages. Supports MRZ-R17.2a being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A(5)(s) of the Act Considers that alterations and additions to retirement villages that are compliant with MRZ-S2 – MRZ-S5 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Retain MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) and seeks amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.131	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Amend	Supports additions and alterations to retirement villages being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R17. Considers the matters of discretion need to align with those for new retirement villages. Supports MRZ-R17.2a being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A(5)(s) of the Act Considers that alterations and additions to retirement villages that are compliant with MRZ-S2 – MRZ-S5 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Amend MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ... vi. MRZ-S12 <u>for multi-unit housing</u> ; vii. MRZ-S13 <u>for multi-unit housing</u> ; and viii. MRZ-S14 <u>for multi-unit housing</u> . 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary ... 2. The matters in MRZ-P9, MRZ-P10, MRZ-P11 and MRZ-P15 (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); and 3. The matters in MRZ-P6, MRZ-P7 and HRZ-P8 for additions and alterations to multi-unit housing or a retirement village, and <u>4. For additions and alterations to retirement villages:</u> <u>i. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>ii. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> <u>iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u> <u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u> Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R17.2a is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for additions and alterations to a retirement village where compliance is achieved with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 and MRZ-S5 is precluded from being limited notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.345	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Amend	Considers that it should be evident that the Residential Design Guide applies to all residential buildings.	Amend the matters of Discretion under MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) to add a new matter of discretion: <u>"The Residential Design Guide"</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.220	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.220	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.385	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Support in part	MRZ-R17 is generally supported, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Amendments are sought.	Retain MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) with amendment.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R1 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.346	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R1	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R1 supports sustainable use of buildings in character areas.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R1 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.387	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-R1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-R1 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.73	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC01-R1	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.62	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-R1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R1 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R2 (Construction, addition, and alteration of accessory buildings) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.347	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R2	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R2 supports sustainable use of buildings in character areas.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R2 (Construction, addition, and alteration of accessory buildings) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.388	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R2	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-R2 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-R2 (Construction, addition, and alteration of accessory buildings) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.74	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC01-R2	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.63	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R2	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-R2 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R2 (Construction, addition, and alteration of accessory buildings) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Support in part	Supports the provision and suggests amendments to reduce ambiguity.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendments
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision or development in accordance with s.6 of the RMA.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R3 provides for the demolition or removal of buildings and structures as a permitted activity, and this is in contrast to MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of an building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930), which addresses the demolition of pre-1930 buildings. Considers that to avoid ambiguity, MRZ-PREC01-R3 should be amended to refer to post-1930 buildings.	Amend MRZ-PREC01-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows: MRZ-PREC01-R3: Demolition or removal of buildings and structures, <u>except those buildings addressed in MRZ-PREC01-R4.</u>
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision or development in accordance with s.6 of the RMA.	Allow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Kimberley Vermaey	348.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Amend	MRZ-PREC01-R3 should be clarified so that it only applies to buildings constructed after the 1930s. Otherwise this rule may clash with MRZ-PREC01-R4 which requires resource consent for buildings constructed prior to 1930.	Amend MRZ-PREC01-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to only apply to buildings constructed after the 1930s.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.252	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.253	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend MRZ-PREC01-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.348	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R3 enabled change and development in character areas.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.389	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R3	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-R3 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.75	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC01-R3	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.51	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Oppose	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R4 should be set aside as the protection of character prevents access to modern homes, or warmer and drier housing.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) in its entirety. [Inferred decision requested]
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Oppose	Allowing greater intensification in Character Precincts by removing the wording "provided it does not detract from the character and amenity" effectively removes the character protection. This rule is important to protect the character and heritage of Character Precincts and to remove it would effectively remove character protection.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.97	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC01-R4	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington	182.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Support	Strongly supports the rule that demolition within a Character Precinct is a restricted discretionary activity for pre- 1930 buildings	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.106	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC01-R4	Support	All inner Residential suburbs should be MDZ Exemption from upzoning Importance of character areas Character Precincts, rules & design regime Extended Character Precincts in line with Boffa Miskell Demolition be a restricted activity for pre-1930 buildings New viewshaft for views of St Paul's	Allow
Avryl Bramley	202.39	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Amend	Considers that the pre 1930's non demolition rules are reinstated and that it should be extended to other building cohorts that are durable.	Seeks amendment to demolition rules and protocols to ensure that demolition is a last resort and that the maximum amount of removal or recyclable activity is undertaken.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Support in part	Considers that appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings and structures is necessary to protect heritage buildings from inappropriate development, which is a matter of national importance under s6 of the Resource Management Act.	Seeks that MRZ-PREC01-R4 is retained as notified, but should apply to an extended area comprising all existing pre-1930s character areas (Appendix 1 of Chapter 5 of the Operative District Plan). [Inferred Decision Requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.94	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC01	Support	Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings 10min walkable catchment Specific heritage identification and assessment Views contributing to sense of place and identity Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell Boffa Miskell streetscapes Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings CCZ encroachment on residential zones Old St Pauls height controls Preserve viewshalfs	Allow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) as notified.
Khoi Phan	326.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the title of MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) as follows: Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930 1950
Khoi Phan	326.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Amend	Considers that it can be demonstrated that the contribution of a building to the character of the area is low, with reference to: a. The level of visibility of the existing building from surrounding public spaces; b. Whether the building is consistent in form and style with other pre-1930 buildings that contribute positively to the character of the area; c. The extent to which the existing building retains its original design features relating to form, materials, and detailing and the extent to which those features have been modified.	Amend MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) as follows: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Permitted Matters of discretion are: The matters contained in MRZ-PREC01-P2.
Waka Kotahi	370.301	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.349	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R4 enables change and development in character areas in a way that contributes to, or preserves, character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.390	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-R4 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) in its entirety.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Oppose	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities wishes to remove reference of Demolition throughout the PDP. TRA are mindful that the greenest buildings are those timber buildings that are already built. There's an accumulative benefit from not demolishing older native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.76	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.64	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-R4 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) as notified.
Christina Mackay	478.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R4	Support	Supports the rule that demolition within Character Precincts as a restricted discretionary activity for pre-1930 buildings (MRZ-PREC01- R4) in order to support the conservation/regeneration of character housing	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R4 (Demolition of any building or part of any building, excluding accessory buildings, constructed prior to 1930) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.30	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures, excluding accessory buildings) as notified.
Bruce Rae	334.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Amend	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R5 should be amended to clarify wording. The phrasing of this section is unhelpful, as it implies the existence of a 'permitted' category where the standards are observed. MRZ-PREC01-R5 also mentions at 3. 'The Residential Design Guide Character Precincts appendix', but not the main Residential Design Guide. Wording here should either be clarified or split into two sections, one where multi-unit housing standards apply and another where they don't.	Amend MRZ-PREC01-R (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures, excluding accessory buildings) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. In cases where there is no compliance with all relevant the standards listed below the extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard: ... 3. The Residential Design Guide together with its Character Precincts Appendix; and ...
Waka Kotahi	370.302	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures, excluding accessory buildings) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.350	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R5 enables change and development in character areas in a way that contributes to, or preserves, character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures, excluding accessory buildings) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.391	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-R5 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures, excluding accessory buildings) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.77	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.65	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-R5 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures, excluding accessory buildings) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.46	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R5.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures, excluding accessory buildings) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.77	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.77	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.47	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend MRZ-PREC01-R5.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures, excluding accessory buildings) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.78	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.78	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC01-R5	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R6	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R6 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.351	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R6	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R6 enables change and development in character areas in a way that contributes to, or preserves, character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R6 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.392	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R6	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-R6 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-R6 (Fences and standalone walls) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.78	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R6	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.66	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R6	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-R6 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R6 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R7 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.303	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R7	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that amendments to Rule MRZPREC01-R7 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Neutral position on Rule MRZPREC01-R7 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.304	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	Considers that amendments to Rule MRZPREC01-R7 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Amend Rule MRZPREC01-R7 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Where the legal road is controlled by Waka Kotahi, written approval has been provided from Waka Kotahi authorising the building or structure.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.352	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R7	Support	Considers that MRZ-PREC01-R7 enables change and development in character areas in a way that contributes to, or preserves, character.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R7 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.393	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R7	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-R7 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-R7 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.79	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R7	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.67	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-R7	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-R7 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R7 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.394	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC02-R1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC02-R1 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.80	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R1	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.68	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC02-R1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-R1 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.254	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R2	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-R2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.255	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R2	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend MRZ-PREC02-R2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.395	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R2	Oppose	MRZ-PREC02-R2 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC02-R2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) in its entirety.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities wishes to remove reference of Demolition throughout the PDP. TRA are mindful that the greenest buildings are those timber buildings that are already built. There's an accumulative benefit from not demolishing older native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.81	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R2	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.69	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R2	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC02-R2 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-R2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures).
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.30	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R2	Amend	Considers that MRZ-PREC02-R2 not having parallel provisions to MRZ-PREC01-P2 (Restrictions on demolition) is an anomaly and should be amended so that demolition is a restricted discretionary activity.	Amend MRZ-PREC02-R2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) so that demolition is a restricted discretionary activity (not a permitted activity).
Waka Kotahi	370.305	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision] Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.396	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Oppose	MRZ-PREC02-R3 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC02-R3 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.82	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.70	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-R3 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.71	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC02-R3 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-R3 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.48	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Seeks to retain MRZ-PREC02-R3.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures) and an amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.79	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.79	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.49	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend MRZ-PREC02-R3.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.80	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.80	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC02-R3	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.397	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R4	Oppose	MRZ-PREC02-R4 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC02-R4 (Fences and standalone walls) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.83	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC02-R4	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.72	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R4	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC02-R4 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-R4 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.
Laura Gaudin	279.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R5	Support	Supports there being character precincts where construction of buildings/structures requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity (with consideration given to Residential Design Guide Character Precincts appendix).	Retain MRZ-PREC01-R5 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings...) as notified (with Restricted Discretionary activity status).
Waka Kotahi	370.306	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R5	Amend	Considers that amendments to Rule MRZ-PREC02-R5 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Amend Rule MRZ-PREC02-R5 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Where the legal road is controlled by Waka Kotahi, written approval has been provided from Waka Kotahi authorising the building or structure.</u> Matters of discretion are:
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.398	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R5	Oppose	MRZ-PREC02-R5 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC02-R5 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.84	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC02-R5	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.73	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC02-R5	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC02-R5 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC02-R5 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.399	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R1 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.85	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC03-R1	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.402	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R4 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R4 (Construction, alteration or addition to buildings, structures or accessory buildings that are not Permitted Activities) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.88	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ@PREC04-R4	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.77	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-R4 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R4 (Construction, alteration or addition to buildings, structures or accessory buildings that are not Permitted Activities) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.50	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R4.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings, structures or accessory buildings that are not Permitted Activities) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.81	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.81	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.51	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend MRZ-PREC03-R4.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings, structures or accessory buildings that are not Permitted Activities) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.82	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.82	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Wellington City Council	266.135	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Amend	Considers there is an error in the rule which is old drafting.	Amend MRZ-PREC-03-R5.1 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: (...) Where: 1. Compliance with MRZ-PREC-03-S6 MRZ-OBPH56 is achieved.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.136	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Amend	Considers there is an error in the rule which is old drafting.	Amend MRZ-PREC-03-R5.2 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: (...) Where: 1. Compliance with MRZ-PREC-03-S6 MRZ-OBPH-36 is achieved.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.403	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R5 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R5 (Fences and standalone walls) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.89	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.78	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-R5 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R5 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.308	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Not specified	Neutral and considers that amendments to Rule MRZ-PREC03-R6 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R6 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.309	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Amend	Neutral but considers that amendments to Rule MRZ-PREC03-R6 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Amend Rule MRZ-PREC03-R6 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Where the legal road is controlled by Waka Kotahi, written approval has been provided from Waka Kotahi authorising the building or structure.</u> Matters of discretion are:
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.404	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R6 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R6 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.90	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.79	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-R6 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R6 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Stevens	151.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes the surrounding area of Khandallah being medium density four storey with a height limit of 14m.</p> <p>Considers that there is not overwhelming demand for housing or business given the limited public transport options available.</p> <p>Considers that the MRZ three storey requirements imposed under the NPS-UD and development along the proposed RTS corridors (excluding JVL) provides ample scope for residential development to meet the expected population growth for the city.</p>	<p>Seeks that the surrounding area of Khandallah should be zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, with a storey /11m maximum height limit throughout.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
David Stevens	151.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that the MRZ three storey requirements imposed under the NPS-UD and development along the proposed RTS corridors (excluding JVL) provides ample scope for residential development to meet the expected population growth for the city.</p>	<p>Seeks that the corridor from Broadmeadows to Crofton Downs should be MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) 3-storey 11m throughout, including the Khandallah and Ngaio Centres.</p>
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standard recommendations.</p>
Leeanne Templer	206.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Opposes the height limit of 11m in MRZ-S1 in Rama Crescent and the streets above it.</p> <p>Considers that Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification.</p> <p>Considers that there is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views.</p> <p>Considers that there needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough.</p> <p>Considers that ambassadorial residencies on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.</p>	<p>Seeks an amendment to MRZ-S1 (Building Height Controls) so that that Rama Crescent and streets above Rama Crescent are exempt from the 11m Height Limit.</p>
Richard W Keller	232.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards</p>
Wellington City Council	266.137	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers there is a need to amend exemptions to MRZ-S1 (Height control area 1)</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) exemptions as follows: (...)</p> <p>This standard does not apply to: a. Fences or standalone walls; b. Solar panel and heating components attached to <u>a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and</u> c. <u>Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m measured vertically.</u></p>
Everard Aspell	270.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Not specified	<p>Considers that allowing building heights of 11-21 metres in the inner city suburbs of Mount Victoria, Mount Cook, Thorndon, Berhampore, Newtown and Aro Valley will create shading, privacy issues, loss of green areas, reduced property values; will forever change the streetscape and will not reflect the character of the area.</p>	<p>Seeks that intensification is restricted to brownfield sites.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.109	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support	Part of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.182	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support in part	Supports the standard to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 11m for any building. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone. FENZ however seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Supports MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.183	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Supports the standard to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 11m for any building. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone. FENZ however seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) as follows: <u>Clause 1 does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Phillippa O'Connor	289.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should have maximum building height increased because: - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university. [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that Standard MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) is amended so that the western side of Kelburn Parade has a maximum height limit of 21m as a permitted activity.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers this dual-standard approach is unnecessary, and that the more permissive height standard in the MRZ should be enabled irrespective of scale of the development.	Seeks that standards MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) and MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) building height control are combined so that there are not different height standards for 1-3 residential units and multi unit developments.
Johanna Carter	296.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1...) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Khoi Phan	326.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S1 should be amended so that structures do not exceed 16 metres in height and the 15 degree slope are removed.	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 11.16 metres in height above ground level, except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown in Diagram 5 below: ...
Richard Benge	327.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the MRZ height control area 2 (14m) at 33 Hiripi Street is too restrictive, and that Height control area 3 from the DDP would have been more appropriate. (Option C) [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Amend the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter to reinstate Height control area 3 (21m). [Inferred decision requested]
Waka Kotahi	370.310	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support	Standard MRZ-S1 is supported as it is consistent with the MDRS.	Retain Standard MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1: 1. where no..) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.405	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support in part	MRZ-S1 is generally supported and it is acknowledged that the standard is taken from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. However, amendments are sought to allow this standard to apply to all residential units regardless of how many are on a site and to be more enabling for residential units located within close proximity to train stations and local centres.	Retain MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1: 1. where no more than three residential units occupy the site; or 2. For the construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures in a Character Precinct or Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct.) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.406	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S1 should be amended to allow this standard to apply to all residential units regardless of how many are on a site and to be more enabling for residential units located within close proximity to train stations and local centres. Consistent with the rest of the submission, the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter is sought.	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1: - where no more than three residential units occupy the site; or - For the construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures in a Character Precinct or Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct.) as follows: Building height control 1: 1. where no more than three residential units occupy the site; or 2. For the construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures in a Character Precinct or Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct. 1. ... <u>Except where:</u> <u>2. In areas identified as having a height control of 18m in the planning maps, the height must not exceed 18 metres above ground level except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed the heights above by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown in Diagram 1 below:</u> ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Donna Yule	421.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes the blanket policy of Medium Density 3 Storey Residential housing in all residential areas - the height limits are too high.</p> <p>Considers that no consideration has been given to the geographical location of each individual suburb, its terrain and orientation to the sun. For suburbs that are built in a north south direction with hills either side and the main housing is on the flat, any 3 storey building will cast a significant shadow over many properties.</p> <p>Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows.</p> <p>Added to that no space between properties, no outside areas to enjoy a little privacy. These suburbs will become sunless undesirable transitional suburbs where people will only stay a short time until they can afford to move elsewhere with sun & outdoor space.</p>	Not specified.
Catharine Underwood	481.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that the current height control areas in Brooklyn should be removed until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed. There are a few protected buildings in Brooklyn, but no character precinct compared to other suburbs. Brooklyn has some older well built houses and street scapes that are worth the protection.	Seeks that MRZ-S1 (Maximum height) of 11m be removed in Brooklyn, until a character/heritage assessment has been completed.
Catharine Underwood	481.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the current height control areas in Brooklyn should be removed until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed. There are a few protected buildings in Brooklyn, but no character precinct compared to other suburbs. Brooklyn has some older well built houses and street scapes that are worth the protection.	Seeks that the Operative District Plan height controls be reinstated in Brooklyn. [Inferred decision requested]
Jonathan Markwick	490.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support	Supports the increase in building height controls around the Johnsonville centre, including those east of the motorway.	Retain MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) around Johnsonville Centre as notified.
Lilias Bell	50.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Supports Proposed District Plan heights for Colway Street in Ngaio.	Retain MRZ-S2 as notified.
David Stephen	82.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Opposes 14m Height Limit in MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) and wants them removed.	Amend MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) as follows: 1. Buildings... a. Height Area 1 11m b. Height Area 2 14m [Decision inferred from submission]
Ian Law	101.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Opposes 14m Height Limit in MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) and wants them removed.	Amend MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) as follows: 1. Buildings... a. Height Area 1 11m b. Height Area 2 14m [inferred decision requested]
Julie Patricia Ward	103.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes 14m Height Limit in walkable catchment from LCZ's and NCZ's.	Seeks that if Khandallah remains a LCZ (Local Centre Zone) the 14m walkable catchment should be removed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	<p>Considers the impact of 14m height limit on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Considers that 14m height limit is inappropriate for the character of the area.</p> <p>Considers the loss of solar access leading to damp homes and less energy efficient, loss of Biodiversity to the Newtown area, loss of wellbeing, and loss of Privacy to our family homes.</p>	Amend the height control in the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace from 14m to 11m.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Leeanne Templer	206.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	<p>Opposes Height Areas in MRZ-S2 for Rama Crescent and the streets above it.</p> <p>Considers that Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification.</p> <p>Considers that there is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views.</p> <p>Considers that there needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough.</p> <p>Considers that ambassadorial residencies on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.</p>	Seeks an amendment to MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control 2) so that that Rama Crescent and streets above Rama Crescent are excluded from building height increased and intensification.
Ruapapa Limited	225.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	<p>Considers that there are many reasons such as steep side streets and lack of access for emergency vehicles which render more intense and higher levels of development inappropriate.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for further reason]</p>	Retain MRZ-S2.1.b (Height Area 2 - 11m) for streets branching off of Oriental Parade as notified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	<p>Opposes Height Control Area 2 - MRZ-S2 (14m) in the residential area of Khandallah.</p> <p>Considers that similar suburbs mainly have 11m height controls.</p> <p>11m Height Control is more appropriate for housing demand and level of commercial activity.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: For multi-unit housing or a retirement village: or Other buildings and structures) - Height control area 2 - 14m in Khandallah.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.250	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act/NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.250	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act/NPSUD.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the maximum height in the residential area of Khandallah should be 11m	Seeks that MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: For multi-unit housing or a retirement village: or Other buildings and structures) - Height control area 2 - is reduced to 11 metres in Khandallah.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.251	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act/NPSUD.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.251	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act/NPSUD.	Disallow
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Supports a height limit of 11m for Hay Street. Considers that Hay Street has many qualifying matters which would exempt it from intensification. There are limited benefits that don't outweigh the consequences of intensification in Oriental Bay. Considers that there would be significant costs related to preparing the area for intensification. The Hay Street Heritage Report 2021 identifies a high concentration of higher quality character streetscape of Hay St. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) - with Hay Street, including the Hay Street extension, within Height Area 2 (11m), as notified.
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.87	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	The submitter oppose points 237.2, 237.3, & 237.5 to restrict development due to 'qualifying matters' and retain Hay Street as MRZ. Qualifying Matters are set out in s77I of the RMA Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act 2021. Hay Street itself does not have any qualifying matters. Site specific limitations are addressed in a s88 RMA report Assessment of Environmental Effects. While Oriental Bay's special character has been addressed in the special Precinct Height Control's (PREC-03) overlay, it is not a Qualifying Matter. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
Richard Martin	244.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Supports the 11m Height Area within the MRZ in Hay Street and Baring Street. A 21m height limit would not work due to steep contours, history of slips, inadequate drainage, and inadequate infrastructure. Considers that Hay Street has unique characteristics that made 21m height limit a poor idea. Considers that Baring Street is prone to slips, has no identifiable owner, limited room for access. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain MRZ-S2 (Maximum height) as notified, with Hay Street and Baring Street within Height control area 2 (11m).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Supports a height limit of 11m for Hay Street. Considers that Hay Street has many qualifying matters which would exempt it from intensification. Considers that there are significant structural issues with the area, limited vehicle space water/drainage issues and heritage value in Hay Street. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain MRZ-S2 (Maximum height) as notified, with Hay Street and Baring Street within Height control area 2 (11m).
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.89	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	The submitter opposes restricting development due to 'qualifying matters' and retain Hay Street as MRZ. Qualifying Matters are set out in s771 of the RMA Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act 2021. Hay Street itself does not have any qualifying matters. Site specific limitations are addressed in a s88 RMA report Assessment of Environmental Effects. While Oriental Bay's special character has been addressed in the special Precinct Height Control's (PREC-03) overlay, it is not a Qualifying Matter. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
Everard Aspell	270.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Not specified	Considers that allowing building heights of 11-21 metres in the inner city suburbs of Mount Victoria, Mount Cook, Thorndon, Berhampore, Newtown and Aro Valley will create shading, privacy issues, loss of green areas, reduced property values; will forever change the streetscape and will not reflect the character of the area.	Seeks that intensification is restricted to brownfield sites.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.110	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Part of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.184	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support in part	Seeks the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers to enable the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Supports MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.185	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	As noted in the previous submission point, seeks the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers to enable the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Amend MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) as follows: <u>Clause 1 does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Considers that Khandallah is a small neighbourhood village that only supports its local community. The adjacent centres of Ngaio-Crofton Downs and Johnsonville have all the services Khandallah has, and also contain larger facilities, so do not require such support. The current supermarket and retail shops, plus services including medical, education, recreation, etc. are all small and are at capacity right now. The road the retail centre is on is a constrained one-lane road. They therefore will not support the increased demand coming from the significant medium density development proposed by 14m zones.	Opposes MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: For multi-unit housing or a retirement village: or Other buildings and structures) with respect to Khandallah being in Height Control Area 2 (14m).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	<p>Considers that Khandallah is a small neighbourhood village that only supports its local community. The adjacent centres of Ngaio-Crofton Downs and Johnsonville have all the services Khandallah has, and also contain larger facilities, so do not require such support. The current supermarket and retail shops, plus services including medical, education, recreation, etc. are all small and are at capacity right now. The road the retail centre is on is a constrained one-lane road.</p> <p>They therefore will not support the increased demand coming from the significant medium density development proposed by 14m zones.</p>	Seeks that Khandallah is moved to Height control Area 1 (11m) under MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: For multi-unit housing or a retirement village: or Other buildings and structures).
Phillippa O'Connor	289.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	<p>Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should have maximum building height increased because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university. <p>[See original submission for full details]</p>	Seeks that Standard MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) is amended so that the western side of Kelburn Parade has a maximum height limit of 21m as a permitted activity.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers this dual-standard approach is unnecessary, and that the more permissive height standard in the MRZ should be enabled irrespective of scale of the development.	Seeks that standards MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) and MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) building height control are combined so that there are not different height standards for 1-3 residential units and multi unit developments.
Johanna Carter	296.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	<p>Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2...) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.
Wilma Sherwin	306.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes 14m Height Limit in Khandallah under MRZ-S2 and wants development heights kept to 11m. Heights of 14m are out of character for what is an outer suburb.	Opposes Khandallah being classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 2 (14m).
Wilma Sherwin	306.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Opposes 14m Height Limit in Khandallah under MRZ-S2 and wants development heights kept to 11m. Heights of 14m are out of character for what is an outer suburb.	Seeks that Khandallah be classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 1 (11m).
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.132	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Supports MRZ-S2 and the additional building height that it enables for retirement villages located in the Height Area 2 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However the standard fails to provide for roof variation height.	Opposes MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.133	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Supports MRZ-S2 and the additional building height that it enables for retirement villages located in the Height Area 2 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However the standard fails to provide for roof variation height.	Amend MRZ-S2 to provide for roof variation height in line with the MDRS.
Waka Kotahi	370.311	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Standard MRZ-S2 is supported as it provides for up to four storeys for multi-units.	Retain Standard MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: 1.For multi-unit...) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.407	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	MRZ-S2 is opposed as it offers two separate height standards, and should be deleted. An amendment to MRZ-S1 is sought to allow that standard to cover all areas and provide for greater height limits in areas with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.	Delete MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: 1. For multi-unit housing or a retirement village: or 2. Other buildings and structures.) in its entirety.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Detrimental impacts arising from excessive ratios of height to boundary.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.71	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZS2	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.136	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose this submission point but seeks that the changes it sought to MRZ-S2 are incorporated in this change in accordance with the MDRS.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.136	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose this submission point but seeks that the changes it sought to MRZ-S2 are incorporated in this change in accordance with the MDRS.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Metlifecare Limited	413.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support in part	Supports the 11m height limit that is proposed to be applied to sites across the Medium Density Residential zone.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Metlifecare Limited	413.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that retire village buildings should be able to be established up to three storeys (or 11m) excluding any pitched roof, rather than the Height Area 1 limit that has been applied. This is consistent with the minimum building height anticipated by the Amendment Act. This also allows the design of retirement villages to be in keeping with the surrounding area as they can have variable roof pitches.	Amend the Height Area 1 limit to read as follows: <u>11m above ground level, except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed the heights above by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more.</u>
Newtown Residents' Association	440.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that 21m height are unnecessary in Newtown. Residential streets outside the suburban centre should be zoned medium density.	Opposes Newtown being classified as HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village).
Newtown Residents' Association	440.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that 14m height are unnecessary in Newtown and should be reduced to 11m.	Opposes Newtown being classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 2 (14m).
Newtown Residents' Association	440.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that 14m height are unnecessary in Berhampore and should be reduced to 11m.	Opposes Berhampore being classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 2 (14m).
Catharine Underwood	481.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Considers that the current height control areas in Brooklyn should be removed until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed. 11 metres is too tall for most of the Brooklyn area and doesn't appear to take topography into consideration or the existing street scape. There are a few protected buildings in Brooklyn, but no character precinct compared to other suburbs. Brooklyn has some older well built houses and street scapes that are worth the protection.	Seeks that MRZ-S2 (Height control area 1) of 11m be removed in Brooklyn, until a character/heritage assessment has been completed.
Catharine Underwood	481.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Considers that the current height control areas in Brooklyn should be removed until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed. 14 metres is too tall for most of the Brooklyn area and doesn't appear to take topography into consideration or the existing street scape. There are a few protected buildings in Brooklyn, but no character precinct compared to other suburbs. Brooklyn has some older well built houses and street scapes that are worth the protection, such as McKinley Crescent, Jefferson Street and Todman Street.	Seeks that MRZ-S2 (Height control area 2) of 14m be removed in Brooklyn, until a character/heritage assessment has been completed.
James Barber	56.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that there should be no height in relation to boundary requirements for low to medium density housing.	Delete MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) in its entirety. [Inferred Decision Requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ann Mallinson	81.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Not specified	Considers that developers should not be allowed to build without a requirement not to intrude on the sunlight of neighbouring buildings. The extra heating that will be used by the affected buildings will badly affect our carbon emissions.	Not Specified.
Interprofessional Trust	96.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that recession plane requirements should be removed from the PDP.	Seeks that MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is deleted.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standard recommendations.
Richard W Keller	232.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards
Wellington City Council	266.138	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers there is a need to amend exemptions to MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to enable minor 'height in relation to boundary' intrusions.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) exemptions as follows: This standard does not apply to: a. (...) b. (...) c. (...); <u>d. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and</u> <u>e. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m measured vertically.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.186	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	As per the previous two submission points, seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards.	Supports MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.187	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	As per the previous two submission points, seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: ... c. Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site; and d. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; <u>and</u> <u>d. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Johanna Carter	296.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone. Considers that the height in relation to boundary should be modified to take into account the orientation of the boundary. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is amended to take into account boundary orientation to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development..

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
James Coyle	307.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Support	Recession planes are supported as long as building height, length and front yards feel appropriate.	Retain MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Khoi Phan	326.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Delete MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) in its entirety.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.134	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Supports MRZ-S3 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) so that it does not apply to boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, commercial and mixed use zones, and special purpose zones.
Waka Kotahi	370.312	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Support	Standard MRZ-S3 is supported as it is consistent with the MDRS.	Retain Standard MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.353	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Support	Considers that MRZ-S3 is reasonable in terms of enabling development whilst providing for some mitigation of shading on adjacent properties.	Retain MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.408	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Support in part	MRZ-S3 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) with amendment.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	Detrimental impacts arising from excessive ratios of height to boundary.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.409	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S3 should be amended to recognise the amended height limits sought through the amendment to MRZ-S1 and ensure development is suitably enabled. An amendment is also sought to remove reference to MRZ-S2 which is opposed.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where MRZ-S1 or MRZ-S2.1.a applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown in Diagram 2 below ; ... 2. For any site where MRZ-S2.1.b MRZ-S1.2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 5.6 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries; and
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.26	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	Detrimental impacts arising from excessive ratios of height to boundary.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.72	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZS3	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kirsty Woods	437.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the current standards for Medium Density Residential fail to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight. Heights from which recession planes on the southern boundary of a new development are measured should also be adjusted down to minimise loss of sun from the north of neighbouring properties.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where MRZ-S1 or MRZ-S2.1.a applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown in Diagram 2 below its northern boundary, and 2 metres vertically above ground level along its southern, eastern and western boundaries; [amendment to diagram will be required] 2. For any site where MRZ-S2.1.b applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 5 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries its northern boundary, and 2 metres verically along its eastern, western and southern boundaries; and
Newtown Residents' Association	440.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S3 should be amended, as it is too limited and does not provide enough protection from shade. It is considered that: - Buildings not directly adjacent to the park or otherwise seperated from the park boundary can still cast a shadow across an open space. - Height in relation to boundary controls do not prevent the remaining bulk of the building from casting significant shade. - The days and hours this standard applies are too restrictive. the 30% shade limit will often be reached with only minor changes to the maximum permitted height between 10am to 3pm at either of the equinoxes. - Peak usage for primary and secondary school aged children is after school, so 3pm is too early for them; the time should extend to at least 4pm and preferably 4.30pm. Carrara Park has two boundaries where adjacent properties are MRZ (14m). Despite the height in relation to boundary standard (5m x 60° recession plane) that applies to development on these properties, the park may not be protected enough from shade. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: ... 3. Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way. 4. For any site where MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2.1.a or MRZ-S2.1.b applies that is located within 60m of a site in the Natural Open Space Zone, Open Space Zone, or Sport and Active Recreation Zone: all buildings and structures must be designed and located to maintain sunlight access to a minimum of 70% of the open space site area during 10am to 4.30pm at either of the equinoxes (i.e. 21 March or 23 September) and at midwinter i.e. 23 June. ...
Jonathan Markwick	490.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that in MRZ, all height-to-boundary or recession plane controls for sites with a street frontage of less than 15m should be scrapped to ensure that these rules do not prevent development on small sites.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to remove all height-to-boundary or recession plane controls for sites with a street frontage of less than 15m
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Jonathon Markwick's submission that seeks to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Karen Serjeantson	43.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that one side of the house should be allowed a five to six metre 'breathing'/'virtual road' space.	Seeks that a yard separation of 5-6 metres is provided along one boundary (inferred decision requested).
James Barber	56.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that there should be no set-back requirements in low to medium density housing.	Delete MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) in its entirety. [Inferred Decision Requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.85	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Rejects the deletion of yard setback standards. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow
James Barber	56.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Prefers housing opening to street, as opposed to a 1.5m courtyard surrounded by high fencing.</p> <p>Setback space can otherwise be used for communal or private greenspaces.</p>	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that front and side yard requirements are removed for all developments in the MRZ. [Inferred Decision Requested]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.86	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Rejects the deletion of yard setback standards. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow
Tim Bright	75.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed.	Seeks that the yard setbacks at MRZ-S4 are reinstated for developments of one to three units. [Inferred decision requested]
Nico Maiden	77.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support in part	Considers smaller front setbacks will allow for bigger backyards and better streetscapes.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified with respect to 1-3 units, with no front yard requirement.
Nico Maiden	77.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers smaller front setbacks will allow for bigger backyards and better streetscapes.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) with respect to 4 or more units, with the front yard requirement reduced to 1 metre or less.
David Stephen	82.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the front and side boundary setbacks in the MRZ should be reinstated.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Hugh Good	90.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support	Considers that Medium Density front and side yard setbacks should not be reinstated.	Supports removal of front and side yards in the Medium Density Residential Zone.
Ian Law	101.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the front and side boundary setbacks in the MRZ should be reinstated.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units. [Inferred decision requested].
Pam Wilson	120.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units [Inferred decision requested].
AdamsonShaw	137.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S4 should be amended as the current standards in the Operative District Plan are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that the front setback is 1.5 metres, or 10 metres less half the width of the road, which ever is the lesser.
AdamsonShaw	137.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S4 should be amended as the current standards in the Operative District Plan are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that there is no side or rear yard setback requirement except that, a minimum width of 1 metre must be maintained between buildings where a residential building (other than an accessory building) on an adjoining site is sited less than 1 metre from the boundary.
Janice Young	140.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the front and side yard setbacks should be reinstated in the MRZ.	Seeks that the front and side yard set-backs at MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) are reinstated for developments of 1 to 3 units.
Grant Buchan	143.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support	Considers that front and side setbacks should be removed. Front yards rarely get used as living space and the side areas of buildings is simply dead space. Many of the housing typologies that have existed, without complaint, in Wellington for 100 or more years have directly fronted the street or shared walls with adjacent houses or other buildings.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified (with no Front or Side setbacks for MRZ houses of 1-3 storeys). [Inferred decision requested].
David Stevens	151.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Opposes the removal of front and side yard setbacks for all MRZ and other developments. Considers that existing homeowners have a fundamental right to sunlight and reasonable privacy on their sections. Without front and side yard setbacks, Medium Density development will impact on the quality of life for these existing homeowners, as well as having a potentially significant reduction on property values.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units. [Inferred decision requested].
Vivienne Morrell	155.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that more of a transition zone than 1m is allowed for between Character Precincts or Heritage areas and other zones.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards
Zaffa Christian	174.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, which allows the ability to be able to build to the fence/boundary line. Opposes this plan based on the recommendations made by Michael Fowler that one metre needs to be maintained in order to minimise damage in an earthquake. Building this close with high-medium rise buildings, also contravenes the sunshine clause currently being upheld by the environmental commission.	Opposes MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, in relation to developments of 1-3 household units.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jon Gaupset	175.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Opposes MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, which allows the ability to be able to build to the fence/boundary line.</p> <p>Opposes this plan based on the recommendations made by Michael Fowler that one metre needs to be maintained in order to minimise damage in an earthquake.</p> <p>Building this close with high-medium rise buildings, also contravenes the sunshine clause currently being upheld by the environmental commission.</p>	Opposes MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, in relation to developments of 1-3 household units.
Avryl Bramley	202.40	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that this has been the case in the past and has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	<p>Seeks that MRZ-S4 is amended to require boundary setbacks.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Avryl Bramley	202.41	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that this has been the case in the past and has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	<p>Seeks reinstatement of side yards in residential areas.</p> <p>[Inferred reinstatement of front and side yards for 1 - 3 units in MRZ-S4].</p>
Monique Zorn	205.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Considers that the removal of front yard standards reduces the ability to meet the objectives and policies in the MRZ.</p> <p>11m high developments on front boundaries are more appropriate in central city, centres and inner residential areas.</p> <p>Construction of buildings on the front boundary of a property creates risks and hazards for footpath users, such as doors opening onto streets and garages opening directly onto paths.</p> <p>Buildings on the front boundaries undermines the streets amenity.</p> <p>The residential design guide leans positively towards a landscaped and active front yard, not an absence of a front yard.</p> <p>The side yard standard has the effect of allowing 11m maximum height to be closer to the neighbouring property, reducing neighbours residential amenity.</p> <p>The removal of the side yard standard also reduces the practical utility area in which to put rubbish bins, bikes or household goods, rear property access, maintenance of side properties without trespassing and may reduce emergency service access.</p> <p>The removal of side yard standards changes the way utilities can be configured and laid.</p> <p>The removal of this side yard standard of 1m across all residential zones will compromise residential amenity and good neighbourly relations.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that front and side yard requirements apply for 1 - 3 residential units.
Russell Taylor	224.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that multi unit developments need to be encouraged	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) not apply to multi unit developments.
Richard W Keller	232.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards
Victoria Stace	235.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that yard setbacks enable adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wilma Sherwin	306.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the front and side boundary setbacks in the MRZ should be reinstated.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units.
James Coyle	307.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that resource consent should be required when front yards are larger than 4m and less than 1.5m for all building types.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to require resource consents for front yards larger than 4m and less than 1.5m
James Coyle	307.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that front yard design be specific depending on the orientation of the street.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S4 should be amended to have an exception for low decks or eaves. Both the front & side yard requirements are more restrictive than current rules. There are also no exceptions for low decks or eaves. A wall 1m clear of the boundary with an eave up to 600 wide above is consistent with other regulatory requirements, so keeping the side yard requirement but allowing a 600 eave (as at GRUZ-S4) would be reasonable, as would that provision's allowance for low decks.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; and b. Fences or standalone walls; and c. <u>Uncovered decks no more than 500mm in height above ground level; and</u> d. <u>Eaves up to 600mm in width.</u>
Khoi Phan	326.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: Yard Minimum depth Front 1.5 metres <u>1.0 metre</u> Side 1 metre <u>0.5 metre</u> Rear 1 metre <u>0.5 metre</u> (excluded on corner sites)
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.88	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Oppose	Seeks side and rear setbacks from the rail corridor for health and safety reasons. Setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that There should be enough space in the side-yard, or backyard, to allow for the placement of a domestic emergency water tank, along with space to sit and enjoy the outdoors. A 1,000 litre tank is likely to be 1m wide, and the PDP proposes 1m side-yard setback requirements only. Sufficient space is needed to be able to walk past a water tank.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to allow for a 1m wide emergency water tank to fit in a side yard.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.135	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support	Supports MRZ-S4 and the boundary setbacks which reflect the setback density standard of the Act.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested										
Waka Kotahi	370.313	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support in part	Standard MRZ-S4 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Standard MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) and seeks amendment.										
Waka Kotahi	370.314	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that all boundary setbacks should have immediate legal effect to align with the MDRS requirements, and to avoid confusion where boundary setbacks are applied from both the operative and district plan. Notes that the intention of the NPS-UD is to enable urban environments to evolve and change, enabled by the national standards.	Seeks to amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to ensure it has immediate legal effect.										
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.354	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the boundary setbacks do not provide for efficient use of land, and will continue to perpetuate the poor land use practice of infill without regard to long term liveability. The submitter seeks that the requirement for a frontage setback be removed, along with side yard requirements. The submitter seeks a greater rear yard set back which they consider will help get our medium and high density zones on a track towards a better, more efficient yet useable urban form for the years to come.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to: - Remove the minimum depth front yard requirement - Remove the side yard requirement for the first 20m from the street frontage to the back. - Increase the rear yard requirement to 8m.										
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.410	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support	MRZ-S4 is supported.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.										
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.119	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor under MRZ-S4, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines.</p> <p>KiwiRail consider that a 5m setback would be more appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the rear of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. An increased setback would provide for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher rise structures and for the safer use of outdoor deck areas at height. This in turn fosters visual amenity, as lineside properties can be regularly maintained.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows:</p> <p>1. Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Yard Boundary</u></th> <th>Minimum depth</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Front</td> <td>1.5 metres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Side</td> <td>1 metre</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rear</td> <td>1 metre (excluded on corner sites)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Rail corridor</u></td> <td><u>5 metres</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Yard Boundary</u>	Minimum depth	Front	1.5 metres	Side	1 metre	Rear	1 metre (excluded on corner sites)	<u>Rail corridor</u>	<u>5 metres</u>
<u>Yard Boundary</u>	Minimum depth														
Front	1.5 metres														
Side	1 metre														
Rear	1 metre (excluded on corner sites)														
<u>Rail corridor</u>	<u>5 metres</u>														
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow										
Donna Yule	421.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Opposes having no residential minimum boundaries space of at least 1 metre.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the geographical location of each individual suburb, its terrain and orientation to the sun. For suburbs that are built in a north south direction with hills either side and the main housing is on the flat, any 3 storey building will cast a significant shadow over many properties.</p> <p>Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows.</p> <p>Added to that no space between properties, no outside areas to enjoy a little privacy. These suburbs will become sunless undesirable transitional suburbs where people will only stay a short time until they can afford to move elsewhere with sun & outdoor space.</p>	Not specified.										

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association	429.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that one major recent decision by the Council has been to remove the building front and side setback requirements in the current District Plan. Permitting buildings onto the boundary is a significant loss of neighbourhood amenity and is likely to further reduce the natural light next to high buildings.	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m sideyard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Meredith Robertshawe	444.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Seeks that MRZ-S4 has front and side yard boundaries retained to retain existing streetscape and visual amenity effects; and minimise potential dominance, lack of privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites. I seek the reinstatement of front and side yard boundaries for: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; b. Fences or standalone walls. Considers that this will ensure that space between separate buildings will be retained, and increase the amenity value for neighbourhoods where medium density building is allowed.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to reinstate the front and side yard set-backs for developments of 1 to 3 units.
Meredith Robertshawe	444.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Seeks that MRZ-S4 has front and side yard boundaries retained to retain existing streetscape and visual amenity effects; and minimise potential dominance, lack of privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites. Seeks the reinstatement of front and side yard boundaries for: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; b. Fences or standalone walls. Considers that this will ensure that space between separate buildings will be retained, and increase the amenity value for neighbourhoods where medium density building is allowed.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; and b. Fences or standalone walls. ...
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend front setbacks to two metres as per the Operative District Plan.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary Setbacks) as follows: Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below: Front - 1.5 metres 2 metres [Inferred decision requested]
Catharine Underwood	481.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that the removal of front and side yard setbacks for medium density residential standards compliant development will negatively affect the street scape of suburban Wellington.	Seeks that front and side yard setbacks in MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) apply to residential units that comply with the medium density residential standards.
Catharine Underwood	481.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that all new buildings in the suburbs should have a minimum set back of 2m to give room for a green corridor. Side yards are a good place for rubbish bins, compost bins or sheds to store bikes and other toys. This practice should be adopted for the sake of climate change, the biodiversity crisis and emissions off setting.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to have a minimum setbacks of 2m and at least 1.5m in the inner city.
Wellington City Council	266.140	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Amend	Considers it is necessary to add exemption to standard for uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height about ground level and eaves up to 600mm in width.	Amend MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as follows: <u>This standard does not apply to:</u> <u>a. Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height above ground level; and</u> <u>b. Eaves up to 600mm in width.</u> <u>c. Multi-unit housing; and</u> <u>d. Retirement villages.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
AdamsonShaw Limited	FS1.1	MRZ-S5	Support	<p>The exemptions proposed by Wellington City Council in their submission are similar to the existing exemptions to site coverage in the Operative District Plan. However the exemption for uncovered decks and uncovered structures should be increased to being "no more than 1m in height about ground level" and "eaves up to 1m in width" as this is the current exemptions under the ODP.</p> <p>Given the topography of Wellington, most decks are greater than 500mm. Decks are used to provide flat outdoor living space and they should not count towards site coverage where they are less than 1m.</p>	<p>Amend / Amend MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) by adding the following:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>This standard does not apply to:</u></p> <p><u>a. Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 1m in height above ground level; and</u> <u>b. Eaves up to 1m in width.</u></p>
Johanna Carter	296.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Amend	<p>Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.</p> <p>Considers that the building coverage requirement is going from 35% to 50% is a significant increase in this zone and will have a huge impact of the feeling of openness in the area increasing overall building bulk.</p> <p>Considers that either retaining the 35% coverage but allow for a 15% deck coverage under particular conditions is a better option.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) is amended from 50% to 35% to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development. An additional 15% for decks could be permitted in particular conditions.</p>
Khoi Phan	326.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	<p>Amend MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as follows:</p> <p>1. Maximum building coverage must not exceed 50% <u>70%</u> of the net site area.</p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.136	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Support	Supports MRZ-S5 and the maximum building coverage which reflects the building coverage density standard of the Act.	Retain MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.315	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Support	Standard MRZ-S5 is supported as it is consistent with the MDRS.	Retain Standard MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.411	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Support	MRZ-S5 is supported.	Retain MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as notified.
Metlifecare Limited	413.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Support	Supports the maximum building coverage is 50% of the net site area.	Retain MRZ-S5 (Building Coverage) as notified.
Richard W Keller	232.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Amend	Considers that the addition of the Coalition for More Homes' alternative recommendations for outdoor living space and green space should be adopted.	Amend MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space per unit) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards
Johanna Carter	296.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Amend	<p>Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.137	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S6.	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.138	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Amend	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S6. If retirement villages are regulated by the standard, the standard should be amended to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard	Should MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) be amended to be subject to retirement villages following notification, seeks that the MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) is amended as follows: <u>For retirement units, clause 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications:</u> <u>a. the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u> <u>b. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u>
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Amend	Considers that bin storage should have a specific and acknowledged location on site that is outside an outdoor living space.	Amend MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as follows: 1. A residential unit at ground floor level must have an outdoor living space that is at least 20 square metres and that comprises ground floor, balcony, patio, or roof terrace space that: a. Where located at ground level, has no dimension less than 3 metres; b. Where provided in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace, is at least 8 square metres and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 metres; c. Is accessible from the residential unit; d. May be: i. grouped cumulatively by area in 1 communally accessible location; or ii. located directly adjacent to the unit; and e. Is free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing (<u>including waste facilities</u>) and maneuvering areas.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.355	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support	Considers that provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.412	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support in part	MRZ-S6 is generally supported and it is acknowledged that that this standard is directly taken from the MDRS, however seek that the standard is more enabling, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.413	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Oppose	Considers that MRZ-S6 should be amended to be more enabling. MRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling outdoor living space requirement which is considered appropriate for all residential units as it provides sufficient onsite space and amenity. Amendments are sought to replace MRZ-S6 with MRZ-S13 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) including the exclusion for multiunit housing and retirement villages and replace with MRZS13 which should then be deleted.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.31	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Oppose	Opposed as existing provision for outdoor living space delivers a better outcome for residents	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	FS117.30	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Oppose	Opposed as existing provision for outdoor living space delivers a better outcome for residents.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.137	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.137	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Metlifecare Limited	413.35	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support	Considers the outdoor living space (per unit) and outlook space (per unit) requirements do not apply to retirement village development. This appropriately recognises that these types of developments are designed for elderly residents and generally have communal outdoor spaces (which are maintained by the village provider) rather than individual backyard or outdoor living areas that would need to be maintained by the residents.	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.
AdamsonShaw	137.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S7 is one of the main limitations to intensification of development and dwelling density in the established residential areas as the requirement to provide a 4m deep outlook space is too much. Considers that the depth of the outlook space should be reduced to 3m so that the complying outdoor living space can double as outlook space.	Amend MRZ-S7.3.a (Outlook space (per unit)) so that, if possible, the depth of the outlook space is reduced to 3m from 4m.
AdamsonShaw	137.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Support in part	Considers that the 4m width requirement is ok in MRZ-S7.	Retain the MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) 4m width requirement as notified.
Johanna Carter	296.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.139	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Support	The RVA supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S7.	Retain MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.140	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Amend	The RVA supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S7. If the standard is amended and retirement villages are regulated by this standard, the standard should ensure that outlook space requirements are provided that are appropriate for retirement villages.	Should MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) be amended to be subject to retirement villages following notification, seeks that the MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) is amended as follows: <u>For retirement units, clauses 1 – 9 apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.356	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Support	Considers that provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.414	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Support in part	MRZ-S7 is generally supported and it is acknowledged that that this standard is directly taken from the MDRS, however seek that the standard is more enabling, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.415	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Oppose	Considers that MRZ-S7 should be amended to be more enabling. MRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling provision which provides sufficient outlook space and is considered to be appropriate for all residential units regardless of the number on a site.	Delete MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) including the exclusion for multiunit housing and retirement villages and replace with MRZS14 which should then be deleted.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard W Keller	232.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Amend	Considers that the addition of the Coalition for More Homes' alternative recommendations for outdoor living space and green space should be adopted.	Amend MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards
Phillippa O'Connor	289.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Not specified	Considers that 'landscaped area' could benefit from a definition.	Seeks clarity on the interpretation of 'landscaped area' as it relates to standard MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area).
Johanna Carter	296.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.143	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S9.	Retain MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.144	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Amend	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S9. If the standard is amended and retirement villages are regulated by this standard, the standard should be amended to apply to retirement units.	Should MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) be amended to be subject to retirement villages following notification, seeks that MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) to only apply to retirement units.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.358	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Support	Considers that MRZ-S9 will help provide a biophilic environment for residents, along with benefits to biodiversity, pleasantness and amenity, as well as helping reduce the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Retain MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.417	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Support	MRZ-S9 is supported.	Retain MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.
Metlifecare Limited	413.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Support	The submitter states that it is appropriate that no landscape area standard applies to retirement village development. Retirement villages have well landscaped and maintained grounds for residents. Regulating this on a per unit basis would be inappropriate, and would not enable the efficient use of the site.	Retain MRZ-S9 (Landscaped areas) as notified.
Rod Halliday	25.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Amend	Considers that 30% permeable surface is too high, considering the MDRZ allows for 50% site coverage and other standards require 20% landscape area of grass or plants.	Seeks that the first point in MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) be amended to require a minimum of 20% of net surface area be permeable.
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Oppose	Oppose submitter seeking to reduce permeable surface from 30% to 20%. This is because residents below the site and downstream will be adversely affected. Housing development on Glenside West slopes should be hydrologically neutral. Because this is almost certainly not achievable, we oppose any high or medium density housing development in this area at all. The Boffa Miskell Upper Stebbings Valley Wellington Landscape and Ecology Analysis report (2018) is very pertinent when considering this development. This report identified Glenside West as having remnant forest of high ecological values, worthy of protection.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission is disallowed to retain appropriate standard for permeable surfaces that avoids any increase in flooding or risk of slips i.e 30% permeable surface or higher. [Refer to further submission for full decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heidi Snelson	FS24.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Oppose	<p>Submitter is seeking to reduce mitigation requirements and responsibilities around hydraulic neutrality and permeable surface requirements in the case of storm water management at a unprecedented time of storm water damage in Wellington.</p> <p>Developments should undertake more mitigation not less in all areas given climate change. Especially those posing more risk, such as steep hillsides, abutting/above key infrastructure (roading, power, water, railway), and significant streams, such as at the sites of the current and planned developments in Churton Park and Glenside West.</p> <p>The Glenside West development area is downstream of both detention structures, on extremely steep hillsides, above Porirua Stream, directly above Middleton Road (State Highway 1 motorway detour route) and the North Island railway line (which runs alongside and over the Porirua Stream). This development area must be specifically required to achieve Hydraulic Neutrality. Be that through specific technological infrastructure in build design and water catchment, significant permeable surface requirements/planting. Through Large Lot Residential Only in Glenside West.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed to ensure strict adherence to hydraulic neutrality in Glenside West Development Area, and Stebbings Valley / Reedy Block Development Area. Seeks minimum standard of hydraulic neutrality required and corresponding requirement of high level of permeable surface mitigations.</p> <p>Seeks that Glenside West be designated Large Lot Residential only.</p>
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Anne Lian	132.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Ingo Schommer	133.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Olivier Reuland	134.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Grant Buchan	143.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Braydon White	146.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	Supports requirement for permeability of 30-40% of the site.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area), such as that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Jill Ford	163.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Amos Mann	172.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Patrick Wilkes	173.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pete Gent	179.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
James Harris	180.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Peter Nunns	196.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Richard W Keller	232.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface areas) to require a minimum of 30 – 40% permeability .
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Wellington City Council	266.141	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Oppose in part	Considers that given this is not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this standard in the THW chapter. Note: MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface area) and MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) are to be relocated to THW – see new THW-P6 and THW-R7.	Delete MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) in its entirety. Consequential renumbering of standards MRZ-S11 and MRZ-S14 to reflect change in numbering. Consequential update to references in notification clauses as required.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	Considers that the definitions lead to unnecessary restriction on site layout and design as currently drafted.	Seeks clarity on the whether the permeable surface area standard MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) is inclusive of landscaped area.
Johanna Carter	296.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.145	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S10.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.359	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	Considers that MRZ-S10 will help to reduce the rate and amount of stormwater run off.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) permeability standard, such as that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.418	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	MRZ-S10 is supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.419	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S10 should be amended so that that reference to multi-unit housing is deleted, as this concept is not supported.	Amend MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Multi-unit housing; and b. Retirement villages.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new MRZ permeability standard, such as that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
David Cadman	398.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new MRZ permeability standard, such as that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Emma Osborne	410.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Metlifecare Limited	413.39	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	The submitter states that no permeable surface area standard applies to retirement village development. This is appropriate as it will enable the efficient use of the site.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.
Luke Stewart	422.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).
Rod Halliday	25.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that the maximum height of 2m for fences and standalone walls is too low.	Seeks that MRZ-S11.2.b (Fences and standalone walls) be amended to allow a fence to be 1.5m in height before the 50% visually transparency requirement applies.
Rod Halliday	25.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that the maximum height for fences and standalone walls needs to specifically exclude retaining walls.	Seeks that MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) be amended to exclude retaining walls from maximum height limits of fences and standalone walls.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.188	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Support in part	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ.FENZ therefore seeks an amendment to provide for this.	Supports MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.189	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. FENZ therefore seeks an amendment to provide for this.	Amend MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: 1. Any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed : a. <u>Exceed</u> a maximum height of 2m above ground level where within 1m of any side or rear boundary; b. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u> 2. On a front boundary or in a front boundary setback any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed : a. <u>Exceed</u> a maximum height of 2m above ground level; and b. Any part of a fence or standalone wall above 1.2m in height must be 50% visually transparent for its entire length, as shown in Diagram 4 below. c. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u>
Johanna Carter	296.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.
Johanna Carter	296.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S11 (Fences) needs to allow building along busy roads to prevent traffic noise.	Seeks amendment to MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to allow for provision for close-board fences along busy roads.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.146	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Support in part	Supports the 2m height standard for fences/walls but considers an exclusion is required for temporary fences/walls e.g. for noise mitigation during construction.	Retain MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.147	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Supports the 2m height standard for fences/walls but considers an exclusion is required for temporary fences/walls e.g. for noise mitigation during construction.	Amend MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to exclude temporary fences/walls from the standard.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.360	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m in height detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. Seeks that fences should be no higher than 1.2m in height at the street frontage. Add provision for 2m height where the height above 1.2m is 50% visually transparent on fences abutting public walkways.	Amend MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to require fences on the front boundary are no greater than 1.2m in height.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.361	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m in height detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. Seeks that fences should be no higher than 1.2m in height at the street frontage. Add provision for 2m height where the height above 1.2m is 50% visually transparent on fences abutting public walkways.	Amend MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to require that fences abutting a public walkway be no more than 2m in height with the area above 1.2m being 50% visually transparent.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.55	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Oppose	Concerned that the height of fences at which they are allowed as permitted activities should be lowered. High fences that cannot be seen through, are a public space problem for safety reasons.	Seeks amendment to standard MRZ-S11 (Fences and Standalone walls).
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.56	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Concerned that the height of fences at which they are allowed as permitted activities should be lowered. High fences that cannot be seen through, are a public space problem for safety reasons.	Seeks that MRZ-S11 is amended so that the fences up to 1m can be built with any material along a boundary with public space, and where higher than 1 metre they must be of a material that allows pedestrians to see through it from the adjacent path.
Property Council New Zealand	338.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Amend	Considers that minimum unit sizes, coupled with increased height density, run the risk of buildings that are smaller in floor space but greater in height. The overall design outcome should be considered so that adverse design outcomes for small, skinny buildings with less total floor space be avoided.	Seeks that overall design outcomes be considered when setting minimum unit sizes in MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.420	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Support in part	MRZ-S12 is supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.421	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S12 should be amended to allow for smaller floor areas for studio units and for simplicity, a minimum floor area for 1 or bedrooms.	Amend MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) as follows: Residential Unit Type Minimum Net Floor Area a. Studio unit 35m² <u>30m²</u> 2. 1 or more bedroom unit 40m ² 3. 2+ bedroom unit 55m²
Metlifecare Limited	413.40	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Support	The submitter states these provisions apply to multi-unit housing, not retirement villages. This is supported. It appropriately recognises that retirement villages contain a range of different units, including dementia and care units and/or serviced apartment units which are generally smaller than residential units established in multi-unit housing developments, due to the nature of the residents and their particular needs.	Retain MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.71	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-S12 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability for developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes are not required where there are three or fewer residential units on a site (in accordance with the medium density residential standards). The submitter considers it is inconsistent to then provide minimum unit sizes for multi-unit housing and will create perverse incentives for developers. - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in HRZ-P3 to provide a range of housing sizes.	Delete MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) in its entirety.
Rod Halliday	25.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	Considers that communal space minimum area and dimensions would benefit from more clarification, namely a note section or an example. The assumption is that the minimum area of 10m ² is cumulative, but that the minimum dimensions remain 8m.	Clarify the intent of MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) by adding an example or a clarification note relating to communal space minimum area and dimensions.
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Clarify MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) "Minimum Dimension" - so that for communal shared living spaces an 8m dimension is required at only one portion of the outdoor living space, with the other dimension able to be smaller than this. i.e. not an 8m x 8m space.
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks amendment to HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) to allow 10m ² minimum area to be achieved with alternative dimensions of 5m x 2m, or 3.2m x 3.2m.
Johanna Carter	296.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S1 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	<p>Considers that the outdoor living space for multi-unit housing in MRZ-S13 has large requirements. The requirement for only 10 square metres of communal outdoor living space per every 5 units fits oddly with both the much larger requirement per unit if the space is private and also the 8m minimum dimension requirement.</p> <p>An 8m x 8m area, would in theory be sufficient communal space for 30 residential units with 4 square metres 'spare' increasing the allowance 5 square metres (matching the studio/1 bedroom private allowance) would leave the minimum area as adequate for 12 residential units.</p> <p>There are also sites within this zone where the site width is less than 8m.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows:</p> <p>Living Space Type ... b. Communal i. For every 5 units <u>unit</u></p> <p>Minimum area - 40m² <u>5m²</u></p> <p>Minimum dimension - 8m <u>except where site width is less than 8m. In that situation an area the full width of the site and 8m deep is acceptable.</u></p>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.362	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Support	Considers that provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.422	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Oppose	Character Precincts are opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Replace MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) with MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) and delete MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing).
Metlifecare Limited	413.41	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Support	Considers that these provisions do not apply to retirement villages. This is supported. It is appropriate to recognise the needs of residents are different to those in a multi-unit housing development.	Retain MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multiunit housing) as notified.
Johanna Carter	296.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S14	Amend	<p>Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that MRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi unit housing) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.363	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S14	Support	Considers that provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain MRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.423	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S14	Oppose	The submitter seeks that this standard replace MRZ-S7 as the level of outlook space proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Replace MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) with MRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) and delete MRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing)
Metlifecare Limited	413.42	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S14	Support	Considers that these provisions do not apply to retirement villages. This is supported. It is appropriate to recognise the needs of residents are different to those in a multi-unit housing development.	Retain MRZ-S12 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-S1 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.
Khoi Phan	326.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	<p>Amend MRZ-PREC01-S1 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed a maximum height of 2m <u>1.5m</u> above ground level within 1m of any site boundary.</p> <p>Except that: a. Any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures along a road boundary, must not exceed a maximum height of 1m above ground level within 1m of the boundary.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.424	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S1	Oppose	Character Precincts are opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-S1 (Fences and standalone walls) in its entirety.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.80	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-S1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-S1 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain MRZ-PREC01-S2 (Maximum height of an accessory building) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.425	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S2	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC01-S2 (Maximum height of an accessory building) in its entirety.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.11	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S2	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S2	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S2	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.11	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC01-S2	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.81	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC01-S2	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC01-S2 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC01-S2 (Maximum height of an accessory building) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.317	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Not specified	Takes a neutral position to standards that relate to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct.	Neutral position on Standard MRZ-PREC03-S1 (Boundary setbacks) and seeks to retain standard.
Waka Kotahi	370.318	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Support	Standard MRZ-PREC03-S1 is generally supported.	Retain Standard MRZ-PREC03-S1 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.426	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S1 (Boundary setbacks) in its entirety.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.12	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.12	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.82	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-S1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S1 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.319	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Not specified	Takes a neutral position to standards that relate to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct.	Neutral position on Standard MRZ-PREC03-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) and seeks to retain standard.
Waka Kotahi	370.320	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Support	Standard MRZ-PREC03-S2 is generally supported.	Retain Standard MRZ-PREC03-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.427	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) in its entirety.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.13	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.13	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

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

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S4	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S4	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.15	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC03-S4	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay).Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.85	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S4	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-S4 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S4 (Minimum residential unit size) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.430	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S5 (Outlook space) in its entirety.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value,for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC03-S5	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay).Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.86	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-S5 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form. The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S5 (Outlook space) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.364	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m in height detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. Seeks that fences should be no higher than 1.2m in height at the street frontage. Add provision for 2m height where the height above 1.2m is 50% visually transparent on fences abutting public walkways.	Amend MRZ-PREC03-S6 (Fences and standalone walls) to require fences on the front boundary are no greater than 1.2m in height.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.365	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m in height detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. Seeks that fences should be no higher than 1.2m in height at the street frontage. Add provision for 2m height where the height above 1.2m is 50% visually transparent on fences abutting public walkways.	Amend MRZ-PREC03-S6 (Fences and standalone walls) to require that fences abutting a public walkway be no more than 2m in height with the area above 1.2m being 50% visually transparent.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.431	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S6 (Fences and standalone walls) in its entirety.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

Residential - High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.87	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Support	<p>Supports the MRZ-PREC03-S6 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.</p> <p>The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.</p>	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S6 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.
Abby and Amos Leota	27.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the zoning of the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) as a High Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Considers that the walking access of the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) to basic amenities is poor. Linden Shops is over 800m (of hillside) walking distance and access to Keneperu Station is difficult.</p> <p>Considers that the two road entry/exit points (Coates Avenue and Handyside Street via Collins Ave) to service the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) have poor visibility, are narrow, and only one side of both streets have a footpath.</p> <p>The Coates Avenue intersection has issues with the pedestrian crossing safety.</p> <p>Considers that the high-density rating of the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) is inconsistent with other urban areas. Other locations in Linden which are within 5-10 minutes from a railway station are zoned differently e.g. Handyside Street with better access to amenities and the station and more suitable for high-density is 11m.</p>	Seeks that the northern Linden, Tawa area is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Area [Inferred decision requested].
Abby and Amos Leota	27.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that there are no available provisions for additional Open Space zones in this proposed high density Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) apart from Wall Park which is on a hillside and adjacent to the new Kenepuru Link Road to Transmission Gully.</p> <p>This area is surrounded by the Kenepuru industrial area and Transmission Gully, impacting beautification, and increasing noise and air pollution.</p> <p>A lack of Open Space impacts the quality of life for residents.</p>	Not specified.
Gregory Webber	33.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	Not against higher density housing in Newtown in specific areas that have a lesser impact on surrounding residents.	Not specified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.217	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Gregory Webber	33.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that there is a lack of specificity regarding existing residents' right to sunlight (on Green Street). This could adversely affect house values.	Not specified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.218	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greg Coyle	39.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that any building over two storeys will shade roof-top solar panels and make these useless. Therefore written approval should be required if development is occurring next to a site with solar panels.	Seeks that neighbours' approval is required for any development next to a site that has roof top solar panels.
Owen Watson	51.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Graham Mexted (No 2) Family Trust	66.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes HRZ zoning of 130 Main Road, Tawa. The building has been office space from the Tawa Borough Council use and rated commercially (rates & water) i.e. non-residential. It is currently used commercially as a cafe. At no time has the current owner used the building for residential use, as the Tawa Borough Council converted it into offices.	Rezone 130 Main Road, Tawa from High Density Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
George North	67.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Supports housing densification in Wellington. Urban sprawl costs the city far more than dense buildings due to bus lines, pipes and powerlines. The character of Wellington comes from the people, and the people are priced out and stressed from rent prices. Denser housing will allow a modern history to develop, rather than trapping Wellington in the past.	Retain High Density Residential Zone chapter as notified.
Judith Graykowski	80.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ new six-storey buildings will make existing neighbours' houses shadier, damper, less healthy, and unpleasant to live in.	Not specified.
Judith Graykowski	80.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that design requirements for multi-unit residential developments should be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience. Considers that the provisions for recession planes, privacy, outlook space and solar access (HRZ-S3, HRZ-S14, and HRZ-S15) are very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the HRZ can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.
Judith Graykowski	80.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that allowing 21 metres height to adjoin designated character areas could create towering buildings that dominate the neighbourhood.	Seeks that more of a transition zone is allowed for at the boundary of Character Precincts or Heritage Areas. [Inferred decision requested].
Aro Valley Community Council	87.36	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that the proposed HRZ zoning will counterintuitively slow down development in Aro Valley. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that land zoned High Density Residential Zone is zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.40	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that 39 Palmer Street should be considered Character Precinct as it is contiguous with four cottages 32-38 Aro Street that are listed Heritage buildings. They were built on the same section and to the same plans in 1879 and not subdivided until 1925.</p> <p>Boffa Miskell Pre 1930 Review recommends research into Potential Historic Heritage and inclusion in areas of Contiguous Character.</p>	<p>Seeks that 39 Palmer Street be considered as being an area of Contiguous Character to Items 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.41	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.38	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that 41 Palmer Street should not be zone High Density Residential as it is contiguous with four cottages 32-38 Aro Street that are listed Heritage buildings. They were built on the same section and to the same plans in 1879 and not subdivided until 1925.</p> <p>Boffa Miskell Pre 1930 Review recommends research into Potential Historic Heritage and inclusion in areas of Contiguous Character.</p>	<p>Seeks that 41 Palmer Street be considered as being an area of Contiguous Character to Items 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.42	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.39	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that 43 Palmer Street should not be zone High Density Residential as it is contiguous with four cottages 32-38 Aro Street that are listed Heritage buildings. They were built on the same section and to the same plans in 1879 and not subdivided until 1925.</p> <p>Boffa Miskell Pre 1930 Review recommends research into Potential Historic Heritage and inclusion in areas of Contiguous Character.</p>	<p>Seeks that 43 Palmer Street be considered as being an area of Contiguous Character to Items 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.43	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.40	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes zoning of all parcels on Boston Terrace as HRZ because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Heritage listed building needs protection on the street. - There is a lack of access for construction vehicles for future development. - There are traffic issues for vehicles accessing Aro Street. 	Seeks that the sites on Boston Terrace are zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.44	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.41	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes zoning of properties directly North and South of 95A Aro Street as HRZ.</p> <p>The site is a Supported Residential Care Facility (Argo Trust) and must not have impeded access to Sunlight / Daylight from the North or East, or it will not be able to function.</p>	<p>Seeks that the sites to the north and east of 95A Aro Street are zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.45	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
M J & P B Murtagh	98.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes unregulated high rise development for Mount Victoria as defined as the suburb is already densely populated. Considers that 21m height limit is not a good idea. Considers that Mount Victoria is densely populated, has high vehicle traffic with lack of parking, and new zoning does not account for these factors. [See original submission for further detail]	Seeks that high rise development in Mount Victoria is more strictly regulated.
Tawa Business Group	107.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of 130 Main Road, Tawa as High Density Residential. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Rezone 130 Main Road, Tawa from High Density Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Dennis Michael Hunt	119.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that allowing 21m high buildings to be built on smallish sites in the HRZ block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road could destroy the ambience of this area and would be short-sighted.	Seeks that 21m high buildings on small isolated sites should not be allowed in the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road while refined design concepts are still being established. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dennis Michael Hunt	119.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that the HRZ block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road would suit apartment style living for students and city workers generally without children (because of the steep terrain).</p> <p>Sun and park-like areas should be prioritised and that exposed decks at higher levels in apartment buildings are not often used primarily due to wind.</p> <p>The steep terrain is advantageous for the creation of sheltered, sunny outdoor areas but would still require at least 30 metres between six-storey apartment blocks on the north east facing slope.</p>	Seeks that a well-thought out vision is developed for accommodation which acknowledges densification and emphasizes design refinement in the HRZ block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road.
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Anne Lian	132.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Ingo Schommer	133.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Olivier Reuland	134.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Grant Buchan	143.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Braydon White	146.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Wants to see the zone more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Seeks that the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Jocelyn Brandon	158.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to allow greater intensification in the lower Kelburn area.	<p>Seeks that greater intensification is not enabled in the lower Kelburn area.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Jill Ford	163.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Amos Mann	172.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Patrick Wilkes	173.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Pete Gent	179.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Dennis Foot	193.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that there are many available sites for intensive high rise housing should be located on Te Aro flat and main transport routes.	Seeks that intensive high density residential housing should be located on Te Aro flat and main transport routes.
Michael O'Rourke	194.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the Government and main opposition party have mandated MRZ changes to the District Plan to reduce the amount of land zoned for High Density Residential Housing.	Seeks that the amount of land proposed as high density residential outside the CBD and rapid transit hubs, should be decreased.
Michael O'Rourke	194.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Opposes the strip south of the Basin Reserve up Adelaide Road to John Street being zoned as CCZ. Notes that by various measures, including the Wellington Regional Council City Zone for public transport ending at the Basin, this area is not the CBD. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Amend the mapping to rezone the Adelaide Road spine as High Density Residential Zone.
Michael O'Rourke	194.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the amount of land in Newtown zoned as HRZ. Considers that the premise of making most of Newtown high density is that it is 10 minutes walk from the CBD - which is false.	Seeks that the amount of land proposed as high density residential in Newtown, especially more than 10 or 15 minutes from the CBD, should be decreased.
Michael O'Rourke	194.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that HRZ four storey or 21m high buildings will negate most of the liveability rules about outdoor space, glazing, boundaries, sun angle boundary heights and site coverage. Considers that we need to minimise the spread of individual high rise building pockets. [Inferred reason given].	Seeks that high rise buildings are concentrated in zones already high (the CBD and faded warehouse spine in lower Adelaide Road).
Michael O'Rourke	194.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that HRZ buildings will require non-renewable materials, result in total de-vegetation of sites, and no requirement for an outdoor space to dry washing means that dryers will be needed all year round.	Not specified.
Michael O'Rourke	194.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that HRZ buildings will cause shading issues and unhealthy homes for those living to the south of these monoliths.	Not specified.
Michael O'Rourke	194.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that HRZ buildings will steal the investment of those who have installed solar panels on their roof.	Not specified.
Michael O'Rourke	194.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that replacing existing homes with HRZ studios, one to two bedroom apartments, can drive families out of neighbourhoods. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.
Peter Nunns	196.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andrew Flanagan	198.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that given the very real possibility of a developer building a six-storey high residential only one metre from the property boundary, the submitter asks how will WCC compensate neighbouring properties.	Seeks that the Council clarifies how it will compensate neighbouring properties of six-storey developments for the loss of light, privacy, increased noise, and investments that depend on sunshine hours.
Kim McGuinness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace being zoned as High Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace is all zoned as Medium Density Residential Zone.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Russell Taylor	224.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the south side hillside of Aro Valley.
Keith Clement	231.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the NPS-UD which is flawed in the it fails to address local circumstance, history, nuance and need.</p> <p>Zoning by height is incompatible and indeed contradictory to the many controls employed over the last fifty years. The HRZ (21m) is at odds with the fine grained largely low rise existing in central city Character Areas. The use of this control requires to be set aside for reconsideration.</p> <p>A 45degree SAP from a 21m high building will cast a shadow to the footpath on the opposite side of the street, all year. This is negative to the public space and amenity and would mean that when the area is fully redeveloped under this proposed control the entire length of the street will be in shade for most of the day, all year.</p> <p>Six storey buildings are a lot more expensive to build (concrete and steel) and operate (lifts and BA Schedule systems) than walk-up town-houses.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that the PDP replaces the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) with MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) wherever possible.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Richard W Keller	232.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that a standard is added requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard W Keller	232.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that universal accessibility is required for all residential development in the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).
Richard W Keller	232.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is amended to be more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Victoria Stace	235.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the Hay Street Extension is not within a 10 minute walking Catchment from the City Centre. All of the properties along the extension have qualifying matters under P3.32 of the NPS-UD. The topography, safety issues, and impracticality make this area unsuitable for HRZ (High Density Residential Zone). [Refer to original submission for full reason]	If the PDP is amended to extend walkable catchment beyond 10 minutes: Retain Hay Street Extension as notified (As Medium Density Residential Zone).
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.84	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Disagrees that changing the zoning of Hay Street to HRZ would result in unstable developments going ahead as a resource consent process will deal with this. [See original Further Submission for the full reasoning].	Disallow
Regan Dooley	239.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High density residential zone) developments should adequately accommodate active and public transport as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary.	Remove the references to "supported residential care activity" from the High Density Residential zone.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of this definition as it is uncertain how the deletion of the definition would affect existing activities that fall within this definition.	Disallow
Pauletta Wilson	257.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the Mt Cook area being zoned as High Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the Mt Cook Area be rezoned as Medium Density Residential Zone with the 11m Height Control Area.
Wellington City Council	266.142	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers the introduction to the chapter needs to be amended to include reference to inundation areas as a qualifying matter.	Amend paragraph 5 of the High Density Residential Zone Introduction as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stream corridors, and overland flow paths <u>and</u> <u>inundation areas</u> (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter). Note – for changes to the HRZ chapter, refer to the attached annotated version of the chapter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.106	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission, noting that inundation areas are managed by other rules so therefore do not necessarily need to be included as qualifying matters.	Disallow
Mary Sullivan	277.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in the Prospect Terrace, Woodland Road, and the up-hill section of Frankmoore Avenue area. Considers that the area includes areas which are difficult to access on foot by most people, particularly elderly and people with young children or disabilities. Some of the area zoned as High density is up steep hills, with narrow roads, and have either no footpaths or footpaths on one side only. They are not therefore suitable for high density developments.	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in the Prospect Terrace, Woodland Road, and the up-hill section of Frankmoore Avenue area.
Eldin Family Trust	287.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes zoning of Selwyn Terrace (and the nearby areas of Hill Street and Guildford Terrace) in the High Density Residential Zone (as alternative to City Centre Zone) due to the height limits this would permit. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes zoning of Selwyn Terrace (and the nearby areas of Hill Street and Guildford Terrace) in the High Density Residential Zone (as alternative to City Centre Zone). [Inferred decision requested]
Priscilla Williams	293.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the hilly terrain makes this area unsuitable for high rise building.	Opposes the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) that spans across Wesley Road, Aurora Terrace and Bolton Street. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.42	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose in part	Considers that HRZ standards should be amended to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle. Multi-unit housing should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking that meets the standards set out in the Transport chapter of the PDP.	Opposes standards in the 'High Density Residential Zone' chapter and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.200	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, The RVA considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.200	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.43	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ standards should be amended to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle. Multi-unit housing should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking that meets the standards set out in the Transport chapter of the PDP.	Amend standards in the 'High Density Residential Zone' chapter to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.201	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, The RVA considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.201	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.
Roland Sapsford	305.46	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that the 10 minute walkable catchments have resulted in parts of Aro Valley being zoned HRZ, when this is not appropriate for this suburb. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that further consideration is given to the unique characteristics of Aro Valley. [Inferred decision sought]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	305.47	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the site to the North of Aro Park being zoned HRZ allows development of a 6-storey building which would significantly reduce daytime sunlight on the park in the cooler months of the year.	Seeks that the site to the north of Aro Park not be classified as High Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Roland Sapsford	305.48	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan should better identify and protect areas of existing green space from partial or complete loss within High Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that the District Plan be amended to better identify and protect areas of existing green space from partial or complete loss within High Density Residential Zones.
Roland Sapsford	305.49	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six-storey buildings should not be allowed on Aro Street. Most of Aro Street, as well as Adams Terrace and lower Durham Street, are zoned for at least six storeys, with the exception of some heritage-listed buildings. While six storeys may be appropriate for structures tucked into the escarpment below Landcross Street or Durham Street, one poorly-placed building fronting Aro Street could have catastrophic effects on winter sunlight for many dwellings, including a large amount of recent infill housing.	Seeks that all High Density Residential Zones be removed from Aro Street. [Inferred decision requested]
Roland Sapsford	305.50	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six-storey buildings should not be allowed on Aro Street. Most of Aro Street, as well as Adams Terrace and lower Durham Street, are zoned for at least six storeys, with the exception of some heritage-listed buildings. While six storeys may be appropriate for structures tucked into the escarpment below Landcross Street or Durham Street, one poorly-placed building fronting Aro Street could have catastrophic effects on winter sunlight for many dwellings, including a large amount of recent infill housing.	Seeks that all High Density Residential Zones fronting Aro Street be removed from Durham Street. [Inferred decision requested]
Roland Sapsford	305.51	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to provide a far more nuanced and careful consideration of issues such as light, shading, wind, privacy, design quality, retention of green areas, character and heritage.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to provide more careful consideration to issues such as light, shading, wind, privacy, design quality, retention of green areas, character and heritage.
Roland Sapsford	305.52	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas, the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities, and take a more sophisticated and nuanced approach to design guidance.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas, the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities, and take a more sophisticated and nuanced approach to design guidance.
Roland Sapsford	305.53	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the vacant site North of 95A Aro Street being zoned HRZ would cause loss of sunlight and negative impacts on the wellbeing of residents of the Argo Trust. The Argo Trust provides a residential and vocational service for six men and women with profound physical and intellectual disabilities. Permanent residents of the Argo Trust have north-facing bedrooms overlooking the vacant site. The vacant site will be zoned for at least six storeys and may cast shade across their home and external spaces.	Seeks that 95 Aro Street not be classified as High Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Roland Sapsford	305.54	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that properties immediately to the East of 95A Aro Street being zoned HRZ would cause loss of sunlight and negative impacts on the wellbeing of residents of the Argo Trust. The Argo Trust provides a residential and vocational service for six men and women with profound physical and intellectual disabilities. Permanent residents of the Argo Trust have north-facing bedrooms overlooking the vacant site. The vacant site will be zoned for at least six storeys and may cast shade across their home and external spaces.	Seeks that properties immediately to the East of 95A Aro Street not be classified as High Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	305.55	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to retain the capacity within Aro Valley for site-by-site consideration of each development by ensuring that most developments triggers the need for a resource consent, as is currently the case.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to require resource consents for new developments in Aro Valley.
Roland Sapsford	305.56	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to develop location specific design guides and relevant standards to enable a more granular approach to local character. Standards should include access to sunlight and shade, the maintenance of personal privacy, the variety and location of green spaces, the location and scale of exterior space and development, the control of heat island effects and the look and feel of the streets we inhabit.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to include location specific design guides and standards to enable a more granular approach to local character.
Roland Sapsford	305.57	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone standards for height limit, site coverage, height in relation to boundary and side and rear yard setbacks so as to require resource consents where new developments have a more than minor impact on local character, sunlight, shading and outdoor recreation space.
Roland Sapsford	305.58	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to require resource consents related to the location of buildings on sites and issues of personal privacy and shading within and between multiple developments on a single site so to enable management of these design quality issues.
Roland Sapsford	305.59	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to retain existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan rather than replace them with the minimum daylight provisions of the proposed Plan.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to retain existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan.
Roland Sapsford	305.60	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to identify underutilised sites and locations within Aro Valley that are not subject to demolition controls and are suitable for intensification within the existing character areas (as defined in the Operative Plan).
Roland Sapsford	305.61	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to identify sites and areas within Aro Valley where more intensive development could occur without adverse effects on sunlight, privacy, heritage and local character.
Roland Sapsford	305.62	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that objectives and rules relating to the HRZ chapter as they relate to Aro valley should clearly identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls set out above, and provide for this planning to occur so as to be complete prior to significant infrastructure investment.	Seeks that community-based planning be identified prior to infrastructure investments in the High Density Residential chapter.
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Wants to see the zone more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that HRZ developments will create civil disobedience in the area.	Opposes zoning of Aro Street as High Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the inclusion of Aro Street in the high density residential zone will achieve the opposite of a healthy, safe, and attractive living environment, and in fact undermine those objectives in this area.	Seeks that Aro Street not be zoned a High Density Residential Zone.
Penelope Borland	317.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that Mount Victoria should not be zoned HRZ, as 6-storey intensification is too much for Mt. Victoria. High density in this area will adversely affect the liveability and sense of place of both Mount Victoria and Wellington's overall identity. High density in Mount Victoria is also unnecessary for housing capacity and will lead to the loss of valuable historic heritage and character that is a part of the city's story and identity.	Seeks that Mount Victoria not be zoned High Density Residential Zone.
Penelope Borland	317.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that a 21m building at the top of Majoribanks Street, on Hawker, Earl's Terrace or Stafford Street would negatively impact light for many neighbours, have dramatic wind effects in extreme wind zones, massively impact the neighbourhood character, and stretch constrained infrastructure including roads, parking and other amenities.	Seeks that Majoribanks Street, Hawker, Earl's Terrace and Stafford Street not have 21m building height limits.
Richard Murcott	322.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the Housing and Business Land Capacity Assessment established that the demand was for 2-3 storey townhouses, not 6 storey blocks. The greatest unmet demand overall in the city will be in terrace housing, which makes 6-storey zoning in the city unnecessary.	Opposes 6-storey housing developments under High Density Residential Zoning in the inner city.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.56	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that wind should be included as a qualifying matter, rule or standard to address any hazard/safety issues that can arise from 6-storey or higher developments. Wind can have adverse impacts on adjacent areas, properties and streets, which should be avoided. Such rules may be particularly pertinent in transition areas between low-rise zones and more permissive height zones, such as the Thorndon flat. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that wind be taken into account as a potential safety hazard linked with High Density Residential Zone developments.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.57	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Khoi Phan	326.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the inner suburb of Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Te Aro and Kelburn should be classified as High Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Te Aro and Kelburn be classified as High Density Residential Zones.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six-storey development in Mount Cook should be focused along the semi-industrial zones near Adelaide Road and in the Arlington to Hankey Street block abutting the City Centre Zone, as these sites are well suited to high-density development.	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones in Mount Cook be localised along the semi-industrial zones near Adelaide Road and in the Arlington to Hankey Street block abutting the City Centre Zone.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.101	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission as this not consistent with the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD.	Disallow
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that multi-unit dwellings are an important aspect of Mt Cook and should have strong environmental and sustainable living provisions. In particular, the impacts of living more sustainably in apartments needs to incorporate provision for waste management such as composting, emergency provisions such as water storage, and access to green spaces and common areas for wellbeing, mental health and dog-walking. Rooftop gardens, pocket parks, well-designed foyers and hallways provide spaces for informal interaction which are important for living well together in an apartment community.	Seeks that provisions on sustainable living be created for multi-unit dwellings in Mount Cook.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tina Reid	341.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Support the majority of the Mt Cook area as high density would destroy the pre-1930 character of the area, and believe that intensification of housing can happen in much more harmonious ways.	Seeks that the majority of Mt Cook area not be zoned High Density Residential Zone.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that four to six-storey buildings in Mount Victoria, aside from Kent Terrace, will be out of scale with the surrounding dwellings. These areas should be redefined for residential and business purposes.	Seeks that Mount Victoria be rezoned from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.256	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	Supports well-planned intensification within the existing urban footprint in appropriate areas that are not subject to a qualifying matter. This approach is consistent with Policy 31 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain chapter, subject to amendments, as outlined in other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.257	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that for the provisions of the zone to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms.	Seeks to ensure the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the need for affordable housing will not be met by demolishing well-functioning pre-1930s inner suburban housing and replacing it with 6-storey apartment blocks. Considers that this will rip apart the fabric of established neighbourhoods, while severely disrupting the lives of many who will no longer be able to afford to live there or whose homes are downgraded. Considers that developers and wealthy property investors will maximise their profits by building luxurious rental complexes at the expense of residents. Notes that this has happened overseas. The submitter states that the goal should be to strengthen the cohesion of the whole community by providing sufficient well-designed and affordable and social housing in the many underdeveloped and derelict areas of the city and its near surrounds. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that more well-designed affordable and social housing be provided in the many underdeveloped and derelict areas of the city and its near surrounds
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that high density housing in inner suburbs should be reduced and re-assessed. Notes that the recent Housing and Business Land Capacity Assessment (HBA) Update undermines the need to expose quality older homes to the random threat of demolition. The submitter understands that the report concluded that Wellington's capacity was already in place in the earlier District Plan to meet the inner-city demand for apartment buildings until 2051. The demand, as described in this Report, is for low-rise town houses which is entirely compatible with retaining the older inner-city houses of our city.	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones be reduced and re-assessed according to the Housing and Business Land Capacity Assessment (HBA).
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that high rise apartment blocks in inner suburbs should be carefully selected. These buildings must be well regulated and subject to rules that avoid increasing the risks of dampness, cold, lack of sunshine and lack of privacy in adjacent homes. They should not be zoned in broad-bush areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones in inner suburbs be carefully and appropriately selected.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that Character Housing and Areas should be listed as Qualifying Matters limiting 6-storey heights in High Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that character be a qualifying matter in High Density Residential Zones.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.93	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that sunshine access and privacy should be considered as Qualifying Matters when considering the suitability of sites for 6-story blocks.	Seeks that sunshine and privacy be treated as Qualifying Matters in High Density Residential Zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.94	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	The HRZ chapter is partially supported, granted HRZ-P6 (Multi unit housing) is amended to require consideration of reverse sensitivity effects. This policies i a matter of discretion for multi-unit housing (i.e. more than 3 dwellings per site) in the HRZ.	Retain the High Density Residential Zone chapter with amendment.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.154	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought relating to recognition of reverse sensitivity in policies and matters of discretion due to potential impacts on residential intensification.	Disallow
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the High Density zoning of all addresses adjacent to the open Community Centre grounds and the community recreational area on Aro Street is inappropriate for the requirements of this well-used inner city community area, that includes a basket ball court and a pedestrian cycle access way through the park to the top of Palmer street and into Wellington city. This is most likely an accident and should be corrected, as sunlight needs to reach the park.	Seeks that properties on Palmer street adjacent to the Aro Valley Cottages Heritage Area be rezoned from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Waka Kotahi	370.323	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers he NPS-UD requires councils to enable buildings of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of existing and planned rapid transit stops, the edge of city centre zones, and the edge of metropolitan centre zones, with building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services in other centre zones. As many centres as possible should be up-zoned to the fullest extent possible to provide for local services for people who will be living in the walkable catchments. [See original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the provisions in the High Density residential zone should be amended to enable higher densities to better align with the NPS-UD. Recommend that greater building heights are enabled – to provide for densities that are commensurate to the services available. Waka Kotahi considers this is best determined by an assessment undertaken by Wellington Council to determine what densities are commensurate in different areas across the district, or otherwise the following maximum building heights are included: - Maximum of six storeys in a walkable catchment of local centre zones - Maximum of twelve storeys in a walkable catchment of city centre, metropolitan centre zones and within a walkable catchment of existing and planned rapid transit stops.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.145	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers the proposed increases in heights are more enabling than NPS-UD requirements without justification.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the enabling of higher densities within the High Density residential zone and greater building heights, to the extent consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission. Kāinga Ora supports subsequent and associated submission points from Waka Kotahi in respect of increased density and greater building heights.	Allow / Seeks that the submission is allowed where it is consistent with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.90	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in heights are more enabling than NPS-UD requirements without justification.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.324	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	Supports the direction to enable a range of housing types and densities in the High Density residential Zone.	Retain the High Density Residential Zone, with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.325	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that enabling up to twelve stories is appropriate in certain areas where the density is supported by services.	Amend the High Density Residential Zone chapter as follows: The High Density Residential Zone provides for a range of housing types at a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone. It gives effect to the requirements of the RMA to allow for three residential units of up to three storeys on a site, and also by enabling multi-unit housing of up to six <u>twelve</u> storeys in <u>appropriate areas</u> through a resource consent process subject to standards and design guidance.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.326	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S4 should have immediate legal effect to align with the MDRS requirements, and to avoid confusion where boundary setbacks are applied from both the operative and district plan. It is noted the intention of the NPS-UD is to enable urban environments to evolve and change, enabled by the national standards.	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that all that relate to HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) have immediate legal effect.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.128	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	The HRZ chapter is generally supported. As it stands, the PDP will enable the construction and use of three dwellings on most residential properties, with a maximum height of 11m and more permissive building recession planes, as a permitted activity. In addition, resource consents may be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity to construct buildings up to 25m in height with no limit to the number of residential units (i.e.: density). The submitters considers these greater residential densities and more permissive building standards are likely to generate greater potential for reverse sensitivity effects that may affect the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of their facilities which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.	Retain the HRZ (high density residential zone) chapter, with amendment to HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing).
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ (High density residential zone) is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.432	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the High Density Residential Zone should apply to areas that extend: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including Appendix 4]	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones extend: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. [Refer to original submission, Appendix 4 for proposed walkable catchment mapping]
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.112	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.73	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.32	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	We oppose changes to introduce new high density provisions as these are not required to deliver the capacity required and will have significant impact on the amenity and liveability of residential areas.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.31	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	We oppose changes to introduce new high density provisions as these are not required to deliver the capacity required and will have significant impact on the amenity and liveability of residential areas.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.433	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	The Introduction of the High Density Residential Zone in the Proposed District Plan is supported, but amendments consistent with the spatial extent and heights are sought.	Retain the Introduction of the High Density Residential Zone with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.434	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the Introduction of the High Density Residential Zone should be amended.	Amend the Introduction of the High Density Residential Zone as follows: The High Density Residential Zone encompasses areas of the city located near to the City Centre Zone, Johnsonville City Centre Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zones, Town Centre Zones and Kenepepe and Tawa railway stations. These areas are used predominantly for residential activities with a high concentration and bulk of buildings and other compatible activities. ... The High Density Residential Zone provides for a range of housing types at a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone. It gives effect to the requirements of the RMA to provide for well functioning urban environments by allowing for three intensive development residential units of up to 6 storeys in all areas of the HRZ and up to 12 storeys in areas of high accessibility to key centres three storeys on a site, and also by enabling multi unit housing of up to six storeys through a resource consent process subject to standards and design guidance. ...
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Changes to high density residential zone approach is opposed. These are not required to deliver the capacity required and will have significant impact on the amenity and liveability of residential areas	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.32	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Changes to high density residential zone approach is opposed. These are not required to deliver the capacity required and will have significant impact on the amenity and liveability of residential areas.	Disallow
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Cadman	398.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.88	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes extent of High Density Residential Zone in Mount Victoria. The areas to the south of Vogel Street are predominantly high density zone in the plan except for small character areas. Submitter considers that that the Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has qualities, including visibility which should qualify it as a character area. The submitter considers that Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has a particularly charming ambience and modification to the houses has generally been in keeping with the Mt Victoria architecture.	Remove High Density Residential Zone from Earls Terrace, Port Street and Stafford Street area.
Investore Property Limited	405.52	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Supports the provision of six storey residential development in the wider Johnsonville catchment.	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.53	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Supports the provision of a broad area of six storey High Density Residential zoning in the wider Johnsonville catchment. Submitter considers that this gives effect to the NPS-UD and reflects the status of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre.	Retain the the provision for six storey high density zoning within the wider Johnsonville catchment as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.54	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the exclusion of the Johnsonville rail line from "rapid transit" and high density residential zoning within catchments of a train station is inappropriate and inconsistent with the NPS-UD, Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan and Change 1 to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes the exclusion of the walkable catchments of the Johnsonville rail line from the High Density Residential Zone. Seeks that the Johnsonville train line is identified as rapid transit and high density residential zoning applies in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.120	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers the Proposed Plan does not recognise rail as a qualifying matter. KiwiRail seeks that the railway corridor be identified as a qualifying matter and be applied to impose building setback requirements from the rail boundary.</p> <p>The High Density Residential Zone adjoins the rail corridor in several suburbs in Wellington City, including Johnsonville, Tawa and Keneperu. KiwiRail support urban development, including around transport nodes, and recognises the benefits of co-locating housing near transport corridors.</p> <p>However, it is critical that the Proposed Plan provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway network. This is necessary to ensure our communities are built in healthy living environments, and the railway network can operate and develop in the future without constraint. An integrated and proactive approach to planning is critical to support the overall vision of our urban environments, and to ensure that our transport network can support the increasing growth and housing intensification.</p> <p>The nature of railway operations means KiwiRail cannot fully internalise all its effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Environmental legislation and caselaw recognises the lawful emission of such effects. Increasing development around railway corridors consequentially means the introduction of more sensitive receivers to adverse effects of existing and lawful railway activities. With a likely increase in sensitive activities forecast to locate in proximity to the railway corridor as a result of the Amendment Act, KiwiRail is concerned that without appropriate planning measures in place at a territorial level, the risk of adverse health and amenity effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor, and reverse sensitivity effects constraining our operations is significantly elevated.</p> <p>For this reason, it is essential that the Proposed Plan appropriately manages the development of new sensitive activities in proximity to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Amend the HRZ Introduction as follows:</p> <p>There are parts of the High Density Residential Zone where the permitted development, height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters. These include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stream corridors and overland flow paths (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter); - Heritage buildings, heritage structures and heritage areas (refer to Historic Heritage Chapter); - Notable trees (refer to Notable Trees Chapter); and - Sites and areas of significance to Māori (refer to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Chapter). <p>- <u>Railway corridor (building set back from rail boundary): (refer to HRZ-S4).</u></p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.28	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes changes to provisions and rules relating to the rail corridor as a qualifying matter in KiwiRail's submission.	Disallow
Emma Osborne	410.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.72	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.
Luke Stewart	422.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Supports medium density residential standards as they allow 3 dwellings up to 3 storeys in height in all residential zones. This would enable higher levels of development than is currently proposed in the Draft District Plan in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association	429.34	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that Johnsonville East should not be in the HDRZ.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Walkable Catchment testing report says that walking network model does not account for the quality or perceived safety of walking routes and pathways.</p> <p>MfE guidance on NPS-UD leaves walking catchment size and "Path quality" up to local councils but does recommend that certain factors are taken into account when determining walking catchment (Full reference in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that Johnsonville East (Map on original submission) should be excluded from High Density Residential Zone on the basis that it has poor pedestrian access, inconsistency with MfE recommended factors, it's accessible via steps, and that in 2013 the Environment Court rejected the claim that Johnsonville East was walkable accessible and WCC agreed to remove it from MDRA.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Johnsonville East (Area A on original submission map, page 25).</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>
Johnsonville Community Association	429.35	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that Middleton Road should not be in the HDRZ.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Walkable Catchment testing report says that walking network model does not account for the quality or perceived safety of walking routes and pathways.</p> <p>MfE guidance on NPS-UD leaves walking catchment size and "Path quality" up to local councils but does recommend that certain factors are taken into account when determining walking catchment (Full reference in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that Middleton Road area (Map on original submission page 25) is excluded from High Density Residential Zoning because it is not walking accessible. Middleton Road area has a busy arterial road with limited crossing areas, is inconsistent with many of the MfE factors, and that in 2013 Environment Court rejected WCC claim that the area was walking accessible and it was removed from MDRA.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Middleton Road (Area B on original submission map, page 25).</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>
Johnsonville Community Association	429.36	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that Woodland Road/Prospect Terrace should not be in the HDRZ.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Walkable Catchment testing report says that walking network model does not account for the quality or perceived safety of walking routes and pathways.</p> <p>MfE guidance on NPS-UD leaves walking catchment size and "Path quality" up to local councils but does recommend that certain factors are taken into account when determining walking catchment (Full reference in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that Woodland Road/Prospect Terrace is not walking accessible, as it requires walking on a steep and narrow road. It is inconsistent with many of the MfE factors. High rise along this ridge will also have an impact on visual amenity.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Woodland Road/Prospect Terrace (Area C on original submission map, page 25).</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association	429.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that Cortina Avenue should not be in the HDRZ.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Walkable Catchment testing report says that walking network model does not account for the quality or perceived safety of walking routes and pathways.</p> <p>MFE guidance on NPS-UD leaves walking catchment size and "Path quality" up to local councils but does recommend that certain factors are taken into account when determining walking catchment (Full reference in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that Cortina Avenue is beyond the 10 minute walking catchment, the central government medium density standards will render the special zoning in the PDP no longer relevant.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Cortina Avenue (Area D on original submission map, page 25).</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>
Miriam Moore	433.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that housing along more accessible routes is essential in Wellington where terrain is a constant challenge to accessibility. Public transport users are likely to walk further for trains, and having an efficient bus service as a faster option should not lessen a train line's suitability as an MRT line, but enhance it.</p>	<p>Seeks to include high density along Mass Rapid Transit</p>
Miriam Moore	433.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that Council should be active in looking for acquisition opportunities for more small and functional parks in the HRZ. Smaller yards and smaller homes need to be brought in hand-in-hand with more spaces for people of all ages and abilities to spend time outside.</p>	<p>Seeks more green spaces within the High Density Residential Zone.</p>
Miriam Moore	433.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers the HRZ provisions should be more enabling provisions of small-scale public commercial activities like corner stores/coffee shops to help keep these areas convenient and active, subject to matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Seek that more public and private community activities are enabled as a Discretionary Restricted activity within the High Density Residential Zone.</p>
Michelle Rush	436.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the HRZ should be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville line as a rapid transit route. All other consequential amendments to the plan's sections should also be made to give effect to this.</p>	<p>Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville Line as a Rapid Transit Line</p>
Michelle Rush	436.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	<p>Objectives in the HRZ chapter are supported as they balance the need for intensification with environmental safeguards.</p>	<p>Retain Objectives in the High Density Residential Zone chapter as notified.</p>
Kirsty Woods	437.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Opposes the High Density Residential zoning for suburban Newtown. High density zoning in this area fails to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight, adverse effects associated with demolition and rebuilding and loss of green spaces. Considers that there is an excess of housing provided through the proposed district plan above what is required. By creating much larger areas to enable 6 storey buildings than is likely to be required, the council is promoting unnecessary adverse effects on existing housing. Considers that the alternative extent provided in the Red Design Architects submission is more appropriate.</p>	<p>Seeks that High Density Zoning in Newtown is limited to the extent indicated in the Red Design Architects and Newtown Residents Association submissions. Seeks that all other areas are rezoned as Medium Density Residential.</p>
Newtown Residents' Association	440.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that Newtown's residential streets outside the suburban centre should be classified as MRZ. In particular the zoning of several blocks around the Newtown suburban centre for heights of up to 21m seems unnecessary and counter productive to maintaining a well functioning urban environment.</p> <p>Allowing 6-storey development blocks in low-rise residential areas would have damaging effects on the value of neighbouring houses. Furthermore, combining terraced homes, typically of 3 storeys, with 6 storey apartment blocks doesn't give good results unless the sites are carefully planned.</p>	<p>Seeks that Newtown's residential streets outside the suburban centre be rezoned as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kathryn Lethbridge	442.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the High Density Residential Zoning of the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) and considers that this should be rezoned as MRZ. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Opposes the zoning of the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) as High Density Residential Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.72	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	WCC summary reads: The zone is a jewel in the Wellington character / heritage crown and appropriate houses in the area should be protected to prevent unnecessary loss to this key cultural asset for the city. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Allow
Kay Larsen	447.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the make up of the area is already dense enough to be considered High-Density. Considers that the terrace is too small to accommodate further traffic from high density development. Considers that the infrastructure on TheTerrace South is insufficient for further development. Considers that the hillside is steep and innappropriate for 6 storey development. Considers that there are many pathways, shortcuts, large old trees, housing and Boyd Wilson Sports Field scattered in the area. [See original submission for full reason]	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Southern Terrace (Area between Abel Smith Street, Ghuznee Street, Terrace and including St John Street and Abel Smith Street extension).
John Wilson	453.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks clarification in relation to zoning around Metropolitan Centre Zones - why High Density Residential rules also apply to the Johnsonville centre compared to the Kilbirnie residential centre. [Inferred decision requested]
John Wilson	453.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the provisions in the Plan relating to "Kenepuru and Tawa railway stations Zone/Zones". [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Delete all provisions related to "Kenepuru and Tawa railway stations Zone/Zones". [Inferred decision requested]
John Wilson	453.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that there are no definition links from the "High Density residential" page as for the "City Centre Zone", which has a definition of the applicable zone rules.	Seeks that definition links are added to the High Density Residential wording in the introduction of the chapter. [inferred decision requested]
Rachel Underwood	458.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that under the proposed plan, the character of suburbs like Mt Victoria, Newtown, Island Bay, Kelburn, Thorndon, Aro Valley, parts of Brooklyn, Ngaio is at risk if developers place six-storey blocks. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks to remove provisions relating to six storey requirements. [Inferred decision requested]
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	The submitter has concerns on the shading of private properties. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks clarity and stricter standards for shading, recession planes privacy, outlook space and solar access in the High Density residential zones. [inferred decision requested].
Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased to a 15 minute walking catchment. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Supports the area zoned as High Residential and the associated six storey allowance in the wider Johnsonville catchment.	Retain the High Density Residential Zoning (21m) in the wider Johnsonville catchment.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Catherine Penetito	474.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the HRZ of Arlington Street. Considers that the District Plan encourages a variety of housing types, sizes and tenure which will be lost in Arlington Street without a zone change. CC-O3 (Urban form and scale) states that development should be consistent with the strategic goal (5) of a natural environment protected, enhanced and integrated into the urban environment. Without a zone change, the very small reserve at the corner of Arlington and Torrens Terrace, enjoyed by locals for its sunshine, could be overshadowed by high-rise development.	Seeks that the part of Arlington Street currently occupied by privately owned housing should be zoned as General Residential Zone.
Catherine Penetito	474.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the HRZ of Taranaki Street. Considers that preventing further development on Taranaki Street will enable the opportunity in the future to open up the park to become a more fitting National site for the capital city.	Seeks that no further development takes place on Taranaki Street.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.76	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Concerned that the Residential Design Guide is not given consideration and referred to in any relevant rules for the High Density Residential Zone	Amend appropriate parts of the High Density Residential Zone rules to reflect that they will give effect to Residential Design Guide. [Inferred decision requested]
Jonathan Markwick	490.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.
Jonathan Markwick	490.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.
Jonathan Markwick	490.23	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six storey high density residential buildings should be allowed in all of Kelburn (with a viewshaft protection from the top of the cable car) to help accommodate demand for student and staff housing close to Victoria University's Kelburn Campus. Students and staff have extremely high rents with a restricted housing supply in Kelburn.	Seeks that six storey high density residential buildings is allowed in all of Kelburn (with a viewshaft protection from the top of the cable car).
Jonathan Markwick	490.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six storey high density residential buildings should be allowed in all of Oriental Bay including Hay Street and Grass Street. This suburb is the easiest suburb to walk to from the city centre (from a traffic safety and scenery point of view). Oriental Bay is also the only suburb that is connected to the city centre with a continuous traffic-free cycle path.	Considers that six storey high density residential buildings should be allowed in all of Oriental Bay including Hay Street and Grass Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Hay St. Submitters repeats comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.</p> <p>Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).</p>	Disallow
Don MacKay	FS94.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Wilkinson Street, particularly its steepness, narrowness, and potentially hazardous nature which make high density intensification inappropriate. Also Don MacKay repeat comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.</p>	Disallow
Jonathan Markwick	490.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) should be removed to allow for six storey high density residential buildings where SCHED 3 - Heritage Areas do not apply (such as McFarlane Street).</p> <p>Restrictive rules protecting Character Precincts should not be a priority and is morally wrong when we are experiencing a massive shortage of housing and a housing crisis.</p>	Seeks that six storey high density residential buildings are allowed in the areas currently encompassed by the Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct which do not overlap with SCHED3 - Heritage Areas and that if needed, lower height controls (than six storeys) can be applied for the properties immediately neighbouring St Gerard's.
Jonathan Markwick	490.26	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that restrictive rules protecting Character Precincts should not be a priority and is morally wrong when we are experiencing a massive shortage of housing and a housing crisis).</p>	Seeks that six storey high density residential buildings is allowed in the areas currently encompassed by Mount Victoria Character Precincts which are outside the SCHED3 - Heritage Areas.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.6	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Greater intensification on Oriental Parade and in Hay and Grass Streets is opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).</p>	Disallow
Denis Foot	FS10.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 490.26]</p>	Disallow
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.6	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.</p> <p>Qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.</p>	Disallow
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place.</p> <p>Qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St. These matters impact the health and safety of Oriental Bay residents.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.6	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.</p> <p>Qualifying matters exist under s.79L and s.79 of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.</p> <p>The futher submitter also also refer to and support the media statement of the Insurance Council of New Zealand Inc dated 23 November 2022.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
Jenny Gyles	FS53.6	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.</p> <p>Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.79L and s.79 of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.</p> <p>Jenny Gyles refers to and support the media statement of the Insurance Council of New Zealand Inc dated 23 November 2022.</p> <p>Considers that the difficulties in obtaining and/or paying for insurance in the future for intensive housing in high hazard zones (especially re earthquake and climate change) and the exposure to hazard of increased infrastructure will be a burden on property owners, taxpayers, ratepayers and residents for many decades to come.</p>	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the high density residential zone building height limit of 21m (or six storeys) for the Lower Kelburn area of Easedale St; Kinross St; Bolton St; Wesley Rd; Aurora Terrace; Clifton Terrace; San Sebastian Rd; Everton Terrace; Onslow Terrace; Talavera Terrace; Clermont Terrace; Salmont Place; Salamanca Road (as far as Kelburn Park), Gladstone Terrace and Rawhiti Terrace near the cable car.</p> <p>The area is difficult and steep terrain which would impeded large scale development.</p> <p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians / cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition. Limited sun hours are available. The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that a maximum building height of 11m applies in the area encompassing the Lower Kelburn area (Easedale St; Kinross St; Bolton St; Wesley Rd; Aurora Terrace; Clifton Terrace; San Sebastian Rd; Everton Terrace; Onslow Terrace, Talavera Terrace; Clermont Terrace; Salmont Place; Salamanca Road (as far as Kelburn Park), Gladstone Terrace and Rawhiti Terrace near the cable car).
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the building height limit of 21m (or six storeys) for the inner suburbs area of west of Kinross Street and Clifton Terrace, broadly bounded by San Sebastian Road, Wesley Road and Bolton Street.</p> <p>The area is difficult and steep terrain which would impeded large scale development.</p> <p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians/cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition. Limited sun hours are available. The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that a maximum building height of 11m applies to an areasthat encompassess west of Kinross Street and Clifton Terrace, broadly bounded by San Sebastian Road, Wesley Road and Bolton Street.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the building height limit of 21m (or six storeys) for the inner suburbs area broadly centred around Clifton Terrace and Talavera Terrace.</p> <p>The area is difficult and steep terrain which would impeded large scale development.</p> <p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians/cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition.</p> <p>Limited sun hours are available.</p> <p>The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that a maximum building height of 11m applies to an area encompassing Clifton Terrace and Talavera Terrace..
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Anne Lian	132.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Ingo Schommer	133.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Olivier Reuland	134.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Grant Buchan	143.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that for higher density zoning in city centres developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Grant Buchan	143.23	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that universal accessibility should be a non-negotiable for all developments.	Seeks that universal accessibility is a non-negotiable for all developments in high density zones.
Jill Ford	163.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jill Ford	163.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
Amos Mann	172.23	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Patrick Wilkes	173.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Pete Gent	179.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Pete Gent	179.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
James Harris	180.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it. [Refer to original submission for full details].	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
James Harris	180.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
Historic Places Wellington	182.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that a policy similar to that requiring new development to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone by ensuring that development responds to the site context, particular where it is located adjacent to a scheduled site of significant to Māori, heritage buildings, structures or areas, character precincts, and other areas should be added.	Add a new Policy with equivalent wording to NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) in the High Density Residential Zone.
Peter Nunns	196.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Peter Nunns	196.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility.
Andrew Flanagan	198.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Andrew Flanagan	198.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
Alan Fairless	242.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in ALL Residential Zones.	Seeks that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in High Density Residential Zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.190	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities' for the reasons set out in the previous feedback point on the proposed definitions of 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that FENZ is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. FENZ considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity. This will provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Add new HRZ rule: <u>HRZ-RX:</u> <u>Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>
Phillippa O'Connor	289.28	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Support	Considers that commercial activities should be able to establish within the residential zones, and that the list of permitted activities is too small and should have a baseline of 100m2 for dairies, restaurants and cafes.	Add a new rule as follows: <u>HRZ-R11 – Dairies, cafes and restaurants</u> <u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The maximum GFA is 100m2</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. Infrastructure and servicing</u> <u>2. Effects on neighbourhood character, residential amenity, safety and the surrounding residential area from building scale, form and appearance; traffic; noise; lighting; and hours of operation</u>
Hilary Watson	321.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that Carrara Park should have 11m height control right round its boundary to get maximum possible sun all year round. Part of the properties around the park are currently inappropriately classified under Building Height Control 2 (21m).	Seeks that all development around Carrara Park is subject to a maximum height limit of 11 metres.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.148	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that Objective 1 of the MDRS must be integrated into the Proposed Plan.	Add new 'well-functioning urban environment' objective in the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-OX Well-functioning urban environment</u> <u>A well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.149	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Support	Considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites and a policy recognising the changing nature of communities should be integrated into the Proposed Plan.	Add the following new policies in the High Density Residential Zone: <u>HRZ-PX Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u> <u>RESZ-PX Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.150	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites and a policy recognising the changing nature of communities should be integrated into the Proposed Plan.	Add the following new policies in the High Density Residential Zone: <u>HRZ-PX Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u> <u>RESZ-PX Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.151	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Support	Considers that it would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	Add new 'Role of density standards' policy in the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-PX Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.152	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that it would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	Add new 'Role of density standards' policy in the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-PX Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.327	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the inclusion of a permitted land use rule to provide for mixed use development in multi-unit housing supports the outcomes of the zone and in the NPS-UD.	Add a new Rule to the High Density Residential Zone chapter as follows: <u>HRZ-R2x Commercial activities</u> <u>Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where</u> <u>a. They are integrated into a multi-unit residential development.</u> <u>b. In apartment buildings, commercial activities are at street level.</u>
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the proposed standards for permitted residential activities do not provide for rubbish/recycling storage. It is proposed that a standard be provided to allow for appropriate storage of a minimum standard.	Seeks that a new standard be added in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter allowing for appropriate rubbish and recycling storage of a minimum standard.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High density rdevelopments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
David Cadman	398.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Cadman	398.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
Ministry of Education	400.99	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the HRZ objectives do not sufficiently provide for additional infrastructure/ educational facilities. Therefore, the submitter supports the inclusion of a new objective as sought.	Add new objective to HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) as follows: <u>HRZ-OX</u> <u>Non-Residential activities</u> <u>Non-residential activities are in keeping with the amenity of the High Density Residential zone and provide for the community's social, economic, and cultural wellbeing [Inferred decision requested]</u>
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.89	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Submitter is concerned that there appears to be no provisions that recognise the possible adverse effects of development and especially intensive development adjacent to the heritage area, on the values identified. For the Doctors Common Heritage area the adjoining zoning is high density. The submitter considers that it is hard to see how development to that extent would not compromise the values for which the Heritage Area is recognised.	Add new provisions within the Proposed District Plan to protect the Doctors' Common Heritage Area from possible adverse effects of intensive development adjacent to the heritage area (inferred decision requested).
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.76	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the chapter should include a policy similar to NZC-P7 ensuring that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Add a policy similar to NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) ensuring that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.
Luke Stewart	422.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.
Christina Mackay	478.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that where heritage listed sites are in HDRZ, the submitter support special height and design controls on those nearby sites to protect context and curtilage setting of heritage listed buildings.	Seeks provisions within High Density Residential Zone to provide for height and design controls for heritage listed sites within zone.
Stratum Management Limited	249.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that HRZ-O1 references 3-storey buildings and that this appears to be an error that should refer to 6-storey buildings.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) to refer to 6-storey buildings.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.153	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.154	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: <u>HRZ-O1 Purpose Residential density</u> The High Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: 1. Housing needs and demand; and 2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.155	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.156	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) to Add new 'Purpose' objective into the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-OX Purpose</u> <u>The High Density Residential Zone accommodates predominantly residential activities and a range of compatible non-residential activities.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.157	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Oppose in part	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Opposes HRZ-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.158	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) to Add new 'Purpose' objective into the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-OX Purpose</u> <u>The High Density Residential Zone accommodates predominantly residential activities and a range of compatible non-residential activities.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.328	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support in part	Support in part.	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.329	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that enabling up to twelve stories is appropriate in certain areas where the density is supported by services.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: <u>The High Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and mixed use activities that support urban living, and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to:</u> 1. Housing needs and demand; and 2. <u>The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings, and higher density residential living such as apartments of up to twelve storeys.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.129	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.366	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support	Considers that increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.435	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support in part	Objective HRZ-O1 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Objective HRZ-O1 (Purpose) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.436	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that HRZ-O1 should be amended to better reflect the density necessary to achieve a well-functioning urban environment anticipated by the NPS-UD and RMA. While this objective comes largely from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (see objective 2), these objectives are mandatory for Medium Density Residential Areas. Therefore, this objective should be adapted to reflect the higher density of the HRZ and to better achieve objective 1 of the RMAA 2021.	Amend Objective HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: The High Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: 1. Housing needs and demand; and 2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character <u>proximate to Centres and Rapid Transit Stops</u> , including 3-6-12 storey buildings.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.74	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZO1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.73	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support	Supports the direction of HRZ-O1.	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Support	Supports objective HRZ-O2. Notes that Disabled people currently lack housing choices due to the traditional design of housing not enabling accessibility. Concepts, such as Universal Design, need to be incorporated into the design of all new builds and this can be done with a wide range of housing designs.	Retain HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.159	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Support	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O2 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Retain HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) and seeks amendment as follows: Land within the High Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; 2. May be of a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone; and 3. Contributes positively to a more intensive high-density urban living environment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.160	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O2 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Seeks to amend HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as follows: Land within the High Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; 2. May be of a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone; and 3. Contributes positively to a more intensive high-density urban living environment.
Waka Kotahi	370.330	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.331	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Amend	Considers that higher densities should be explicitly provided for and expected in the zone, to better align with the direction of the NPS-UD to achieve a compact urban form.	Amend HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as follows: Land within the High Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; 2. May be of a Provides for a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone; and 3. Contributes positively to a more intensive high-density urban living environment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.130	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.367	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Support	Considers that increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.	Retain HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.437	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Support in part	Objective HRZ-O2 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Objective HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.438	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Amend	Considers that HRZ-O2 should be amended to better reflect density outcomes anticipated in the HRZ as outlined elsewhere in the submission.	Amend Objective HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as follows: Land within the High Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; 2. May be <u>is</u> of a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone;...
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.74	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Support	Supports the direction of HRZ-O2 to provide for more density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone and for a more intensive high-density urban living environment. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.191	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Supports the policy as it promotes safe and accessible living environments.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, and accessible living environments) as notified.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Supports objective HRZ-O3 as enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.161	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. In addition, notes that HRZ-O3 makes reference to 'accessible living environments'. Opposes regulation of internal environments as retirement village operators are best placed to understand the accessibility requirements of their residents and access is addressed by the Building Act.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) and seeks amendment to delete reference to "accessible living environments".
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.162	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. In addition, notes that HRZ-O3 makes reference to 'accessible living environments'. Opposes regulation of internal environments as retirement village operators are best placed to understand the accessibility requirements of their residents and access is addressed by the Building Act.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.163	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. In addition, notes that HRZ-O3 makes reference to 'accessible living environments'. Opposes regulation of internal environments as retirement village operators are best placed to understand the accessibility requirements of their residents and access is addressed by the Building Act.	Seeks to amend HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) to delete reference to "accessible living environments".
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.131	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.368	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Considers that increased density needs to be done well: this objective gives an important signal to ensure that this is achieved.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	F589.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of this definition as it is uncertain how the deletion of the definition would affect existing activities that fall within this definition.	Disallow
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of “supported residential care activity”, then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified.</p> <p>The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama’s supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.</p>	Retain HRZ-P1.4 (Enabled activities) as notified if “supported residential care activity” definition and references to this term are retained.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.192	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support in part	Seeks to amend HRZ-P1 to enable the establishment of emergency service facilities in the High Density Residential zone. Considers emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community.	Supports HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.193	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Amend	Seeks to amend HRZ-P1 to enable the establishment of emergency service facilities in the High Density Residential zone. Considers emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community.	<p>Amend HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Home business; 2. Boarding houses; 3. Visitor accommodation; 4. Supported residential care; 5. Childcare services; and 6. Community gardens; <u>and</u> 7. <u>Emergency service facilities.</u>
Phillippa O'Connor	289.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Amend	Considers the scope of activities enabled in the Medium Density Residential zone are limited and do not align with current rule HRZ-R10 or proposed new rule HRZ-P11.	<p>Amend Policy HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Home Business; 2. Boarding Houses; 3. Visitor Accommodation; 4. Supported Residential Care; 5. Childcare Services; and 6. Community Gardens.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.164	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Oppose	Considers that the policy appears to identify / support the permitted activities of the MDR Zone - being some residential activities (e.g. boarding houses, visitor accommodation and supported residential care), and some non-residential activities (e.g. home businesses, childcare services and community gardens). Considers that retirement villages are residential activities that should be permitted in the residential zones. Rather than listing retirement villages in this policy, considers that an enabling retirement village-specific policy (MRZ-P6) is more appropriate. Considers that while the policy is seeking to 'enable' the permitted activities in the zone, the phrasing of the policy qualifies this enabling provision by reference to a scale and intensity that is 'consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone'. Considers this part of MRZ-P1 conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act for the MRZ. Considers that MRZ-P1 appears to summarise provisions provided elsewhere in the chapter, but in a confusing manner that does not provide any additional guidance for consent applicants or other users of the District Plan.	Delete HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) in its entirety as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.332	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.333	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Amend	Considers that to support the higher densities, commercial activities (particularly at ground floor) should be enabled and encouraged where they are integrated with residential development	Amend HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including: 1. Home business; 2. Boarding houses; 3. Visitor accommodation; 4. Supported residential care; 5. Childcare services; and 6. Community gardens. <u>7. Commercial activities where they are integrated with residential development.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.132	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.369	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support	Considers that increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.	Retain HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.439	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P1 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Policy HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.440	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Amend	Considers that the wording should be updated to better recognise the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect.	Amend Policy HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated and planned built form of the Zone, including:
LIVE WELLington	FS96.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Oppose	The proposal to delete the term 'amenity' from this point is opposed, along with all other attempts to remove 'amenity' from the Plan.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roland Sapsford	FS117.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Oppose	The proposal to delete the term 'amenity' from this point is opposed, along with all other attempts to remove 'amenity' from the Plan.	Disallow
Antony Wilkinson	11.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Oppose in part	Opposes HRZ-P2 on the grounds that increasing the height limit to 6 stories will negatively affect the character of the city and its suburbs. Population growth estimates from the Council are too optimistic and should not warrant six-story residential buildings being built.	Seeks that the height limit of up to 6 stories in HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) be rescinded.
Khoi Phan	326.30	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as follows: Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, low-rise apartments, and residential buildings of up to 6-15 storeys in height.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.165	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-P2 generally aligns with the wording of Policy 1 of the Act, with amendments that respond to Policy 3 of the NPSUD. The drafting could be improved to clarify the references to 3-storeys and 6- storeys, which conflict on their face.	Retain HRZ-P2 as notified, subject to drafting improvements.
Waka Kotahi	370.334	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support in part	Support in part.	Retain HRZ-P2 (Enable a variety of housing) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.335	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Amend	Considers that higher densities should be explicitly provided for and expected in the zone, to better align with the direction of the NPS-UD to achieve a compact urban form. This should include provision for apartments of appropriate heights and dwellings of four storeys.	Amend HRZ-P2 (Enable a variety of housing) as follows: Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3- 4- storey townhouses attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments of up to twelve storeys in height in suitable locations, and residential buildings of up to 6- storeys in height. <u>twelve storeys in height</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.133	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.370	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support	Considers that provision for a wide variety of housing types is essential if we are to achieve the city's social, economic and environmental goals.	Retain HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.441	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P2 is supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Policy HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.442	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Amend	Considers amendments are needed to provide for a higher density.	Amend Policy HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as follows: Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 36- storey attached and detached dwellings, low-rise apartments, and residential buildings of up to 6-12 storeys in height <u>located close to higher order centres.</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.75	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP2	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.75	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support	Supports HRZ-P2, noting the storey limits mentioned in this policy do not preclude developments which do not meet permitted activity standard.	Retain HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified, on the basis HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) is also retained.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that replacing the term 'abilities' with 'impairments' in HRZ-P3 is more appropriate. Notes that using the term 'abilities' to refer to disabled people is regarded as euphemistic by many within the disabled community.	Amend HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities <u>impairments</u> . [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.166	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Oppose	Considers that the current drafting of the first part of HRZ-P3 aligns with the wording of Policy 4 of the MDRS; however surplus to the requirements of the Act HRZ-P3 seeks to 'encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities', which is <u>generally already covered by HRZ-P2</u> .	Opposes HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.167	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of the first part of HRZ-P3 aligns with the wording of Policy 4 of the MDRS; however surplus to the requirements of the Act HRZ-P3 seeks to 'encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities', which is <u>generally already covered by HRZ-P2</u> .	Amend HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities.
Waka Kotahi	370.336	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support in part	Support in part.	Retain HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.337	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that to support the higher densities, commercial activities (particularly at ground floor) should be enabled and encouraged where they are integrated with residential development	Amend HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, <u>and commercial activities where appropriately integrated into residential development</u> , to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.134	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.371	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support	Considers that the policy sends an important signal about the quality of housing in high density areas: it is essential that density is done well, and that those living in such areas can do so in a way that meets their health and wellbeing.	Retain HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.443	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P3 is supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Policy HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.444	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that an amendment to HRZ-P3 is required to remove reference to tenure to recognise that tenures cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan.	Amend Policy HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, <u>and sizes and tenures</u> to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.76	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support	Supports the direction of HRZ-P3 to provide for a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures.	Retain HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.168	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support	Supports HRZ-P4 to the extent it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS. However, considers that the replacement of "all relevant residential zones" with reference to the HRZ creates interpretation issues as it suggests the medium density residential standards do not apply in parts of the HRZ (but not what standards apply instead). Areas subject to qualifying matters have not been zoned HRZ so that part of the policy is not required.	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) and seeks amendment as follows: Apply the medium density residential standards across the High Density Residential Zone except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.169	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Amend	Supports HRZ-P4 to the extent it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS. However, considers that the replacement of “all relevant residential zones” with reference to the HRZ creates interpretation issues as it suggests the medium density residential standards do not apply in parts of the HRZ (but not what standards apply instead). Areas subject to qualifying matters have not been zoned HRZ so that part of the policy is not required.	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) and seeks amendment as follows: Apply the medium density residential standards across the High Density Residential Zone except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, – water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga).
Waka Kotahi	370.338	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support in part	Support in part.	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.339	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Amend	The submitter considers that given that higher densities and a more urban form are anticipated in the High Density Residential Zone, Waka Kotahi considers that the permitted level of development should be higher – to support the urban change outcomes in the NPS-UD.	Amend HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as follows: Apply the medium density residential standards across the High Density Residential Zone except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga), <u>and enable higher permitted threshold of development due to the more urban character of the High Density Residential Zone.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.135	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.372	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support	Considers the provision is reasonable in light of legitimate qualifying matters	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.445	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support	Policy HRZ-P4 is supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.77	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Amend	Support the application of the Medium Density Residential Zone standards to the High Density Residential Zone, however, these standards should apply as a minimum. The submitter considers that the High Density Residential Zone should be more permissive than the Medium Density Residential Zone. If this does not occur, then the submitter considers that the High Density Residential Zone will become a de facto Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) to ensure the residential standards in the High Density Residential Zone are more permissive, and encourage denser and more intensive development than that permitted within the Medium Density Residential Zone.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.170	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Support	Supports HRZ-P5 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.	Retain HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.136	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.446	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Support	Policy HRZ-P5 is supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.78	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Support	Supports HRZ-P5 for developments that do not meet the permitted activity status. The submitter considers that this retains flexibility for quality development proposals.	Retain HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.39	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Amend	Considers that since this rule makes all multi-unit housing a RD activity and refers back to broad policies as matters of discretion, Council's scope is too broad for an RD activity. Considers this may risk failing to meet S77B, and Council is already required to consider relevant policies under 104(1)(b).	Amend HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) to: Provide for developments not meeting permitted activity status, while encouraging high-quality <u>developments buildings</u> .
Stratum Management Limited	249.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	<p>Considers that policy HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) relates to the provision of multi-unit housing. It seeks to provide for multi-unit housing where the development can demonstrate four factors.</p> <p>The first matter relates to 'fulfilling' the intent of the residential design guide. The residential design guide, as notified, contains 137 individual guidelines. Considers that it is unclear how, or at what point, any given multi-unit development can fulfil the intent of the design guide given that a design guide assessment is inherently a subjective assessment. Seeks clarification as to whether the intent of the design guide is fulfilled when a proposal is considered to achieve more than 50% of the applicable design guides for example?</p> <p>Considers that the approach to this matter is also inconsistent with the approach adopted by the City Centre zone. In that zone, the reference to the design guide is made within the matters for discretion of, for example, Rule CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures). It also omits reference to 'fulfilling the intent of' the design guide. This approach is preferred.</p> <p>The second matter requires the provision of a minimum area of private or shared open space. In the context of this policy, a multi-unit development that does not meet the minimum area standard should not be provided for. Notwithstanding that non-compliance with the standard can be considered through a resource consent process.</p> <p>Matter 3 requires the provision for on site management of waste storage and collection. This matter is also considered through the design guide. Stratum invites further consideration of the appropriate means to achieve this and suggests that there may be duplication across the policy and design guide.</p>	<p>Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:</p> <p>Delete matter (1);</p> <p>Delete the words 'a minimum area of' from matter (2);</p> <p>Consider whether the policy needs to address matters relating to waste storage and collection.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.194	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for multi-unit housing and retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development can be adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure, or can address any constraints on the site	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.30	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that Reference to the Design Guide as a matter of discretion (by virtue of referring to Policy HRZ-P6 in the matters of discretion for activities requiring consent under HRZ-R2.2) is challenged and deletion sought accordingly. Given the prescriptive, yet subjective, nature of the assessment, elevating this Guide to a statutory requirement for compliance or assessment is not considered appropriate or commensurate in respect of a restricted discretionary activity assessment.	<p>Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <p>1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide;</p> <p>1. 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants;</p> <p>2. 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and</p> <p>3. 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.44	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.45	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P6 should be amended, as multi-unit housing and other non-residential activities and building cannot require car parking as set out in the NPS-UD. Developments should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking to align with infrastructure and transport objectives in the PDP.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide;2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants;3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.5. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for cycle and micromobility parking and charging;6. Adequate cycle facilities are accessible, secure, and covered (protected from weather)
Z Energy Limited	361.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that as it stands, the PDP will enable the construction and use of three dwellings on properties that share a common boundary with the Z on Constable Street, with a maximum height of 11m and more permissive building recession planes, as a permitted activity. In addition, resource consents may be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity to construct buildings on these properties up to 25m in height with no limit to the number of residential units (i.e.: density). These greater residential densities and more permissive building standards are likely to generate greater potential for reverse sensitivity effects that may affect the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of Z facilities which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act. Several of Z Energy's service stations either directly adjoin or are located in close proximity. The proposed changes to the residential zone provisions and consequential increase in development potential on these surrounding sites have the potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects including nuisance effects (e.g. noise, lighting and odour displacement) and amenity effects. For instance, an occupier on a third storey apartment building is more likely to perceive noise and visual effects compared to an occupier of single storey dwelling which is less elevated and, more than likely, screened by a fence and landscaping. [Refer to original submission, including table of Z sites]	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide;2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants;3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.5. <u>Manages reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.156	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought relating to recognition of reverse sensitivity in matters of discretion due to potential impacts on residential intensification.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.340	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.341	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that multi-unit housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: ... 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.; <u>and</u> <u>5. Where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), buildings for noise sensitive activities are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects to occupants.</u> <u>6. For higher density developments, options to incorporate mixed-uses such as commercial activities have been explored.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.137	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	HRZ-P6 is partially supported, but amendments are required for proposed residential developments that adjoin or are in close proximity to lawfully established non-residential activities where reverse sensitivity effects might occur.	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.138	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P6 should be amended to better protect larger-scale and higher-density residential developments where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity where there is an interface with a Commercial or Mixed-Use Zone, or with lawfully established non-residential activities. Amendments are required for proposed residential developments that adjoin or are in close proximity to lawfully established non-residential activities where reverse sensitivity effects might occur. The following relief appropriately gives effect to design principle 1(c): 'The Site' of the National Medium Density Design Guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which encourages new development to respond to existing or proposed nearby non-residential activities.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. <u>5. Manages reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.49	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ – P6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought due to potential impacts on the scale of residential intensification.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in these submission points as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that the collection of waste from multi-unit housing sites needs the waste storage areas to be accessed by rubbish trucks or conveniently walked to the kerb for pickup. Specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks needs to be ensured.	Seeks that specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection truck be ensured in HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.373	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Seeks that there is a need to ensure multi-unit developments reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle when considered for consenting.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) to add a new Point 5 to the list, as follows: ... <u>5. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.447	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P6 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Policy HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.448	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Seeks amendments to Policy HRZ-P6. Considers that residential development should be considered on the basis of its effects and merits rather than specifically on typology or the scale/collective number of dwellings. Therefore is requesting deletion of 'multiunit housing' as a separate activity type from stand-alone houses or any other residential typology for the purposes of the zone rules and standards. Also considers that the policy should allow reference to more than three residential units on a site as they are managed through resource consent process.	Amend Policy HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Multi-unit housing <u>Higher density residential development</u> Provide for multi-unit housing <u>more than six residential units per site</u> where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide <u>Achieves the following urban design outcomes:</u> <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings;</u> <u>d. Responds to the natural environment;</u> 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately able to be serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any water <u>constraints on the site.</u>
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks to retain greater guarantees of proportionate and quality development than the unquantified terms proposed.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.147	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Oppose	Considers the submission is more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.79	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Submitter considers that the matters in clauses 1, 2 and 4 can be addressed elsewhere and do not meet the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness. In particular: • The Residential Design Guide should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. • External areas should not be mandated [Refer to original submission for full reason]. As drafted, these additional requirements for multi-unit housing (which do not apply to housing which complies with the Medium Density Residential Zone standards) may defeat the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone which is to provide for more intensive development than that permitted within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Multi-unit housing Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.254	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.254	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.80	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	<p>Considers that the matters in clauses 1, 2 and 4 can be addressed elsewhere and do not meet the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Residential Design Guide should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. • External areas should not be mandated [Refer to original submission for full reason]. <p>As drafted, these additional requirements for multi-unit housing (which do not apply to housing which complies with the Medium Density Residential Zone standards) may defeat the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone which is to provide for more intensive development than that permitted within the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) so that any particular design outcomes required be included expressly as a policy, rather than through the Residential Design Guide.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.255	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.255	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.195	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for multi-unit housing and retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development can be adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure, or can address any constraints on the site	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.171	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support in part	Considers generally that HRZ-P7 does not appropriately provide for / recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents.	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.172	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers generally that HRZ-P7 does not appropriately provide for / recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents.	<p>Amend HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide where it is relevant; 2. Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and 5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone. <p><u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.342	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement village) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.343	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that retirement villages in urban areas should be suitably located to ensure that they are not car-centric developments. Consideration of location, access to services for residents with varying degrees of mobility should be included in any development proposal.	Amend HRZ-P7 (Retirement village) as follows: ... 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and 5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone.; and 6. <u>Is suitably located and designed to enable multimodal connectivity.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.139	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that the collection of waste from retirement villages needs the waste storage areas to be accessed by rubbish trucks or conveniently walked to the kerb for pickup. Specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks needs to be ensured.	Seeks that specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks be ensured in HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages).
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the relief sought in this submission but further clarification about the amendment sought is required.	Amend / Further clarification about the specific relief sought is required.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the relief sought in this submission but further clarification about the amendment sought is required.	Amend / Further clarification about the specific relief sought is required.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.374	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that there is a need to ensure retirement villages reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle when considered for consenting.	Amend HRZ-P7 (Retirement Villages) to add a new Point 6 to the list, as follows: ... 6. <u>Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.449	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Supports Policy HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.138	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however The RVA opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Disallow the submission point in favour of the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.138	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however Ryman opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Disallow the submission point in favour of the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.450	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers amendments to HRZ-P7 is required to remove direct reference to the design guide and instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD.	Amend Policy HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows: Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide where it is relevant. <u>Achieves the following urban design outcomes:</u> <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings;</u> <u>d. Responds to the natural environment;</u> 2. Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; 4. Is adequately able to be <u>adequately able to be</u> serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and 5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values <u>amenity values anticipated and planned built form</u> for the Zone.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.139	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however The RVA opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Disallow the submission point in favour of the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.139	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however Ryman opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Disallow the submission point in favour of the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.196	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for a range of residential buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, that provide for healthy, safe and accessible living environments.	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.
Philip O'Reilly and Julie Saddington	310.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Amend	HRZ-P8 is weak in giving guidance on managing the interface between the Character Precincts and other zones and should be amended to have an additional sub-point. Adding this additional sub-point will result in the same outcome of improved management between the High Density Residential and Character Precincts.	Amend HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as follows: ... 4. Achieve attractive and safe streets; <u>and</u> 5. <u>Where these buildings and structures are in a site adjacent to a character and heritage precinct, their form and scale be sympathetic towards the identified Character Precinct and heritage precinct values.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.173	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Oppose in part	Considers it is not clear whether MRZ-P8 [HRZ-P8] applies to retirement villages, given MRZ-P7 [HRZ-P7] is a more specific policy. The RVA seeks that this policy does not apply to retirement villages.	Opposes HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.174	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Amend	Considers it is not clear whether MRZ-P8 [HRZ-P8] applies to retirement villages, given MRZ-P7 [HRZ-P7] is a more specific policy. The RVA seeks that this policy does not apply to retirement villages.	Amend HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) to clarify that it does not apply to retirement villages.
Waka Kotahi	370.345	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.346	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Amend	Considers that multi-unit housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as follows: ... 4. Achieve attractive and safe streets, <u>and</u> 5. <u>Where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects on sensitive receivers;</u> 6. <u>For higher density developments, options to incorporate mixed-uses such as commercial activities at ground floor have been explored.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.140	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.375	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support	HRZ-P8 is supported as it is important in ensuring that density is done well.	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.451	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support	Policy HRZ-P8 is generally supported.	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.
Trelissick Park Group	168.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P9 is too vague and should be amended to require at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Amend HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) to require neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.
Tyers Stream Group	221.74	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) so that the level of permeable surface is proportionate to the extent of hard surface increase from the development.
Wellington City Council	266.143	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Oppose in part	Considers that given this is not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this policy in the THW chapter. Note: HRZ-P9 and HRZ-S10 are to be relocated to THW – see new THW-P6 and THW-R7.	Delete HRZ-P9 (Permeable Surface) in its entirety. Consequential renumbering of HRZ-P10 to HRZ-P14 to reflect change in numbering.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.141	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.376	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Support	HRZ-P9 is supported as it is important in ensuring that increased density manages risks of stormwater runoff including risks to water quality and flooding.	Retain HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.452	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P9 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Supports Policy HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.453	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Amend	Considers that an amendment is required to HRZ-P9 to relate to sufficient permeable surface provision rather than a minimum. There may be instances where stormwater runoff effects can be mitigated by a lower level of permeable surface area and the policy should recognise this.	Amend Policy HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as follows: Require development to provide a minimum level of sufficient permeable surface <u>area</u> to assist with reducing the rate and amount of storm water run-off.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tyers Stream Group	221.75	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that new 'landscaping' should be required, not just 'sought'.	Amend HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as follows: Encourage the retention of existing vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected, and where vegetation is proposed to be removed, seek <u>require</u> new landscaping of equal or better quality to help integrate new development into the surrounding environment and minimise hard surfacing.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.175	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Oppose in part	Considers that the requirement to provide "equal or better quality" vegetation where existing vegetation is removed is unlikely to be feasible alongside residential intensification.	Opposes HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.176	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that the requirement to provide "equal or better quality" vegetation where existing vegetation is removed is unlikely to be feasible alongside residential intensification.	Amend HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) to encourage new landscaping but delete reference to "equal or better quality."
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.142	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.377	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Support	HRZ-P10 is supported as it is important to assist with reducing unnecessary loss of vegetation, with benefits to biodiversity, pleasantness and amenity, as well as helping reduce the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Retain HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.82	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Support	Supports the use of policy which encourages the retention of existing vegetation (including native vegetation) that would otherwise be unprotected under the Proposed District Plan.	Retain HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.454	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Support	Policy HRZ-P10 is generally supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.81	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that the retention of existing vegetation (other than protected vegetation) is difficult to reconcile with the more intensive urban built form encouraged in the High Density Residential Zone.	Option 1: Delete HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) in its entirety.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.82	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that the retention of existing vegetation (other than protected vegetation) is difficult to reconcile with the more intensive urban built form encouraged in the High Density Residential Zone.	Option 2: Amend HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) to acknowledge the greater intensity encouraged in the High Density Residential Zone.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.177	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	Supports HRZ-P11 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.347	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	Support policy wording as it requires consideration of passive surveillance.	Retain HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.143	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.378	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	HRZ-P11 is supported as it will help ensure attractiveness at street level, as well as provide for passive surveillance: designing for safety is highly important in built environments.	Retain HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.455	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	Policy HRZ-P11 is generally supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.144	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	HRZ-P12 is supported as it will encourage the diversion of waste appropriately. The definition for community gardens does not allow for composting of food waste specifically, which may preclude the undertaking of food waste composting. [Submitter identified HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) instead of HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation); submission points have been changed to refer to HRZ-P12]	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.379	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	Considers that the policy will help compensate for residents having less available green space, and provide for community building and public health, as well as potential infrastructure for green waste recycling at a local scale: important for the circular economy.	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.456	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	Policy HRZ-P12 is generally supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.
VicLabour	414.32	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	Supports provision for community gardens and urban agriculture and considers a green city and more community spaces is needed.	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.77	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	Supports policy HRZ-P12 in the High-Density Residential Zone Chapter, as provisions for community gardens and circular production supports more sustainable living which is beneficial in response to climate change.	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.
Property Council New Zealand	338.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.204	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.204	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support	Supports policy HRZ-P13 and widest possible application of the City Outcomes Contribution through the Environmental and Accessibility Performance Fund established by the WCC in order to incentivise the building of housing and public buildings to Universal Design standards. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support	Supports policy HRZ-P13 and widest possible application of the City Outcomes Contribution through the Environmental and Accessibility Performance Fund established by the WCC in order to incentivise the building of housing and public buildings to Universal Design standards. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.178	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of HRZ-P13 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. Considers that the policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.348	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P13 (City outcomes contribution) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.349	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Amend	Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows: 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.; and/or 6. Incorporating non-residential uses to provide for mixed use development.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.145	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.457	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Policy HRZ-P13 is opposed and amendment is sought.	Opposes Policy HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) and amendment is sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.140	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.140	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.458	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to Policy HRZ-P13 to instead encourage positive outcomes for development in the HRZ. [See original submission for further details]	Amend Policy HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contributions) as follows: Require over height, large scale residential development in the High Density Residential Zone to contribute to positive outcomes <u>Encourage</u> development in the High Density Residential Zone to contribute to positive outcomes deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Residential Design Guide, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development, and where this is provided legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5.4. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.141	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.141	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	405.55	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks that HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) is deleted in its entirety as notified.
VicLabour	414.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.83	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Amend	The submitter considers that while they are generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). As currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions. HRZ-P13 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes. The City Outcomes Contribution should be reviewed to reflect any amendments made to CCZ-P11 and the relevant provisions in the Design Guides.	Seeks that HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) be reconsidered following any amendments to the City Outcomes Contribution within the City Centre Zone.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.256	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.256	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.49	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	Delete HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety.
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports these submissions seeking deletion of the City Outcomes Contributions. While MRNZL recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.197	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support	Supports the policy as it enables non-residential activities and buildings that support the needs of the local communities which provides for emergency service facilities to locate in this zone. This policy also supports non-residential activities that maintain the safety of the transport network and are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities, and boarding houses) as notified.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.31	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Considers that Non-residential activities (being activities already contemplated by the zone by way of restricted discretionary or discretionary activities, or ones that infringe the zone standards) should be able to be accommodated in the zone if they can demonstrate the requirements of the policy.	<p>Amend HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows:</p> <p>Only Allow non-residential activities and buildings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the needs of local communities; 2. Are of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone; 3. Contribute positively to the urban environment and achieve attractive and safe streets; 4. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle; 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.46	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) with amendment.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.47	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P14 should be amended, as multi-unit housing and other non-residential activities and building cannot require car parking as set out in the NPS-UD. Developments should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking to align with infrastructure and transport objectives in the PDP.	<p>Amend HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows:</p> <p>Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that:</p> <p>....</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 7. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for cycle and micromobility parking and charging; 8. Adequate cycle facilities are accessible, secure, and covered (protected from weather)

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.43	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P14 should be amended to clarify wording relative to the discretionary activity status of various non-residential activities and buildings provided for within the High Density Residential zone as restricted discretionary activities, and the provision of all other activities as discretionary activities.	Amend HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only Allow non-residential activities and buildings that: 1. Support the needs of local communities; 2. Are of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone; 3. Contribute positively to the urban environment and achieve attractive and safe streets; 4. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle; 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; <u>7. Can demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.350	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings), with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.351	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: ... 1. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 2. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; <u>and</u> <u>3. are integrated into residential developments where possible</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.146	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.380	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support	Considers that HRZ-P14 will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.459	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support	Policy HRZ-P14 is generally supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.100	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support in part	Supports HRZ-P14 in part as it provides for non-residential activities in the HRZ.	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.101	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Seeks that HRZ-P14 be amended to ensure that additional infrastructure (including educational facilities) are explicitly recognised and provided for within the HRZ.	Amend HRZ (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that: ... 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. <u>7. Provides additional infrastructure to support the needs of the community</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.381	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R1	Support	Considers that HRZ-R1 will help compensate for residents having less available green space, and provide for community building and public health, as well as potential infrastructure for green waste recycling at a local scale.	Retain HRZ-R1 (Community gardens) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.34	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R1	Support	Supports provision for community gardens and urban agriculture and considers a green city and more community spaces is needed.	Retain HRZ-R1 (Community gardens) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.
Khoi Phan	326.31	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. No more than three <u>ten</u> residential units occupy the site.
Waka Kotahi	370.352	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Support in part	Supports provision for three dwellings per site.	Retain HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.353	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Amend	Considers there may be opportunity to provide for higher densities as a permitted activity – such as four dwellings of up to four storeys subject to permitted activity standards and restricted discretionary activity status supported where that can't be achieved. Support notification preclusion where resource consent is required.	Amend HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows: Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses Activity status: Permitted Where: No more than three <u>four</u> residential units occupy the site.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.382	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Support	HRZ-R2 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.460	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R2 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.461	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Amend	Considers changes can be made to HRZ-R2 provide for better clarity in regard to the intention of the rule and notification preclusions and allow for a higher permitted activity threshold to allow for up to 6 dwellings within the HDRZ	Amend Rule HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted where: a. No more than three <u>six</u> residential units occupy the site. b. <u>Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u> <u>i. HRZ-S1;</u> <u>ii. HRZ-S3;</u> <u>iii. HRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear/side yard boundary setback;</u> <u>iv. HRZ-S5;</u> <u>v. HRZ-S7</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p><u>2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u> a. where compliance with HRZ-R1.a. cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: <u>1. The matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3, HRZ-P5 and HRZ-P6. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>2. The development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape;</u> <u>3. The extent and effects on the three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development.</u> <u>4. The degree to which development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that inappropriate for its scale.</u></p> <p><u>b. where compliance with HRZ-1.b. cannot be achieved.</u> 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard. Notification status: <u>1. An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R2.2.a is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified, which complies with HRZ-R1.a. but does not comply with MRZ-R1.b. is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>2. An application for resource consent made which does not comply with HRZ-R1.a. but complies with HRZ-R1.b. is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u> <u>3. An application for resource consent made which does not comply with HRZ-R1.a. and HRZ-R1.b. but complies with HRZ-S1 and HRZ-S5 is precluded from being either publicly notified.</u></p>
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks to retain greater guarantees of proportionate and quality development than the unquantified terms proposed.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.148	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Oppose	Considers the submission is more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.383	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Support	HRZ-R3 is supported as it will help enable businesses well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R3 (Home business) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.462	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R3 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R3 (Home business) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.463	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPSUD.	Amend Rule HRZ-R3.2 (Home business) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of HRZ-R3.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effects of non-compliance with any requirement not met; and 2. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Craig Palmer	492.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Support in part	Supports HRZ-R3 (Home business) facilitating individuals being able to conduct a business from their principal place of residence.	Retain HRZ-R3 (Home business) with amendment.
Craig Palmer	492.26	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-R3 (Home business) should be amended to reduce the proposed numbers working and those visiting as they are out of proportion to a home-based business. Considers that the HRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Amend HRZ-R3.1.b. (Home Business) as follows: ... b. No more than four three people in total work in the home business at any one time, and the maximum number of people on site associated with the home business does not exceed 40 <u>6</u> people at any one time;
Craig Palmer	492.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the MRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Seeks that HRZ-R3 (Home Business) is amended to include the mandatory notification and consultation provisions of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 need to be added as a caveat.
Craig Palmer	492.28	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the HRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Not specified.
Craig Palmer	492.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates should be considered.	Seeks that HRZ-R3.2 (Home Business) is amended to include the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates as a matter of discretion. [inferred decision requested]
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R4	Oppose	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain HRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.
Khoi Phan	326.32	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 40 <u>20</u> residents.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.384	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R4	Support	HRZ-R4 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as notified.
Khoi Phan	326.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 40 <u>20</u> residents.
Airbnb	126.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R6	Support	Supports the approach to visitor accommodation in the residential zone.	Retain HRZ-R6 (Visitor Accomodation) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.344	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R7	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the permitted activity status for childcare service activities for up to 10 children, the effects of larger scale activities of this nature should be assessed through a resource consent and the RD activity status for childcare activities exceeding 10 children at a time is considered appropriate.	Retain HRZ-R7 (Child care services) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.354	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R7	Amend	Considers the effects of larger scale activities of this nature should be assessed through a resource consent and the RD activity status for childcare activities exceeding 10 children at a time is considered appropriate. Traffic effects should be added as a matter of discretion as childcare activities can generate high volumes of traffic. In urban areas, childcare services should be located and designed to facilitate alternative transport modes – e.g located in densely populated areas with good walking connections. In addition, a matter of discretion should be included to support multi-use development, provision to include childcare facilities into residential developments where possible.	Amend HRZ-R7 (Child care services) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity may adversely impact on the amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. 2. <u>The extent to which childcare facilities are integrated into residential development</u> 3. <u>Traffic generation and effects on the road network, and</u> 4. <u>How alternative modes will be supported.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.385	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R7	Support	HRZ-R7 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R7 (Child care services) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.102	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R7	Support	Supports that the District Plan continues to outline exclusions for childcare facilities in relevant rules in residential zones.	Retain HRZ-R7 (Childcare services) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.179	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R8	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Retain HRZ-R8 (Retirement village) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.180	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R8	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Amend HRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as follows: 1. Activity status: <u>Restricted Discretionary Permitted</u> Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in HRZ P2, HRZ P3 and HRZ P7. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ R8.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.355	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R8	Support	Support the restricted discretionary activity status for retirement villages provided that HRZ-P7 is revised to require consideration to multi-modal connectivity.	Retain as drafted, provided changes to HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) is updated as per previous submission point.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.386	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R8	Support	HRZ-R8 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R8 (Retirement Village) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.356	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Support in part	Supports in part	Retain HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.357	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Amend	Considers in interests of amenity and services for urban environments, Waka Kotahi considers that commercial activities should be included as a restricted discretionary activity. Access to appropriately located and scaled commercial activities improves amenity for residents in urban environments and creates for walkable environments. Waka Kotahi supports this rule provided that commercial services are included and HRZ-P14 is revised to include provision for integrated residential developments.	Amend HRZ-R9 Community facility, <u>commercial activity</u> , health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.387	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Support	HRZ-R9 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.464	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R9 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.465	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPSUD. Small scale commercial activities, such as cafes, convenience stores, and hairdressers, provide amenity to residents in a walkable urban setting and increase the vibrancy of an area. Operating thresholds have been incorporated to ensure such activities do not detract from the underlying residential environment.	Amend Rule HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as follows: Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding childcare services) <u>and Commercial activities</u> 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Where commercial activities:</u> <u>a. Are limited to the ground floor tenancy of an apartment building;</u> <u>b. Have a gross floor area that does not exceed 200m2</u> <u>c. Have hours of operation between:</u> <u>i. 7.00am and 9.00pm Monday to Friday; and</u> <u>ii. 8.00am and 7.00pm Saturday, Sunday and public holidays.</u> Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in HRZ-P14. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R9.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.
Ministry of Education	400.103	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Support in part	Support HRZ-R9 in part.	Retain HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.104	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Amend	Seeks HRZ-R9 be amended to replace 'education facilities' with 'educational facilities' to keep definitions consistent throughout the plan.	Amend HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as follows: Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, <u>educational</u> facility (excluding child care services) 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in HRZ-P14. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R9.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.
Braydon White	146.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for HRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.44	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain HRZ-R10 (All other activities) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.358	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R10	Support	Support discretionary activity status for activities not provided for so that the effects of incompatible activities can be assessed and managed.	Retain HRZ-R10 (All other activities) as notified.
Jonathan Markwick	490.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for HRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary. [Inferred decision requested]
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.198	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R11	Support	Supports the rule as the maintenance and repair of buildings and structures within the HRZ are a permitted activity.	Retain HRZ-R11 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.199	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R12	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the HRZ are a permitted activity.	Retain HRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.258	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R12	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain HRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.259	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R12	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend HRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Khoi Phan	326.34	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the title of HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three <u>ten</u> residential units occupy the site
Waka Kotahi	370.359	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Support in part	Supports construction of residential buildings as a permitted activity subject to standards. Also supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity Status where permitted activity status is not met.	Retain HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.360	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that the permitted density should be increased to better align with the outcomes of the NPS-UD.	Amend HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three <u>four</u> residential units occupy the site.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.146	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Oppose	Considers the original submission is more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification. [Inferred reference to 370.360]	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.466	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R13 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.467	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that an amendment is required to the title of HRZ-R13 to apply to all buildings not just those associated with no more than three residential units on a site. Considers that the permitted standard should also be expanded to six residential units as the HDZ should provide for a greater number of dwellings than the MRZ given that a greater intensity of dwellings are anticipated in this Zone. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to HRZ-P10.	Amend Rule HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site. 1. Activity Status: Permitted where: <u>a. There are no more than six residential units on a site; and</u> a.b. Compliance with the following standards is achieved: ... 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of HRZ-R13.1.a and HRZ-R13.1.b cannot be <u>are not</u> achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard; and 2. The matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3, HRZ-P4, HRZ-P5, HRZ-P8, HRZ-P9, HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11.; <u>and</u> <u>3. where compliance with HRZ-R13.1.a is not achieved the matters in HRZ-P6.</u> Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R13.2.a which results from non-compliance with HRZ-S1, HRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 or MRZ-S5 is precluded from being publicly notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.121	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that for health and safety reasons, a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary is sought. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to rail land is important. KiwiRail seek amendment to this rule to ensure compliance with the requested rail corridor boundary setback standard (HRZ-S4) is required.	Amend HRZ-R13.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i. HRZ-S1; ii. HRZ-S3; iii. HRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard <u>and rail corridor</u> boundary setbacks; iv.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.122	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. This amendment is sought in addition to the amendment sought in relation to HRZ-R13.1.	Amend HRZ-R13.2 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirement of HRZ-R13.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. ... 2. ... 3. <u>The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.35	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow
Rachel Underwood	458.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers inappropriate to include the standards for setbacks and side yards when implementing HRZ-R13 .	Seeks to amend HRZ-R13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Compliance with the following standards is achieved: HRZ-S1; HRZ-S3; HRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard boundary setback; HRZ-S5... [inferred decision requested].
Stratum Management Limited	249.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	The non-notification statement for this rule precludes public notification. Given that any multi-unit development is subject to this rule, and that it specifies a range of standards that apply to multi-unit development, where a proposal meets these standards, it should be processed on a non-notified basis.	Amend the notification status under HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) by adding the following: <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 that meets the standards specified is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.210	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.210	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.
Wellington City Council	266.144	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Considers the notification clauses for 4 or more household units need to align with Sch 3A, cl 5 of the RMA. This also needs to reflect the building standards	Amend the notification clause of HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: Notification status: <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 which results from non-compliance with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S4 or HMRZ-S5 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 which results from non-compliance with HRZ-S12, HRZ-S13 or HRZ-S14 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.242	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.242	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.
Khoi Phan	326.35	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.181	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Support in part	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, minimum privacy separation to a boundary for a retirement village, and minimum building separation distance for a retirement village standards. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to HRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to HRZ-P13. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Support applications made under HRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but Considers that if a retirement village is compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 it should also be precluded from limited notification	Retain HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.182	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, minimum privacy separation to a boundary for a retirement village, and minimum building separation distance for a retirement village standards. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to HRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to HRZ-P13. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Support applications made under HRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but Considers that if a retirement village is compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 it should also be precluded from limited notification	<p>Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard:</p> <p>i. HRZ-S2;</p> <p>ii. HRZ-S3;</p> <p>iii. HRZ-S12 for multi-unit housing only;</p> <p>iv. HRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing only;</p> <p>v. HRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing only;</p> <p>vi. HRZ-S15;</p> <p>vii. HRZ-S16; and</p> <p>viii. HRZ-S17.</p> <p>2. For multi-unit housing only, the <u>the matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3, HRZ-P5, HRZ-P6, HRZ-P7, HRZ-P8, HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11.</u></p> <p>3. <u>For retirement villages:</u></p> <p><u>i. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>ii. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p><u>iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>iv. When assessing the matters in 1(i - ii), and 1(vi - viii); and 4(i-iii), consider:</u></p> <p><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>v. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>The matters in HRZ-P13 where the development comprises 25 or more residential units; or exceeds the maximum height requirement by 25% or more.</p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village where compliance is achieved with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15 and HRZ-S17 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.183	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Oppose in part	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, minimum privacy separation to a boundary for a retirement village, and minimum building separation distance for a retirement village standards. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to HRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to HRZ-P13. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Support applications made under HRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but Considers that if a retirement village is compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 it should also be precluded from limited notification	Opposes HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.184	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, minimum privacy separation to a boundary for a retirement village, and minimum building separation distance for a retirement village standards. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to HRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to HRZ-P13. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Support applications made under HRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but Considers that if a retirement village is compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 it should also be precluded from limited notification.	Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard: i. HRZ-S2; ii. HRZ-S3; iii. HRZ-S12 for multi-unit housing only; iv. HRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing only; v. HRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing only; vi. HRZ-S15; vii. HRZ-S16; and viii. HRZ-S17. 2. For multi-unit housing only, the matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3, HRZ-P5, HRZ-P6, HRZ-P7, HRZ-P8, HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11. 3. For retirement villages: i. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>ii. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> <u>iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>iv. When assessing the matters in 1(i - ii), and 1(vi - viii); and 4(i-iii), consider:</u> <u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> <u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>v. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p>the matters in HRZ-P13 where the development comprises 25 or more residential units, or exceeds the maximum height requirement by 25% or more.</p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village where compliance is achieved with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15 and HRZ-S17 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>
Waka Kotahi	370.361	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Support in part	Restricted Discretionary Activity status is supported for construction of multi-unit houses, subject to our submission points on standards, objectives, and policies referred to in the rule.	Retain HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) with amendments to submission points made in relation to points made on standards, objectives, and policies.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.468	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R14 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.469	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that amendments to HRZ-R14 are required to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards. Opposes the including of multi-unit housing as this can be managed through HRZ-R13 in accordance with the amendments sought to that rule.	<p>Amend Rule HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:</p> <p>Construction of buildings for multi-unit housing or a retirement village</p> <p>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the follow standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard:</p> <p>i. HRZ-S2;</p> <p>ii. HRZ-S3;</p> <p>iii. HRZ-S12 for multi-unit housing only;</p> <p>iv. HRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing only;</p> <p>v. HRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing only;</p> <p>vi. HRZ-S15;</p> <p>vii. HRZ-S16; and</p> <p>viii. HRZ-S17.</p> <p>2. The matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3, HRZ-P5, HRZ-P6, HRZ-P7, HRZ-P8, HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11.</p> <p>3. The matters in HRZ-P13 where the development comprises 25 or more residential units, or exceeds the maximum height requirement by 25% or more.</p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14 that complies with the relevant standards is precluded from public and limited notification.</u></p>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.142	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it aligns with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission on HRZ-R14 and HRZ-R17.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.142	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it aligns with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission on HRZ-R14 and HRZ-R17.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.40	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that since this rule makes all multi-unit housing a RD activity and refers back to broad policies as matters of discretion, Council's scope is too broad for an RD activity. Considers this may risk failing to meet S77B, and Council is already required to consider relevant policies under 104(1)(b).	Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to: 2. The matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3, HRZ-P5, HRZ-P6, HRZ-P7, HRZ-P8 , HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.41	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that preclusion from public notification only does not comply with Clause 5(2) of Schedule 3A, which requires both limited and public notification be excluded for any resource consent for 4+ units that comply with the MDRS.	Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to: Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being limited notified where the proposal complies with HRZ-S2 to HRZ-S9.</u> <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being limited notified where the proposal complies with HRZ-S2 to HRZ-S5 and HRZ-S12 to HRZ-S17.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.212	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.212	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.
Wellington City Council	266.145	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Amend	Considers a change to this rule is required to provide for small structures on legal road (up to 1.5m high) as a Permitted Activity. Considers this will reduce consenting requirements. It is noted that structures on legal road are covered by the encroachment licence process. There is a consequential amendment to update the Restricted Discretionary rule.	Amend HRZ-R16 as follows: HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) ... <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. It is a retaining wall of less than 1.5m in height above ground level.</u> 2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Where: 1. Compliance with any of the requirements of HRZ-R16.1 a cannot be achieved. (...)</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.200	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Support in part	Supports the rule as the development on or over a legal road is a restricted discretionary activity and which must ensure that highway access and safety is maintained for all road users. Fire and Emergency relies on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network to respond to emergency call outs. It is therefore critical that buildings and structures on legal roads do not hinder the ability for FENZ to respond to emergency call outs effectively and efficiently for firefighting and other rescue operations. A further matter of discretion is therefore sought	Supports HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.201	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Amend	Supports the rule as the development on or over a legal road is a restricted discretionary activity and which must ensure that highway access and safety is maintained for all road users. Fire and Emergency relies on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network to respond to emergency call outs. It is therefore critical that buildings and structures on legal roads do not hinder the ability for FENZ to respond to emergency call outs effectively and efficiently for firefighting and other rescue operations. A further matter of discretion is therefore sought	Amend HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... 3. Maintaining safe access and safety for road users, including pedestrians; and 4. The matters in HRZ-P8, HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11; <u>and</u> 5. <u>Maintaining the ability for emergency services, including fire appliances, to access the property for firefighting purposes.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.39	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.39	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.362	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R16 is supported, but amendment is sought	Retain Rule HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.363	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Amend	Considers that amendments to Rule HRZ-R16 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Amend Rule HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Where the legal road is controlled by Waka Kotahi, written approval has been provided from Waka Kotahi authorising the building or structure.</u> Matters of discretion are:
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.470	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Support	Rule HRZ-R16 is supported.	Retain HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.202	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Support	Supports the rule as the addition or alteration to buildings and structures within the HRZ is provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity.	Retain HRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.185	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Support in part	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R17. The RVA considers the matters of discretion need to align with those for new requirement villages. Supports HRZ-R17.2a being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A(5)(s) of the Act Considers that alterations and additions to retirement villages that are compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Retain HRZ-R17.2 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) and seeks amendment

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.186	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Amend	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R17. The RVA considers the matters of discretion need to align with those for new requirement villages. Supports HRZ-R17.2a being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A(5)(s) of the Act Considers that alterations and additions to retirement villages that are compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 should also be precluded from limited notification.	<p>Amend HRZ-R17.2 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. The matters in HRZ-P9, HRZ-P10, HRZ-P11 and HRZ-P14 (this clause is not applicable o retirement villages); and</p> <p>3. The matters in HRZ-P6, HRZ-P7 and HRZ-P8 for additions and alterations to multi-unit-housing; or a retirement village, and</p> <p>4. For additions and alterations to retirement villages:</p> <p>i. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>ii. <u>The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p>iii. <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>iv. <u>When assessing the matters in 1(a)(i) – (v), and 2(a)(4)(i) –(iii), consider:</u></p> <p>a. <u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p>b. <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>v. <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village</u></p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R17.2.a is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for additions and alterations to a retirement village where compliance is achieved with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15 and HRZ-S17 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.471	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R17 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.472	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to remove reference to policies which are opposed and reference to residential units, multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Amend HRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i. HRZ-S1; ii. HRZ-S2; iii. HRZ-S3; iv. HRZ-S4; v. HRZ-S5; vi. HRZ-S10; and vii. HRZ-S12; viii. HRZ-S13; ix. HRZ-S14; x. HRZ-S15; xi. HRZ-S16; and xii. HRZ-S17. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where: a. Compliance <u>is not achieved</u> with any of the requirements of HRZ-R17.1. a cannot be achieved . Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard; 2. The matters in HRZ-P9, HRZ-P10 , HRZ-P11 and HRZ-P14; and 3. The matters in HRZ-P6 , HRZ-P7 and HRZ-P8 for additions and alterations to multi-unit housing or a retirement village.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.143	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it aligns with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission on HRZ-R14 and HRZ-R17.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.143	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it aligns with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission on HRZ-R14 and HRZ-R17.
Peter Preston	42.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m high buildings with 5 metre boundaries are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society. Afternoon sun may be blocked from these properties. Degradation and abandonment of these properties may ultimately occur as their heritage or character may be visually destroyed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct or heritage area border and a High Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kirsty Wood	109.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that PDP doesn't take into account HRZ zoning bordering character precincts.</p> <p>Considers that HRZ zoning next to character precincts or heritage areas will ruin the character/heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the HRZ zoning will result in blocked afternoon sun in a number of locations.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct border or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that PDP doesn't take into account HRZ zoning bordering character precincts.</p> <p>Considers that HRZ zoning next to character precincts or heritage areas will ruin the character/heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the HRZ zoning will result in blocked afternoon sun in a number of locations.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct border or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
LIVE WELLington	154.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that shading effects on parks may occur not just with adjacent buildings as buildings on sites further away may also cause shading.</p>	<p>Seeks amendment to the assessment criteria of HRZ-S1 (Building height control where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows:</p> <p>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; 2. Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites; and 3. Effects on the function and associated amenity values of any adjacent open space zone <u>within 50 metres.</u>
Glen Scanlon	212.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that this does not rule out higher buildings but it does mean there is due process for such projects</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that height limits are decreased from 21m to 8m where the landscape begins to rise in Mount Victoria.
Glen Scanlon	212.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that steep elevation and close elevation already limits sunlight access to their property.</p> <p>Considers that lowering heights in these areas would align with Hawker Street.</p> <p>Considers that this does not rule out higher buildings but it does mean there is due process for such projects</p> <p>Considers that 21m height can theoretically be built right next door with little consideration for sunlight access beyond "Adequate sunlight access" which has no guidance.</p> <p>Considers that construction of large buildings would require purchasing many properties in the area with major earthworks to provide suitable platforms. The costs will be high, infrastructure will be under pressure and it's a high wind zone - the PDP does not account for these. As a result, properties will be expensive.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the height control in Earls Terrace, Port Street and Stafford Street are amended from 21m to 11m.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.146	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers there is a need to amend exemptions to HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to enable minor building height limit intrusions.	Amend HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) exemptions as follows: (...) This standard does not apply to: a. Fences or standalone walls-; <u>and</u> <u>b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm;</u> <u>c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m measured vertically;</u> <u>d. Multi-unit housing; and e. Retirement villages.</u>
Everard Aspell	270.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Not specified	Considers that allowing building heights of 11-21 metres in the inner city suburbs of Mount Victoria, Mount Cook, Thorndon, Berhampore, Newtown and Aro Valley will create shading, privacy issues, loss of green areas, reduced property values; will forever change the streetscape and will not reflect the character of the area.	Seeks that intensification is restricted to brownfield sites.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.111	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support	Part of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.203	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations i is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Supports HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.204	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations i is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Amend HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... a. Fences or standalone walls-; <u>and</u> <u>b. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Marilyn Powell	281.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that for WCC to permit high rise dwellings will mean demolition destruction of well-maintained wooden heritage housing stock and insertion of concrete and glass. Inserting just one such high-rise will affect negatively the surrounding wooden housing, causing shading and weatherboard deterioration.	Not specified.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.73	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support	TRA support these submissions insofar as they underpin the reasons to change the Hobson residential are from HDZ to MDZ and to create a Character Precinct over the block.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Phillippa O'Connor	289.32	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should have maximum building height increased because: - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university. [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) is amended so that the western side of Kelburn Parade has a maximum height limit of 21m as a permitted activity.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers this dual-standard approach is unnecessary, and that the more permissive height standard in the MRZ should be enabled irrespective of scale of the development.	Seeks that standards HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) and HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) building height control are combined so that there are not different height standards for 1-3 residential units and multi unit developments.
Khoi Phan	326.36	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S1 should be amended so that structures do not exceed 15 metres in height and the 15 degree slope are removed.	Amend HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 11 15 metres in height above ground level, except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown in Diagram 5 below: ... Remove High Density Residential Zoning at 35 to 61 Hankey Street.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	The 6-storey height limit at 35 to 61 Hankey Street is not supported, as these properties are along the ridgeline, steeply sloped, and already suffer from poor pedestrian and vehicle access.	Remove High Density Residential Zoning at 35 to 61 Hankey Street.
Kerry Finnigan	336.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that early 1900s houses in Newtown will have no protection from being shaded by 6-storey buildings and may lose their privacy and value by being exposed to a possible "visual pollution" in the neighbourhood. These houses are the main assets of many residents in Newtown who put in work, money and time to upgrade and maintain their character.	Seeks that areas in proximity to early 1900s houses in Newtown not be zoned High Density Residential. [Inferred decision requested]
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.364	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support in part	Standard HRZ-S1 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.365	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S1 should be amended to enable greater densities (heights and number of dwellings) to promote a more urban form. Considers that dwellings of this scale that comply with the permitted activity standards should not require resource consent and be better aligned with the outcomes of the NPS-UD.	Amend Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Building height control 1 where no more than three four residential units occupy the site 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 11 14 metres in height above ground level, except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown in Diagram 5 below: ... Retain Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.473	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support in part	Standard HRZ-S1 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.474	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that amendments are required to allow this standard to apply to all residential units regardless of how many are on a site and to be more enabling for residential units located within close proximity to train stations and local centres. Considers that amendments are required to align with the NPS-UD Policy 3 which enables building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, particularly within walkable distances of existing and planned rapid transit stops and amenities such as local centres. Similarly, heights should be adjusted to 35 meters where the following criteria are broadly met to recognise the higher level of these centres in the Centres hierarchy given their broader function and characteristics. Expand the High Density Residential Zone and heights as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 43m (12 Storeys) within 400m of edge of the CCZ and 36m (10 Storeys) within 400m to 1500m from the edge of the CCZ • 36m (10 Storeys) within 800m of the MCZ • 29m (8 Storeys) within 800m of the TCZ. <p>[See Appendix 4 of original submission for more detail]</p>	<p>Amend Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site 1. Buildings and structures must <u>meet the following requirements:</u> <u>a. not exceed 44.22 metres in height above ground level, except that:</u> <u>i. This can be extended to 43m where Buildings and Structures are located within 400m of the CCZ; and</u> <u>ii. This can be extended to 36m where Buildings and Structures are located between 400m-800m of the CCZ or 400m of the MCZ; and</u> <u>iii. This can be extended to 29m where Buildings and Structures are located within 400m from Miramar Town Centre and 50m adjoining the Tawa MUZ extension, within 400m of the Tawa Town Centre Zone and 36m within 400m of the Newtown Town Centre Zone; and</u> <u>b. in all other cases 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown in Diagram 5 below:</u> <u>Except where:</u> [diagram] This standard does not apply to: a. Fences or standalone walls. <u>b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and</u> <u>c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g., finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m.</u></p> <p>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; 2. Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites; and 3. Effects on the function and associated amenity values of any adjacent open space zone.; <u>and</u> 4. <u>Wind effects</u></p> <p>[Refer to original submission for further information]</p>
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.</p> <p>Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.</p>	Disallow
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.104	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	The proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS and would enable an unjustified level of development. There is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZS1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Don MacKay	FS94.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZS1	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.35	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	We opposed amendments to standard HRZ-S1 to increase building height controls within given distances of CCZ, MCZ and Town Centre Zones. The proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS and would enable an unjustified level of development. There is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposed amendments to standard HRZ-S1 to increase building height controls within given distances of CCZ, MCZ and Town Centre Zones. The proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS and would enable an unjustified level of development. There is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary.	Disallow
Donna Yule	421.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes the blanket policy of Medium Density 3 Storey Residential housing in all residential areas - the height limits are too high.</p> <p>Considers that no consideration has been given to the geographical location of each individual suburb, its terrain and orientation to the sun. For suburbs that are built in a north south direction with hills either side and the main housing is on the flat, any 3 storey building will cast a significant shadow over many properties.</p> <p>Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows.</p> <p>Added to that no space between properties, no outside areas to enjoy a little privacy. These suburbs will become sunless undesirable transitional suburbs where people will only stay a short time until they can afford to move elsewhere with sun & outdoor space.</p>	Not specified.
Gregory Webber	33.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes six storey buildings in Green Street and believes that two-three storey housing is acceptable.	Amend the 21m height limit at HRZ-S2
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.219	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greg Coyle	39.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes six storey height limit in Newtown	Not specified
M J & P B Murtagh	98.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the 21m height standard for Mount Victoria should be reduced.	Seeks that the 21m height limit specified at HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is reduced in relation to Mount Victoria.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes HRZ-S2 height limit of 21m with regards to Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood. Considers that an 11m height limit will help preserve the unique character of the area. Lower Kelburn is not suitable for 21m height limit because of steep and narrow access, hilly and deeply indented physical character which would require significant infrastructural development to intensify. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes HRZ-S2 (Height Controls for multi unit housing or a retirement village) with regards to 6 storey building height in Lower Kelburn
Everard Aspell	270.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Not specified	Considers that allowing building heights of 11-21 metres in the inner city suburbs of Mount Victoria, Mount Cook, Thorndon, Berhampore, Newtown and Aro Valley will create shading, privacy issues, loss of green areas, reduced property values; will forever change the streetscape and will not reflect the character of the area.	Seeks that intensification is restricted to brownfield sites.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.112	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Part of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.205	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Supports HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.206	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Amend HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m; <u>and</u> d. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.
Marilyn Powell	281.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that for WCC to permit high rise dwellings will mean demolition destruction of well-maintained wooden heritage housing stock and insertion of concrete and glass. Inserting just one such high-rise will affect negatively the surrounding wooden housing, causing shading and weatherboard deterioration.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.74	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	TRA support these submissions insofar as they underpin the reasons to change the Hobson residential are from HDZ to MDZ and to create a Character Precinct over the block.	Allow
Phillippa O'Connor	289.34	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should have maximum building height increased because: - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university. [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that Standard HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) is amended so that the western side of Kelburn Parade has a maximum height limit of 21m as a permitted activity.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.35	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers this dual-standard approach is unnecessary, and that the more permissive height standard in the MRZ should be enabled irrespective of scale of the development.	Seeks that standards HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) and HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) building height control are combined so that there are not different height standards for 1-3 residential units and multi unit developments.
Hilary Watson	321.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Considers that Building Height Control 2 is inadequate for properties surrounding Carrara Park. The park serves a large community of people of all ages who live nearby, some of whom are in social housing and apartments with little outdoor space. Carrara Park is a precious resource for the community, heavily used in the afternoon when the sun comes from the northwest and west, an area inappropriately zoned in the PDP at 21 meters. The new three storey block on Regent St already casts shade on the park in the morning at certain times of the year.	Opposes HRZ-S2 in relation to properties around Carrara Park being classified under Building Height Control 2 in HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village).
Khoi Phan	326.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 21 30 metres in height above ground level. ...
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that 21 metres heights, or 6 stories, is too tall for the whole Mt Cook area given much of the suburb should be captured within the character area per the findings of the Boffa Miskell report. 21-metre areas adjoining designated character areas could create towering buildings dominating the neighbourhood. Furthermore, such heights will cause neighbouring properties to become shadier, damper, less healthy and unpleasant to live in, with risks of blocking sunlight and solar energy production.	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones in Mount Cook not be directly adjacent to Character Precincts.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.102	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZS2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.187	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Supports HRZ-S2 and the additional building height that it enables for retirement villages.	Retain HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.366	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support in part	Supports the direction to enable a range of housing types and densities in the High Density residential Zone.	Retain Standard HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.367	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that enabling up to twelve stories is appropriate in certain areas where the density is supported by services.	Amend Standard HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 24 <u>22</u> metres in height above ground level. This standard does not apply to: a. Fences or standalone walls; b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m. Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; 2. Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites; 3. Effects on the function and associated amenity values of any adjacent open space zone; and 4. Wind effects; and 5. <u>Contribution to built urban form and outcomes sought under the NPS-UD.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.475	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes the provision of two entirely separate height standards seeks an amendment to HRZ-S1 to allow that standard to cover all areas and provide for greater height limits close to train stations and centres. [As detailed above].	Delete HRZ-S2 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) in its entirety as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZS1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Investore Property Limited	405.56	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Supports the provision of a broad area of six storey High Density Residential zoning in the wider Johnsonville catchment. Submitter considers that this gives effect to the NPS-UD and reflects the status of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre.	Retain HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.84	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Submitter considers that there should be further scope for development above the façade height, e.g. plant rooms, sloping roofs, etc. The submitter considers that is the view from the street which is the greatest concern (i.e. the height of the parapet). The submitter considers that the way the current height limits are drafted encourages a 'flat haircut' style of building and limits potential roof designs.	Amend HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 21 metres in height above ground level. This standard does not apply to: ... b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m; <u>d. Circumstances where up to 50% of a building's roof in elevation exceeds the maximum height where the entire roof slopes 15° or more; or</u> <u>e. Circumstances where, in respect of flat roofs or roofs sloping less than 15°, non-habitable rooms (such as plant rooms) and other roof-top structures may exceed the height, provided those structures are set back from the leading edge of the parapet by at least 2 metres and do not exceed 50% of the overall roof area.</u> ... [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jonathan Markwick	490.28	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Supports the increase in height controls in the "Kelburn North" area.	Retain HRZ-S2 (Maximum height) around Kelburn North as notified.
Jonathan Markwick	490.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Supports the increase in height controls in the Hobson Street, Hobson Crescent and Moturoa Street (Thorndon) area.	Retain the High Density Residential Zoning (21m) for Hobson Street, Hobson Crescent and Moturoa Street as notified.
Judith Graykowski	80.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is very limited and simply not adequate.	Not specified.
Ann Mallinson	81.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Not specified	Considers that developers should not be allowed to build without a requirement not to intrude on the sunlight of neighbouring buildings. The extra heating that will be used by the affected buildings will badly affect our carbon emissions.	Not Specified.
Joanna Newman	85.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m or 28.5m buildings are permitted up against character precincts, heritage areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society. Considers that allowing buildings of heights with 5 metre boundaries will destroy heritage or character from a visual point of view and lead to degradation of such properties. [See original submission for further detail] Supports evidence submitted by the Mt Victoria Historical Society.	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct or heritage area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Interprofessional Trust	96.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that recession plane requirements should be removed from the PDP.	Seeks that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is deleted.
Gael Webster	114.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m or 28.5m high buildings are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society. Considers that allowing buildings of such heights with a 5 metre height to boundary will destroy the heritage or character from a visual point of view and reduce the well-being of residents due to insufficient light and sunshine, and will likely to lead to degradation and abandonment of these properties.	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide is required between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.
Vivienne Morrell	155.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is very limited and simply not adequate, given that HRZ buildings can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m or 28.5m buildings are permitted up against character precincts, heritage areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society.	Not specified.
Pauletta Wilson	257.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the plan has very limited controls to manage shading and sunshine and that these are not adequate given buildings in the new high density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Seeks that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is amended to limit the shading of private properties beyond the controls that are in the plan already.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.147	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers there is a need to amend exemptions to HRZ-S3.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) exemptions as follows: (...) This standard does not apply to: a. (...) b. (...) c. (...)- <u>d. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and</u> <u>e. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m measured vertically.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.207	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Support in part	As per previous submission points, FENZ seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards	Supports HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.208	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	As per previous submission points, FENZ seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... b. Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site; <u>and</u> c. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; <u>and</u> <u>d. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Phillippa O'Connor	289.36	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that at 21m, a maximum height to boundary of 8m plus 60 degrees is onerous and renders future development of smaller sites in particular likely unable to achieve maximum height.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 2. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 3 19 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, <u>except where (3) or (4) below is applicable.</u>
James Coyle	307.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 is not suitable to be applied around Carrara Park for the following reasons: - The shallow depth of the park in the North South Direction make it susceptible for shading. - The location of amenities close to the Western Boundary are susceptible to shading. - The equinox is not a suitable measure to shading as the sun angle is still high. - The mixture of HRZ and MRZ zones around the park further complicates and adds risk to shading, there is no guidance on MRZ for open space. - Winter sun has significant shading potential. - There are little accessible parks in Newtown. A hatched zone measured by the winter solstice sunrise to sunset angles should be created. All properties in this zone need a 45deg recession plane measured from 2m above ground at the boundary. The point of measurement should be from the southwest boundary corner and the South east boundary corner. [Refer to attachment]	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) around Carrara Park in Newtown to require properties to have a 45 degree recession plane measured from 2m above ground at the boundary.
James Coyle	307.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that Carrara Park should be protected for development to the East / North / West. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Carrara Park be protected for development to the East, North and West.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Philip O'Reilly and Julie Saddington	310.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	HRZ-S3 does not provide any protection of the amenity effects on character precinct and should be amended to have an additional sub-point. The policy as it stands will result in large buildings creating significant effects on neighbouring character areas, eroding their special character values.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: ... 3. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 5 metres vertically above ground level along any boundary that adjoins a site in: i. The Medium Density Residential Zone; or ii. The Wellington Town Belt Zone; or iii. Any Heritage Area; or iv. Any site containing a Heritage Building; or v. Any site occupied by a school; <u>or</u> vi. <u>Any Character Precinct.</u>
Hilary Watson	321.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the upzoning of 73.2 percent of Newtown as HRZ is not respectful of the City's historic heritage and will result in the irretrievable loss of character, distinctiveness and identity across the suburb, including Character Precincts. The HRZ in the area will not effectively achieve the strategic direction supporting the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing, as well as their health and safety. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks to reduce the extent of the High Density Residential Zone in Newtown. [Inferred decision requested]
Hilary Watson	321.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3.4 provides inadequate height zoning for properties around Carrara Park in Newtown. The provision does not provide sufficient sun access to the park and is too limited in the way it relates to the properties surrounding Carrara Park in Newtown. Properties surrounding Carrara Park should have appropriate setbacks and roof planes so that the park gets maximum possible sun all year round.	Seeks that the properties bordering Carrara Park have appropriate setbacks and roof planes so that the park gets maximum possible sun all year round.
Khoi Phan	326.38	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Delete HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) in its entirety.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 is inadequate, given buildings can go right up to site boundaries. Design requirements for multi-unit residential developments need to be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to better future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that adjacent property owners, particularly of wooden structures, should be enabled to gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures, and to maintain access to services/utilities and boundary fences. It references standard HRZ - S3 and states that "amend if necessary". 1.5m front yard setback and a 1 metre yard are considered absolute minimums (perhaps should be more).	Seeks that there are adequate setbacks for buildings and structures from neighbouring boundaries in any residential zone. 1.5m front yard setback and a 1 metre yard are considered absolute minimums (perhaps should be more).
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.188	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S3 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	Retain HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.189	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Supports HRZ-S3 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) so that it does not apply to boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, commercial and mixed use zones, and special purpose zones.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.388	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Support	HRZ-S3 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.476	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S3 in general subject to amendments being made to reflect the relevant height control as sought for other standards and to achieve improved regional alignment and enable appropriate levels of intensification in the HRZ.	Retain HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.477	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Supports HRZ-S3 in general subject to amendments being made to reflect the relevant height control as sought for other standards and to achieve improved regional alignment and enable appropriate levels of intensification in the HRZ.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where HRZ-S1 applies: No part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4-19 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries within 21.5 m from the frontage, as shown in Diagram 6 below. (diagram) 2. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: No part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 8 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries except where (1) above is applicable, and except where (3) or (4) below is applicable; 3. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: No part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 56 metres vertically above ground level along any boundary that adjoins a site in: ...
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.35	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZS3	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.85	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend		Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where HRZ-S1 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown in Diagram 6 below. (Diagram) ... [Also delete diagram]
Anna Kemble Welch	434.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 should be amended to allow for more daily sunlight access throughout the year. Carrara Park in Newtown is in the middle of a residential area and close to a large amount of WCC housing with many families who use the park as their playground and social space to meet friends. If neighbouring properties are designated as Medium or High Density residential, then future development could easily overshadow the open space and make the playground cold and damp, uninviting and unhealthy. The provision in item 4 does not go far enough to protect this from happening. Retaining a minimum of 70% sunlight for only half the year (spring to autumn equinox) for only the hours of 10am to 3pm means the park could be heavily shaded for the other half of the year, autumn to spring, which is the time people really need the sunshine. 10am to 3pm cuts out the times children are likely to play in the park after school, so by the time they get there it is no longer sunny.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: ... 4. For any site where HRZ-S2 or HRZ-S1 applies that is located within 60 meters of adjacent to a site in the Natural Open Space Zone, Open Space Zone, or Sport and Active Recreation Zone: all buildings and structures must be designed and located to maintain sunlight access to a minimum of 70% of the open space site area during 10am to 4.30pm throughout the year, 3pm at either of the equinoxes (i.e. 21 March or 23 September). ...
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Inconsistent with the MDRS and with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Inconsistent with the MDRS and with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kirsty Woods	437.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the current standards for High Density Residential fail to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight. Heights from which recession planes on the southern boundary of a new development are measured should also be adjusted down to minimise loss of sun from the north of neighbouring properties.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where HRZ-S1 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown in Diagram 6 below its northern boundary, and 2 metres vertical above ground level on its southern, eastern and western boundaries; 2. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 8 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, its northern boundary except where (3) or (4) below is applicable, and 5 metres vertically above ground level on its southern, eastern and western boundaries; ...
Newtown Residents' Association	440.26	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers tht HRZ-S3 should be amended, as it is too limited and does not provide enough protection from shade. It is considered that: - A 4m wall on the north boundary, with a 60 degree recession plane, would allow a complete blocking of sun for existing homes on Newtown's small sections, where there is likely to only be a small side yard. - The standard only applies to buildings in the HRZ directly adjacent to a park, and not to buildings across the street or otherwise seperated from the park boundary. - The days and hours this standard applies are too restrictive and will often be reached with only minor changes to the maximum permitted height. However it is during the winter that the need for sunlight is most acute, and a building that meets the standard at the solstice will be shading a much bigger area by mid winter. Carrara Park in Newtown is an example of a space that will be affected by this standard. - Peak usage for primary and secondary school aged children is after school, so 3pm is too early for them; the time should extend to at least 4pm and preferably 4.30pm. - Sites where HRZ-S1 applies have a required set back from the boundary, but if someone chooses to build to the allowed 11m height then the remaining bulk of the building still casts a significant shadow. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: ... 4. For any site where HRZ-S2 or HRZ-S1 applies that is located adjacent to <u>within 60m of</u> a site in the Natural Open Space Zone, Open Space Zone, or Sport and Active Recreation Zone: all buildings and structures must be designed and located to maintain sunlight access to a minimum of 70% of the open space site area during 10am to 3pm <u>4pm</u> at either of the equinoxes (i.e. 21 March or 23 September) <u>and at midwinter ie. 23 June.</u>
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as very limited and simply not adequate.	Not specified.
Catharine Underwood	481.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the standard is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the new medium density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be stricter.
AdamsonShaw	137.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S4 should be amended as the current standards in the Operative District Plan for the corresponding zone are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards. The front yard setback should be 1 metre as it is in the ODP for the inner residential zone.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that the front yard setback is 1 metre.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
AdamsonShaw	137.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S4 should be amended as the current standards in the Operative District Plan for the corresponding zone are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that there is no side or rear yard setback requirement except that, a minimum width of 1 metre must be maintained between buildings where a residential building (other than an accessory building) on an adjoining site is sited less than 1 metre from the boundary.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.89	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of yard setback standards. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Zaffa Christian	174.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that a one metre needs to be maintained in order to minimise damage in an earthquake. This is based on recommendations made by Michael Fowler. Building this close with high-medium rise buildings, also contravenes the sunshine clause currently being upheld by the environmental commission.	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) applies to developments of 1 - 3 units, so that buildings are setback at least one metre from the fence/boundary line. [Inferred decision requested].
Jon Gaupset	175.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that a one metre needs to be maintained in order to minimise damage in an earthquake. This is based on recommendations made by Michael Fowler. Building this close with high-medium rise buildings, also contravenes the sunshine clause currently being upheld by the environmental commission.	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) applies to developments of 1 - 3 units, so that buildings are setback at least one metre from the fence/boundary line. [Inferred decision requested].
Avryl Bramley	202.42	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that this has been the case in the past and has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	Seeks that HRZ-S4 is amended to require boundary setbacks. [Inferred decision requested]
Avryl Bramley	202.43	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that this has been the case in the past and has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	Seeks reinstatement of side yards in residential areas. [Inferred reinstatement of front and side yards for 1 - 3 units in HRZ-S4].
Russell Taylor	224.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that multi unit developments need to be encouraged	Seeks that HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) not apply to multi unit developments.
Victoria Stace	235.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that yard setbacks enable adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Seeks that HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that this enables adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures. [Note the submitter refers to HRZ-S3, which is the height in relation to boundary standard]	Seeks that HRZ-S4 is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings. [Inferred decision requested]
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Support in part	Supports the minimum yard setbacks of 1.5m (front yard) and 1m (side yards) in all residential zones. Considers that this enables adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Supports HRZ-S4 (Building setbacks) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the minimum yard setbacks of 1.5m (front yard) and 1m (side yards) should apply in all residential zones as this enables adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Seeks that HRZ-S4 is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington City Council	266.148	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) exemptions as follows: This standard does not apply to: <u>a. Developments of 1-3 household units with respect to the front and side yard set-back requirements;</u> <u>a.b. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; and</u> <u>b.c. Fences or standalone walls;</u> <u>d. Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height above ground level;</u> <u>e. Eaves up to 600mm in width;</u> <u>e.e. Multi-unit housing; and</u> <u>e.f. Retirement villages.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.90	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Rejects exempting 1-3 dwellings from complying with yard setback standards. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S4 should be amended to have an exception for low decks and eaves. Both the front & side yard requirements are more restrictive than current rules. There are also no exceptions for low decks or eaves. A wall 1m clear of the boundary with an eave up to 600 wide above is consistent with other regulatory requirements, so keeping the side yard requirement but allowing a 600 eave (as at GRUZ-S4) would be reasonable, as would that provision's allowance for low decks.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; and b. Fences or standalone walls; and c. <u>Uncovered decks no more than 500mm in height above ground level; and</u> d. <u>Eaves up to 600mm in width</u>
Khoi Phan	326.39	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: Yard Minimum depth Front 1.5 metres <u>1.0 metre</u> Side 1 metre <u>0.5 metre</u> Rear 1 metre <u>0.5 metre</u> (excluded on corner sites)

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested										
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that setback requirements should be modelled after the Sydney Design Guide, by taking into account the width of the street (i.e. narrower the street, lower the height in which a setback takes effect) and the height of the building (i.e. higher the building, the greater the setback is).	Seeks that setback requirements take into account the width of the streets and heights of buildings.										
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.190	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S4.	Retain HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.										
Waka Kotahi	370.368	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Support in part	Standard HRZ-S4 is supported, but amendment is sought	Retain Standard HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) with amendment.										
Waka Kotahi	370.369	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S4 should have immediate legal effect to align with the MDRS requirements, and to avoid confusion where boundary setbacks are applied from both the operative and proposed district plan. It is noted the intention of the NPS-UD is to enable urban environments to evolve and change, enabled by the national standards.	Seeks to amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to ensure it has immediate legal effect.										
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.389	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the boundary setbacks do not provide for efficient use of land, and will continue to perpetuate the poor land use practice of infill without regard to long term liveability. The submitter seeks that the requirement for a frontage setback be removed, along with side yard requirements. The submitter seeks a greater rear yard set back. Considers that this will help get our medium and high density zones on a track towards a better, more efficient yet useable urban form for the years to come.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to remove: - the minimum depth front yard requirement, - the side yard requirement for the first 20 m from front (street frontage) to back, and increase the rear yard requirement to 8 metres.										
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.478	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S4 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) and seeks amendment.										
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.479	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Supports HRZ-S4 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... c. Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units; and										
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.123	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor under HRZ-S4, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. KiwiRail consider that a 5m setback would be more appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the rear of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. An increased setback would provide for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher rise structures and for the safer use of outdoor deck areas at height. This in turn fosters visual amenity, as lineside properties can be regularly maintained. KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Yard Boundary</th> <th>Minimum depth</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Front</td> <td>1.5 metres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Side</td> <td>1 metre</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rear</td> <td>1 metre (excluded on corner sites)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rail corridor</td> <td>5 metres</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Yard Boundary	Minimum depth	Front	1.5 metres	Side	1 metre	Rear	1 metre (excluded on corner sites)	Rail corridor	5 metres
Yard Boundary	Minimum depth														
Front	1.5 metres														
Side	1 metre														
Rear	1 metre (excluded on corner sites)														
Rail corridor	5 metres														
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.36	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought insofar as it relates to the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow										

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Donna Yule	421.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Opposes having no residential minimum boundaries space of at least 1 metre.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the geographical location of each individual suburb, its terrain and orientation to the sun. For suburbs that are built in a north south direction with hills either side and the main housing is on the flat, any 3 storey building will cast a significant shadow over many properties.</p> <p>Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows.</p> <p>Added to that no space between properties, no outside areas to enjoy a little privacy. These suburbs will become sunless undesirable transitional suburbs where people will only stay a short time until they can afford to move elsewhere with sun & outdoor space.</p>	Not specified.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.38	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Considers that one major recent decision by the Council has been to remove the building front and side setback requirements in the current District Plan. Permitting buildings onto the boundary is a significant loss of neighbourhood amenity and is likely to further reduce the natural light next to high buildings.</p>	<p>Seeks that HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m sideyard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings.</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>
Kirsty Woods	437.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Considers that the current standards for High Density Residential fail to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight. Standards should acknowledge the effects on existing properties of new-builds, depending on whether they are built to the north, east, west or South.</p>	<p>Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows:</p> <p>1. Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below:</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <p>a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; <u>and</u></p> <p>b. Fences or standalone walls;</p> <p>c. Multi-unit housing; and</p> <p>d. Retirement villages.</p> <p><u>The standard for Front Yard minimum depth do not apply to:</u></p> <p><u>a. Multi-unit housing; and</u></p> <p><u>b. Retirement villages.</u></p>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.169	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	<p>The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.</p>	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.169	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.</p>	Disallow
Meredith Robertshawe	444.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Seeks that front and side yard boundaries retained to increase the streetscape and visual amenity effects; and minimise potential dominance, lack of privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites.</p>	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to reinstate the front and side yard set-backs for developments of 1 to 3 units.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meredith Robertshawe	444.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Seeks that MRZ-S4 has front and side yard boundaries retained to retain existing streetscape and visual amenity effects; and minimise potential dominance, lack of privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Seeks the reinstatement of front and side yard boundaries for:</p> <p>a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed;</p> <p>b. Fences or standalone walls;</p> <p>c. Multi-unit housing; and</p> <p>d. Retirement villages</p> <p>Considers that this will ensure that space between separate buildings will be retained, and increase the amenity value for neighbourhoods where medium density building is allowed.</p>	<p>Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <p>a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed;</p> <p>b. Fences or standalone walls;</p> <p>c. Multi-unit housing; and</p> <p>d. Retirement villages.</p> <p>...</p>
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.184	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend front setbacks to two metres as per the Operative District Plan.	<p>Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows:</p> <p>Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below:</p> <p>Front - 1.5 metres 2 metres</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Catharine Underwood	481.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that the removal of front and side yard setbacks for medium density residential standards compliant development will negatively affect the street scape of suburban Wellington.	Seeks that front and side yard setbacks in HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) apply to residential units that comply with the medium density residential standards.
Catharine Underwood	481.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that all new buildings in the inner city should have a minimum set back of at least 1.5 (2m is better) to give room for a green corridor. Side yards are a good place for rubbish bins, compost bins or sheds to store bikes and other toys. A good example of why larger set backs are needed in The Paddington on Taranaki Street, which was meant to have several street trees lining the pavement and softening the development, as part of the consent but ended up with no trees due to underground services like pipes, telecommunications, electricity and sewerage. If there had been a setback, a green front would have been possible. The residents of The Paddington and Wellington are the poorer because of this.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to have setbacks of 2m and at least 1.5m in the inner city.
Wellington City Council	266.149	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	<p>Amend HRZ-S5 (Building coverage) exemptions as follows:</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <p><u>a. Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height above ground level;</u></p> <p><u>b. Eaves up to 600mm in width;</u></p> <p>c. Multi-unit housing; and</p> <p>d. Retirement villages.</p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.191	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S5	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S5.	Retain HRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.370	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S5	Support	Standard HRZ-S5 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.480	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S5	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S5 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-S5 (Building coverage) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.481	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S5	Amend	Supports HRZ-S5 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Amend HRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as follows: This standard does not apply to: a. Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units; and ...
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.192	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S6.	Retain HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.371	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Support	Standard HRZ-S6 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.23	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Amend	Considers that bin storage should have a specific and acknowledged location on site that is outside an outdoor living space.	Amend HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as follows: 1. A residential unit at ground floor level must have an outdoor living space that is at least 20 square metres and that comprises ground floor, balcony, patio, or roof terrace space that: a. Where located at ground level, has no dimension less than 3 metres; b. Where provided in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace, is at least 8 square metres and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 metres; c. Is accessible from the residential unit; d. May be: i. grouped cumulatively by area in 1 communally accessible location; or ii. located directly adjacent to the unit; and e. Is free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing (including waste facilities) and maneuvering areas.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.390	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Support	HRZ-S6 is supported as provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.482	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Oppose in part	Acknowledges that HRZ-S6 is directly taken from the MDRS, however, considers that the standard could be made more enabling. HRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling outdoor living space requirement which is considered appropriate for all residential units as it provides sufficient onsite space and amenity. Amendments are sought to replace HRZ-S6 with HRZ-S13 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) in its entirety as notified. Seeks to replace standard with amendments sought to HRZ-S13.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.144	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.144	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.483	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Amend	Acknowledges that HRZ-S6 is directly taken from the MDRS, however, considers that the standard could be made more enabling. HRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling outdoor living space requirement which is considered appropriate for all residential units as it provides sufficient onsite space and amenity. Amendments are sought to replace HRZ-S6 with HRZ-S13 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) in its entirety as notified. Seeks to replace standard with amendments sought to HRZ-S13.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.145	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.145	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S6	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.193	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S7.	Retain HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.372	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Support	Standard HRZ-S7 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.391	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Support	HRZ-S7 is supported as provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.484	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Oppose in part	Acknowledges that HRZ-S7 is directly taken from the MDRS, however, considers that the standard could be made more enabling. HRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling provision which provides sufficient outlook space and is considered to be appropriate for all residential units regardless of the number on a site. Amendments are sought to replace MRZ-S7 with MRZ-S14 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) in its entirety as notified. Seeks to replace standard with amendments sought to HRZ-S14.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.148	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.148	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.485	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Amend	Acknowledges that HRZ-S7 is directly taken from the MDRS, however, considers that the standard could be made more enabling. HRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling provision which provides sufficient outlook space and is considered to be appropriate for all residential units regardless of the number on a site. Amendments are sought to replace MRZ-S7 with MRZ-S14 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) in its entirety as notified. Seeks to replace standard with amendments sought to HRZ-S14.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.149	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.149	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Craig Palmer	492.30	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) avoids specifying access to direct sunlight within principal living rooms. The very small living spaces allowed for under HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing), i.e. 35m ² to 55m ² , necessitate a counterbalancing measure to ensure that direct sunlight prevents claustrophobia and depression from living in confined shaded spaces. In Wellington direct sunlight enjoyed indoors is crucially important. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that provision is made to ensure that principal living rooms enjoy a minimum of two hours of direct sunlight from June to August.
Craig Palmer	492.31	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) avoids specifying access to direct sunlight within principal living rooms. The very small living spaces allowed for under HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing), i.e. 35m ² to 55m ² , necessitate a counterbalancing measure to ensure that direct sunlight prevents claustrophobia and depression from living in confined shaded spaces. In Wellington direct sunlight enjoyed indoors is crucially important. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that provision is made to ensure that principal living rooms enjoy a minimum of two hours of direct sunlight from June to August.
Interprofessional Trust	96.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Amend	Considers that the 20% glazing standard has no support in science and that glass is not an insulating cladding. [Refer to original submission for further details]	Seeks that the 20% glazing standard is amended to say 15-50% glass when oriented 90° of north and 20% max for other orientations, excluding shopfronts [refer to submission for further details].
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.194	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S8.	Retain HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.373	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Support	Standard HRZ-S8 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.392	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Support	HRZ-S8 is supported as the standard will help ensure attractiveness at street level, as well as provide for passive surveillance: designing for safety is highly important in built environments.	Retain HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.486	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S8 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.487	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Amend	Supports HRZ-S8 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Amend HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) t as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: i. Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units; and ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Phillippa O'Connor	289.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Not specified	Considers that 'landscaped area' could benefit from a definition.	Seeks clarity on the interpretation of 'landscaped area' as it relates to standard HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area).
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.195	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S9.	Retain HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.374	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Support	Standard HRZ-S9 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.393	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Support	HRZ-S9 is supported as the standard will ensure that increased density is done well, with benefits for health and wellbeing through fostering a biophilic environment.	Retain HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.488	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S9 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) and seeks amendment.
Wellington City Council	266.150	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Oppose in part	Considers that given this is not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this standard in the THW chapter. Note: HRZ-P9 and HRZ-S10 are to be relocated to THW – see new THW-P6 and THW-R7.	Delete HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) in its entirety. Consequential renumbering of standards HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) and HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to reflect change in numbering. Consequential update to references in notification clauses as required.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZS10	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the MRZ and HRZ policy and permeable surface rules are better suited to the Three Waters Chapter and support the amendments.	Allow
Phillippa O'Connor	289.38	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Not specified	Considers that the definitions lead to unnecessary restriction on site layout and design as currently drafted.	Seeks clarity on the whether the permeable surface area standard HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) is inclusive of landscaped area.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.196	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S10.	Retain HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.394	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Support	HRZ-S10 is supported as the standard will ensure that increased density manages risks of stormwater runoff including risks to water quality and flooding.	Retain HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.489	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Amend	Supports HRZ-S10 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Amend HRZ-S10 (Landscaped area) and seeks amendment as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units; and ...
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.490	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S10 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units; and ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that the current wording of HRZ-S11 potentially allows fences for multi-unit developments to be at any height provided the fences were not immediately on the front boundary.	Seeks amendment to HRZ-S11 (Fences and Standalone Walls) to improve clarity to avoid fences for multi-unit developments being able to have any height as long as they are not on the front boundary.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.209	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Support in part	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ	Support HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.210	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ	Amend HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: 1. Any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed : a. <u>Exceed</u> a maximum height of 2m above ground level where within 1m of any side or rear boundary. b. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u> 2. On a front boundary or in a front boundary setback any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed : a. <u>Exceed</u> a maximum height of 2m above ground level; and b. Any part of a fence or standalone wall above 1.2m in height must be 50% visually transparent for its entire length, as shown in Diagram 8 below. c. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u>
Khoi Phan	326.40	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: 1. Any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed: a. A maximum height of 2m <u>1.5m</u> above ground level where within 1m of any side or rear boundary;
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.197	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Support in part	Supports the 2m height standard for fences/walls but considers an exclusion is required for temporary fences/walls e.g. for noise mitigation during construction.	Retain HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.198	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Supports the 2m height standard for fences/walls but considers an exclusion is required for temporary fences/walls e.g. for noise mitigation during construction.	Amend HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to exclude temporary fences/walls from the standard.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.395	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m height destroy streetscapes, detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. The submitter seeks that fences should not be allowed to be more than 1.2m in height where that fence fronts the street, and that the provision for 2 m with the area above 1.2m being 50% visually transparent be applied to fences abutting public walkways.	Amend HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: - Require a fence on a front boundary to be no more than 1.2m in height. - Require a fence abutting a public walkway to be no more than 2 m with the area above 1.2m being 50% visually transparent.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.57	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Oppose	Concerned that the height of fences at which they are allowed as permitted activities should be lowered. High fences that cannot be seen through, are a public space problem for safety reasons.	Seeks amendment to standard HRZ-S11 (Fences and Standalone walls).
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.58	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Concerned that the height of fences at which they are allowed as permitted activities should be lowered. High fences that cannot be seen through, are a public space problem for safety reasons.	Seeks that MRZ-S11 is amended so that the fences up to 1m can be built with any material along a boundary with public space, and where higher than 1 metre they must be of a material that allows pedestrians to see through it from the adjacent path.
Property Council New Zealand	338.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Amend	Considers that minimum unit sizes, coupled with increased height density, run the risk of buildings that are smaller in floor space but greater in height. The overall design outcome should be considered so that adverse design outcomes for small, skinny buildings with less total floor space be avoided.	Seeks that overall design outcomes be considered when setting minimum unit sizes in HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.491	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S12 in part, but considers that there should be smaller floor areas for studio units and for simplicity, a minimum floor area for 1 or bedrooms.	Retain HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.492	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Amend	Supports HRZ-S12 in part, but considers that there should be smaller floor areas for studio units and for simplicity, a minimum floor area for 1 or bedrooms.	Amend HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) as follows: 1. Residential units, including any dual key unit, must meet the following minimum sizes: Residential Unit Type Minimum Net Floor Area a. Studio Unit 35m² <u>30m²</u> b. 1 <u>or more</u> bedroom(s) unit 40m ² c. 2+ bedroom unit 55m²
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.86	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes HRZ-S12 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in HRZ-P2 to provide a range of housing sizes.	Delete HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) in its entirety.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.87	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Amend	Opposes HRZ-S12 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in HRZ-P2 to provide a range of housing sizes.	Seeks that if Council does decide to retain minimum residential unit sizes, it should be clearly defined that hotel accommodation, student accommodation and other similar accommodation types are distinct from residential unit sizes. The definition of residential units does not clearly exclude student accommodation and may render it subject to these minimum sizes.
Craig Palmer	492.32	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Oppose	Considers that the minimum unit size standards in HRZ-S12 are small.	Not specified.
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Clarify HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) "Minimum Dimension" - so that for communal shared living spaces an 8m dimension is required at only one portion of the outdoor living space, with the other dimension able to be smaller than this. i.e. not an 8m x 8m space.
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks amendment to HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) to allow 10m ² minimum area to be achieved with alternative dimensions of 5m x 2m, or 3.2m x 3.2m.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.28	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Amend	Considers that the outdoor living space for multi-unit housing in HRZ-S13 has large requirements. The requirement for only 10 square metres of communal outdoor living space per every 5 units fits oddly with both the much larger requirement per unit if the space is private and also the 8m minimum dimension requirement. An 8m x 8m area, would in theory be sufficient communal space for 30 residential units with 4 square metres 'spare' increasing the allowance 5 square metres (matching the studio/1 bedroom private allowance) would leave the minimum area as adequate for 12 residential units. There are also sites within this zone where the site width is less than 8m.	Amend HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Living Space Type ... b. Communal i. For every 5 units unit Minimum area - 10m² <u>5m²</u> Minimum dimension - 8m <u>except where site width is less than 8m. In that situation an area the full width of the site and 8m deep is acceptable.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.493	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S13 is appropriate to apply to all sites. Seeks that this standard replace HRZ-S6 as the level of outdoor living area proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Opposes HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) and seeks that HRZ-S13 replace the standard with the following amendment to the title of HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.146	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.146	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.494	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S13 is appropriate to apply to all sites. Seeks that this standard replace HRZ-S6 as the level of outdoor living area proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Opposes HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) and seeks that HRZ-S13 replace the standard with the following amendment to the title of HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.147	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.147	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.88	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Oppose	Opposes this provision for the following reasons: - mandating unutilised external areas is expensive and will have a detrimental impact on dwelling prices. -there is insufficient economic justification for the provision and it does not meet the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness. -there is also a lack of sufficient research that underpins Council's evidence base. -Wellington's climate also reduces the amenity and use of outdoor living spaces, which can be exposed and windy.	Delete HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) in its entirety.
Judith Graykowski	80.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the HRZ can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.
Vivienne Morrell	155.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) is very limited and simply not adequate, given that HRZ buildings can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.
Pauletta Wilson	257.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that the plan has very limited controls to manage shading and sunshine and that these are not adequate given buildings in the new high density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Seeks that HRZ-S14 (outlook space for multi unit housing) is amended to limit the shading of private properties beyond the controls that are in the plan already.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S14 is inadequate, given buildings can go right up to site boundaries. Design requirements for multi-unit residential developments need to be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.	Amend HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) to better future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S15 is inadequate, given buildings can go right up to site boundaries. Design requirements for multi-unit residential developments need to be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.	Amend HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to better future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.495	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S14 is appropriate to apply to all sites. Seeks that this standard replace HRZ-S7 as the level of outdoor living area proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Opposes HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) and seeks that HRZ-S14 replace the standard with the following amendment to the title of HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Outlook space for multi-unit housing
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.150	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.150	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.496	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S14 is appropriate to apply to all sites. Seeks that this standard replace HRZ-S7 as the level of outdoor living area proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Opposes HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) and seeks that HRZ-S14 replace the standard with the following amendment to the title of HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Outlook space for multi-unit housing
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.151	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.151	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Il Casino Apartment Body Corporate	426.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Oppose	Considers that the standard requires a more context-specific standard to define what constitutes acceptable levels of natural light. For example, lower level apartments may lose daylight due to high neighbouring buildings, resulting in colder, darker apartments that use more electricity and do not result in a desirable urban living environment.	Opposes HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) and seeks amendment.
Il Casino Apartment Body Corporate	426.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that the standard requires a more context-specific standard to define what constitutes acceptable levels of natural light. For example, lower level apartments may lose daylight due to high neighbouring buildings, resulting in colder, darker apartments that use more electricity and do not result in a desirable urban living environment.	Amend HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) to have better design considerations and with specific consideration given to natural light for high rises.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Oppose	Considers HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) very limited and simply not adequate.	Not specified.
Catharine Underwood	481.26	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that the standard is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the new medium density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Amend HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) to be stricter.
Judith Graykowski	80.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the HRZ can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.
Vivienne Morrell	155.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is very limited and simply not adequate, given that HRZ buildings can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pauletta Wilson	257.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that the plan has very limited controls to manage shading and sunshine and that these are not adequate given buildings in the new high density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Seeks that HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is amended to limit the shading of private properties beyond the controls that are in the plan already.
Steve Dunn	288.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that two metre setbacks from boundaries and restricted rootzones in pavement does not support healthy trees or the objectives of a vibrant green living environment. A larger growing zone and porous ground is needed.	Seeks that HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is amended to ensure healthy tree growth in streetscape and intensified residential areas.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.199	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Support	Does not oppose HRZ-S15 and the minimum privacy separation to a boundary above ground level at retirement villages.	Retain HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as notified.
Sarah Walker	367.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Concerned about the minimum of 2 metres from the boundary that apartments can be built from existing apartments. Considers this will change the look and feel of the community, block light and pose a security risk. Also considers this will impact upon the value of homes which will place financial pressure on owners. Considers that in apartments with windows only on one side that sunlight would not be able to enter apartments with the new standards.	Not specified.
Waka Kotahi	370.375	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Not specified	Submitter takes a neutral position on HRZ-S15. Notes that there are no HIRB or boundary setback standards.	Not specified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.497	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S15. However, considers that reference to multi-unit housing should be deleted as this concept is not supported.	Retain HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.498	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Supports HRZ-S15. However, considers that reference to multi-unit housing should be deleted as this concept is not supported.	Amend HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing more than six residential units or a retirement village
Il Casino Apartment Body Corporate	426.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Considers that a 2m setback does not result in good urban design that encourages people to live in the city. Considers that sense of community is lost as people do not want to spend as much time at home. Considers that privacy and security of residents will also be affected.	Opposes HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.73	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.73	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Il Casino Apartment Body Corporate	426.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that a 2m setback does not result in good urban design that encourages people to live in the city. Considers that sense of community is lost as people do not want to spend as much time at home. Considers that privacy and security of residents will also be affected.	Amend HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to require better design considerations and wider gaps between high rise buildings.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.74	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.74	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Considers HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) very limited and simply not adequate.	Not specified.
Catharine Underwood	481.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that the standard is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the new medium density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Amend HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to be stricter.
James Coyle	307.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Amend	Considers that the 20m building depth standard is too long for Newtown.	Seeks that HRZ-S16 (Building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is reduced for Newtown.
James Coyle	307.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Amend	Considers that boundary setbacks for front yards should be provided to encourage planting and soil retention.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front yards for developments of 1 to 3 units.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.200	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Oppose in part	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for HRZ-R17 and HRZ-R14 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.201	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Amend	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for HRZ-R17 and HRZ-R14 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend the title of HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: HRZ-S16 Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village
Waka Kotahi	370.376	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Oppose	Considers HRZ-S16 should be removed as it is unnecessarily restrictive to development. Considers that residential developments are already required to consider residential [design guide] and require consent as a RD activity. Submitter is unsure of the intended purpose of restricting depth, and is concerned about the implications where large multi-unit residential developments are proposed. Considers that this standard and HRZ-S17 may be better addressed with a building coverage standard that enables densities sought by the NPSUD for urban areas.	Delete Standard HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.499	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Oppose	Opposes HRZ-S16 as Building for multi-unit housing (more than six units) is a Restricted Discretionary activity so this matter can be considered as part of that consent process, so this standard is unnecessary.	Delete HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety as notified.

Residential - Large Lot Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.89	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Oppose	Considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and they do not consider that it meets the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Delete HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.90	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Amend	Considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and they do not consider that it meets the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Remove HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) from HRZ and include the provision in a non-statutory Design Guide.
James Coyle	307.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Amend	Considers that the 10m building separation standard needs to exclude car parking and decks from these areas. These areas should be used for ecological or green spaces to ensure safe landing spots for birds, tree canopy and soil retention.	Seeks that HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) excludes car parking and decks from within these areas.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.202	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Oppose in part	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 10 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for HRZ-R17 and HRZ-R14 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes the title of HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.203	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Amend	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 10 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for HRZ-R17 and HRZ-R14 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend the title of HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: HRZ-S16 Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village
Waka Kotahi	370.377	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S17 should be removed as it is unnecessarily restrictive to development. Considers that residential developments are already required to consider residential [design guide] and require consent as a RD activity. Submitter is concerned about the implications where large multi-unit residential developments are proposed.	Delete Standard HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.500	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Oppose	Opposes HRZ-S17 as Building for multi-unit housing (more than six units) is a Restricted Discretionary activity so this matter can be considered as part of that consent process, so this standard is unnecessary.	Delete HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.91	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Oppose	Considers that the building separation distance is too restrictive and they do not consider it meets the RMA tests for appropriateness.	Delete HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety.
RR Ventures (2018) Ltd	227.3	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Oppose	Opposes 166 Glanmire Road (Part Lot 8 DP 2205) being zoned as Large Lot Residential Zone. Considers that this section is 20,491 sq. mtr in area and is currently undeveloped. Considering the size and proximity to council's infrastructure, we believe the potential of the section can be further enhanced if it can be zoned residential, subdivided and developed to accommodate low to medium density housing.	Seeks that 166 Glanmire Road (Part Lot 8 DP 2205) be rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.21	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Oppose	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary.	Remove the references to "supported residential care activity" from the Large Lot Residential zone.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.10	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of this definition as it is uncertain how the deletion of the definition would affect existing activities that fall within this definition.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Peter Charlesworth	248.3	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the portion of the site 11B Wilmshurst Place containing the existing dwelling should be zoned Medium Density Residential Zone to be consistent with the current Outer Residential Area zoning, as the LLRZ zoning will result in development that is inconsistent with the proposed zoning and form of development that surrounds the site directly to the north, east and west.</p> <p>Considers that there is no rationale for zoning the Outer Residential Area portion of the site as LLRZ to a less enabling zone, as this will be contrary to the NPS-UD.</p> <p>[Refer to submission for area of the site that the submission applies to]</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the part of the site at 11B Wilmshurst Place containing the existing dwelling is zoned MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) not LLRZ (Large Lot Residential Zone).
Wellington City Council	266.151	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Amend	Considers that the permeable area requirements have been relocated to the THW chapter.	<p>Amend paragraph 3 of the Large Lot Residential Zone Introduction as follows:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>The Zone provides for lower density development through development controls which limit the scale of buildings that can be built, through restrictions on the number of residential buildings, site coverage, building height, height in relation to boundaries, and permeable area requirements.</p> <p>Note – for changes to the LLRZ chapter, refer to the attached annotated version of the chapter.</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the MRZ and HRZ policy and permeable surface rules are better suited to the Three Waters Chapter and support the amendments.	Allow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.34	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Amend	Considers that this will keep earthworks to a minimum and enabling significant and effective environmental impacts to be mitigated against. Complying with the PDP areas of significant concern around Earthworks and Three Waters.	Seeks that development in the LLRZ (Large Lot Residential Zone) is given Discretionary activity status.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.35	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Amend	Considers that this will keep earthworks to a minimum and enabling significant and effective environmental impacts to be mitigated against. Complying with the PDP areas of significant concern around Earthworks and Three Waters.	Seeks that building in the LLRZ (Large Lot Residential Zone) is required to be done on individual building platforms.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.260	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Support in part	Supports well-planned intensification within the existing urban footprint in appropriate areas that are not subject to a qualifying matter. This approach is consistent with Policy 31 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain chapter, subject to amendments outlined in other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.261	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Amend	Considers that for the provisions of the zone to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms.	Seeks to ensure the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.
Richard Herbert	360.4	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that SNAs should be reinstated on residential zones as originally proposed in earlier drafts of the Proposed District Plan, and prior to the Councillor Amendment to remove SNAs from Residential zones in June 2022.</p> <p>SNAs on Large Lot Residential Zones are supported.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Reinstate Significant Natural Areas for Large Lot Residential Zones.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.94	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' is amended to include reference to the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.92	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Amend	Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.
Alan Fairless	242.23	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / New LLRZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in ALL Residential Zones.	Seeks that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in Large Lot Residential Zones.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / New LLRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / New LLRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.211	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / New LLRZ	Amend	Seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities' for the reasons set out in the previous feedback point on the proposed definitions of 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in areas where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that FENZ is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. FENZ considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Add new Large Lot Residential Zone rule: <u>LLRZ-RX:</u> <u>Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>
Oranga Tamariki	83.10	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-O1	Support	Residential zones are considered an appropriate zone for Oranga Tamariki homes. Oranga Tamariki consider that there is land within the Large Lot Residential Zone that can satisfy site selection criteria for Oranga Tamariki homes. For consistency with the residential-related provisions and terminology used in the other residential zones (i.e., General Residential and Medium Density Residential), Oranga Tamariki supports the inclusion of residential activities within LLRZ-O1, as opposed to the original drafting which referred to residential development. If the nesting recommendation for supported residential care is accepted, this objective will be further strengthened.	Retain LLRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.212	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-O3	Support in part	Supports the objective as it enables non-residential activities within the Large Lot Residential zone. However, FENZ seeks an amendment to enable activities that provide for the safety of communities within the LLRZ.	Supports LLRZ-O3 (Non-residential activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.213	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-O3	Amend	Supports the objective as it enables non-residential activities within the Large Lot Residential zone. However, FENZ seeks an amendment to enable activities that provide for the safety of communities within the LLRZ.	Amend LLRZ-O3 (Non-residential activities) as follows: Non-residential activities are in keeping with the amenity of the Large Lot Residential zone and provide for the community's <u>safety and</u> social, economic, and cultural well-being.
Ministry of Education	400.105	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-O3	Support	Support LLRZ-O3 as it explicitly recognises and provides for a range of non-residential activities in the LLRZ (including educational facilities).	Retain LLRZ-O3 (Non-Residential activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.22	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P1	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain LLRZ-P1 (Residential activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	F589.11	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of this definition as it is uncertain how the deletion of the definition would affect existing activities that fall within this definition.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.378	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P1	Support in part	Supports the provision of appropriately scaled residential activities where they do not result in adverse effects to the roading network.	Not specified.
Waka Kotahi	370.379	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P1	Amend	Policy wording should be revised to enable the management of the effects on the roading network from residential activities.	Amend LLRZ-P1 (Residential activities) as follows: Residential activities Allow residential activities in the Large Lot Residential Zone that result in a low density of building form and open character, <u>and that do not adversely affect the safety and efficiency of the roading network.</u>
Oranga Tamariki	83.11	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P2	Support	The Large Lot Residential Zone is fundamentally a residential zone and it is considered appropriate for Oranga Tamariki homes to establish in such zones (as provided for in the General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone). Oranga Tamariki support the inclusion of supported residential care activities within LLRZ-P2. This achieves a consistent approach to residential care activities across all the Residential Zones.	Retain LLRZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.23	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P2	Oppose in part	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain LLRZ-P2.4 (Enabled non-residential activities) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.214	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P2	Support in part	Supports the policy as it enables non-residential activities and buildings in the LLRZ. However, FENZ seeks the inclusion of emergency service facilities with the policy to provide for the establishment of fire stations with the LLRZ.	Supports LLRZ-P2 (Enabled non-residential activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.215	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P2	Amend	Supports the policy as it enables non-residential activities and buildings in the LLRZ. However, FENZ seeks the inclusion of emergency service facilities with the policy to provide for the establishment of fire stations with the LLRZ.	Amend LLRZ-P2 (Enabled non-residential activities) as follows: Provide for home business, visitor accommodation, supported residential care activities, <u>emergency service facilities</u> , and childcare service activities to occur where the scale is such that the low-density amenity of the Large Lot Residential Zone is maintained.
Waka Kotahi	370.380	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P2	Support in part	Supported, with amendments.	Retain LLRZ-P2 (Enabled non-residential activities) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.381	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P2	Amend	Policy wording should be revised to enable the management of the effects on the roading network from residential activities.	Amend LLRZ-P2 (Enabled non-residential activities) as follows: Provide for home business, visitor accommodation, supported residential care activities, and childcare service activities to occur where: 1. the scale is such that the low-density amenity of the Large Lot Residential Zone is maintained; and 2. <u>the safety and efficiency of the roading network will be maintained.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.382	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P4	Support	Supports the wording as notified which provides for appropriately scaled community facility activities where they do not result in adverse effects to the roading network.	Retain LLRZ-P4 (Community facilities) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.383	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P5	Support in part	Supported, with amendments.	Retain LLRZ-P5 (Inappropriate activities) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.384	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P5	Amend	Supports the policy direction to avoid activities which are incompatible but consider the wording should include those activities which adversely affect the roading network.	Amend LLRZ-P5 (Inappropriate activities) as follows: Avoid activities that are incompatible with the purpose and the amenity values of the Large Lot Residential Zone, <u>or which have an adverse effect on the safety and efficiency of the roading network.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.385	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P7	Support	Supports the wording as notified which provides for appropriately scaled educational facility activities where they do not result in adverse effects to the roading network.	Retain LLRZ-P7 (Educational facilities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.106	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P7	Support	Supports LLRZ-P7 as it explicitly recognises and provides for educational facilities in the LLRZ.	Retain LLRZ-P7 (Educational facilities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.216	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P8	Support	Supports the policy as it ensures new buildings in the LLRZ can be appropriately serviced by either on-site or council reticulated infrastructure.	Retain LLRZ-P8 (Infrastructure) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.386	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P8	Support in part	Supports the policy direction. Requests amendments.	Retain LLRZ-P8 (Infrastructure) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.387	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-P8	Amend	Consider the wording should be amended to provide for all public infrastructure.	Amend LLRZ-P8 (Infrastructure) as follows: Ensure that new buildings can be appropriately serviced by either on-site or council reticulated public infrastructure that is able to accommodate the demand generated by the proposed activity within the building.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.24	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R1	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain LLRZ-R1 (Residential activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.12	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / General LLRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of this definition as it is uncertain how the deletion of the definition would affect existing activities that fall within this definition.	Disallow
Waka Kotahi	370.388	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R2	Support	Supports the permitted activity status and rules for home business activities, and the restricted discretionary activity status where the rules are not complied with. Waka Kotahi also supports that the effects on the roading network are included as a matter of discretion for restricted discretionary activities. This rule provides for small-scale activities while enabling the management of effects to the transport network from larger scale activities.	Retain LLRZ-R2 (Home business) as notified.
Craig Palmer	492.33	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R2	Support in part	Supports LLRZ-R2 (Home business) facilitating individuals being able to conduct a business from their principal place of residence.	Retain LLRZ-R2 (Home business) with amendment.
Craig Palmer	492.34	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R2	Amend	Considers that LLRZ-R2 (Home business) should be amended to reduce the proposed numbers working and those visiting as they are out of proportion to a home-based business. Considers that the LLRZ-R2 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Amend LLRZ-R2.1.b. (Home Business) as follows: ... b. No more than four three people in total work in the home business at any one time, and the maximum number of people on site associated with the home business does not exceed 10 <u>6</u> people at any one time;
Craig Palmer	492.35	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R2	Amend	Considers that the LLRZ-R2 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Not specified.
Craig Palmer	492.36	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R2	Amend	Considers that the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates should be considered.	Seeks that LLRZ-R2.2 (Home Business) is amended to include the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates as a matter of discretion. [inferred decision requested]
Airbnb	126.9	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R3	Support	Supports the approach to visitor accommodation in the residential zone.	Retain LLRZ-R3 (Visitor Accomodation) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.389	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R3	Support	Supports the permitted activity status and rules for Visitor Accommodation activities, and the restricted discretionary activity status where the rules are not complied with. Waka Kotahi also supports that the effects on the roading network are included as a matter of discretion for restricted discretionary activities. This rule provides for small-scale activities while enabling the management of effects to the transport network from larger scale activities.	Retain LLRZ-R3 (Visitor accommodation) as notified.
Craig Palmer	492.37	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the LLRZ-R2 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Seeks that LLRZ-R2 (Home Business) is amended to include the mandatory notification and consultation provisions of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 need to be added as a caveat.
Waka Kotahi	370.390	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R4	Support	Supports the permitted activity status and rules for Childcare services, and the discretionary activity status where the rules are not complied with. This rule provides for small-scale activities while enabling the management of effects to the transport network from larger scale activities. Childcare activities can have significant effects on the transport network and a discretionary activity status is therefore appropriate.	Retain LLRZ-R4 (Childcare services) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.107	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R4	Support	Supports that the District Plan continues to outline exclusions for childcare facilities in relevant rules in residential zones.	Retain LLRZ-R4 (Childcare services) as notified.
Oranga Tamariki	83.12	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R5	Support	Oranga Tamariki support the Permitted activity status for supported residential care activities. It provides flexibility for Oranga Tamariki to establish homes (up to 10 residents) in residential zones. Residential zones are considered an appropriate zone for Oranga Tamariki homes.	Retain LLRZ-R5.1 (Supported Residential Care Activities) as notified.
Oranga Tamariki	83.13	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R5	Amend	Oranga Tamariki support the Restricted Discretionary activity status for supported residential care activities exceeding 10 residents. Oranga Tamariki consider it acceptable for Council to consider the effects on the amenity values of the wider area as a result of the intensity and scale of the activity. Oranga Tamariki seek the preclusion of public notification for supported residential care activities exceeding 10 residents to ensure consistency across the residential zones.	Amend LLRZ-R5.2 (Supported Residential Care) as follows: Supported residential care activities 1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with LLRZ-R5.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the amenity values of nearby properties; 2. The local roading network has the capacity to accommodate any increase in traffic associated with the activity, and the safety and efficiency of the roading network will be maintained; and 3. There is adequate infrastructure to support the activity. <u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LLRZ-R5.2 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.25	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R5	Oppose in part	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain LLRZ-R5 (Supported residential care) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.391	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R5	Support	Supports the permitted activity status and rules for supported residential care activities, and the restricted discretionary activity status where the rules are not complied with. Waka Kotahi also supports that the effects on the roading network are included as a matter of discretion for restricted discretionary activities. This rule provides for small-scale activities while enabling the management of effects to the transport network from larger scale activities.	Retain LLRZ-R5 (Supported residential care) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.392	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R6	Support in part	LLRZ-R6 is supported, as some rural activities in the zone are permitted activity where the activities will not adversely affect the safety or efficiency of the transport network. The discretionary activity status where the permitted standards are not met is also supported as this enables managing adverse effects to the transport network. It is considered that the rule should be amended to ensure that trip generation as a result of these permitted activities is minimal.	Retain LLRZ-R6 (Rural activity) with amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.393	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R6	Amend	Considers that the rule should be amended to ensure that trip generation as a result of these permitted activities is minimal.	Amend LLRZ-R6 (Rural activity) as follows: Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is limited to: i. The grazing and keeping of livestock; ii. Equestrian activities; and iii. Horticulture.; <u>and</u> b. Vehicle movements generated by the activity comply with the trip generation thresholds in the <u>transport chapter</u> .
Waka Kotahi	370.394	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R7	Support	Considers these activities can have significant effects on the transport network and a discretionary activity status is therefore appropriate and enable managing adverse effects on the transport network.	Retain LLRZ-R7 (Community facility) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.395	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R8	Support	Considers these activities can have significant effects on the transport network and a discretionary activity status is therefore appropriate and enable managing adverse effects on the transport network.	Retain LLRZ-R8 (Educational facility) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.108	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R8	Support in part	Supports LLRZ-R8 in part.	Retain LLRZ-R8 (Educational facility) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.109	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R8	Amend	Amend LLRZ-R8. The submitter requests that educational facilities are provided for as a Restricted Discretionary activity in the LLRZ. The submitter considers that educational facilities should be provided for in this zone as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure that may need to be located in within the LLRZ.	Amend LLRZ-R8 (Educational facility) as follows: Educational Facility 1. Activity Status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters in LLRZ-P7</u> <u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LLRZ-R8.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.217	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R9	Oppose in part	Considers this rule would deem the construction of an emergency service facility, such as a fire station, as a non-complying activity in this zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment. It is therefore critical to the safety and wellbeing of the future population of LLRZ that the principle of constructing and operating a fire station within this zone is acceptable.	Retain LLRZ-R9 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, or discretionary) as notified, subject to inclusion of new rule LLRZ-RX with respect to emergency service facilities (as set out in the following submission point).
Waka Kotahi	370.396	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R9	Support	Supports the activity status of noncomplying for activities not listed – this enables the management of any adverse effects on the safety and function of the transport network	Retain LLRZ-R9 (Any activity not otherwise listed as permitted, restricted discretionary, or discretionary) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.218	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R10	Support	Supports the rule as the maintenance and repair of buildings and structures within the LLRZ are a permitted activity.	Retain LLRZ-R10 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.219	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R11	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the LLRZ are a permitted activity.	Retain LLRZ-R11 (Demolition or removal of a building or structure) as notified
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.262	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R11	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain LLRZ-R11 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.263	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R11	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend LLRZ-R11 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.220	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R12	Support	Supports the rule as the addition or alteration to buildings and structures within the LLRZ is provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity.	Retain LLRZ-R12 (Construction, addition, or alteration of buildings, accessory buildings) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.124	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-R12	Amend	Considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. This amendment is sought in addition to the amendment sought in relation to LLRZ-S6.	Amend LLRZ-R12 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings, accessory buildings) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of LLRZ-R12.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effects of the non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards. <u>2. The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u>
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.29	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that LLRZ-S1 should be amended, as it does not adequately cover a situation where a minor unit forms part of the main residential building (e.g. in a separate wing or floor level) rather than existing as a standalone building.	Amend LLRZ-S1 (Maximum number of residential buildings) as follows: 1. There shall be a maximum number of: a. One residential unit per site; or b. One residential unit and one minor residential unit per site <u>(whether both are located within one building or each located in a separate building).</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.397	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S1	Support in part	Supports, with amendments.	Retain LLRZ-S1 (Maximum number of residential buildings) with amendments.
Waka Kotahi	370.398	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S1	Amend	Considers the residential activities that are not permitted should be assessed for any adverse effect on infrastructure and the transport network.	Amend LLRZ-S1 (Maximum number of residential buildings) as follows: ... 4. Whether the topography of the site mitigates or exacerbates effects; and 5. The extent to which site layout or landscaping has been incorporated into the design to mitigate any resulting amenity effects; and <u>6. Whether the proposal will have any adverse effects on infrastructure capacity or the safety and efficiency of the transport network and how any effects will be managed.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.91	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S1	Support	Supports the addition to assessment criteria to allow for consideration of infrastructure and the transport network when the activity fails to meet permitted activity standards. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.30	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that LLRZ-S2 should be amended to mention 'gross floor area' and 'net floor area' are both defined terms. The use of either of these would be preferable to the current use of 'floor area' which is not. It would also be helpful to clarify that unlike a Minor Residential Unit, where a 1 per site maximum is stated at LLRZ-S1, several accessory buildings of up to 100 sq.m each are acceptable.	Amend LLRZ-S2 (Maximum floor area of accessory buildings and minor residential units) as follows: 1. The maximum <u>gross</u> floor area of an <u>each</u> accessory building per site shall be 100m2; and 2. The maximum <u>gross</u> floor area of a minor residential unit per site shall be 80m2 ...
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.221	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S3	Support in part	Supports the standard as it permits buildings and structures up to 8m in height. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone. As such, FENZ seeks an exemption from LLRZ-S3 for emergency service facilities within the LLRZ. FENZ seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Support LLRZ-S3 (Maximum Height), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.222	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S3	Amend	Supports the standard as it permits buildings and structures up to 8m in height. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone. As such, FENZ seeks an exemption from LLRZ-S3 for emergency service facilities within the LLRZ. FENZ seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Amend LLRZ-S3 (Maximum Height) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m; and <u>d. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.223	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S4	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards.	Support LLRZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.224	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S4	Amend	Seeks an exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards.	Amend LLRZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... 1. No part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a building line of 45 degrees from a height of 2.5m above ground level from all boundaries of the site; <u>and</u> 2. <u>Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.31	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S5	Amend	Considers that LLRZ-S5 should be amended to be more concise on what defines a site area and to be less restrictive. Initial limit is set at site coverage of 35%, which is based on building footprint as a percentage of net site area. Equivalent provisions in other residential zones (ref MDZS5, HRZ-S5) are similar, with a higher 50% limit. For all of these it would be helpful to mention that the site area to be used is the 'net site area' LLRZ-S5 also has a hard maximum coverage limit of 500 sq.m, which is expressed in terms of 'total floor area', not building footprint. To be consistent, this coverage limit should also be expressed as a maximum building footprint figure (which, like 'net site area' is a defined term). Also note while 'gross floor area' and 'net floor area' are defined terms, 'floor area' and 'total floor area' are not. The hard limit currently stated is likely to encourage subdivision into smaller sites, which is not a desirable outcome. The maximum coverage of 500 sq. m also appears unduly restrictive. Even using 'building footprint' rather than 'total floor area' for the 500 sq m limit, only sites smaller than 1430 sq. m will be governed by the 35% limit instead. The sites in this zone are largely land previously zoned rural, where there was a 400 sq, m limit on residential buildings plus an 800 sq .m limit on accessory buildings. buildings. A building footprint limit of at least 600 sq. m would be more consistent with the scale of existing development. Wording suggested would give a 'pause' at a building footprint of 600m2 until this size falls below 20% of the net site area.	Amend LLRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as follows: 1. <u>For net site areas below 1750m2:</u> Maximum site coverage: 35%, or a maximum total floor area <u>building footprint of 500 600 m2</u> inclusive of any accessory buildings (whichever is the lesser) 2. <u>For net site areas 1750m2 and above : Maximum site coverage: 20%.</u> ...
James Barber	56.6	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S6	Oppose	Prefers housing opening to street, as opposed to a 1.5m courtyard surrounded by high fencing. Setback space can otherwise be used for communal or private greenspaces.	Delete LLRZ-S6 (Building setbacks) in entirety. [Inferred Decision Requested]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.92	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S6	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of building setbacks. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.225	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S6	Support	Supports the standard as it exempts water tanks for firefighting purposes from the required setback from road boundaries.	Retain LLRZ-S6 (Building setback) as drafted.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.125	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S6	Amend	Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to or protruding over rail land is crucial. The Proposed Plan enables a 3m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor under LLRZ-S6. This standard does however, enable a 5m setback from a road boundary. KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures.	Amend LLRZ-S6 (Building setback) as follows: 1. Buildings or structures must not be located within: a. A 5m setback from a road <u>or rail corridor</u> boundary; and b. A 3m setback from a side or rear boundary.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.226	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S7	Support in part	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. FENZ therefore seeks an amendment to provide for this.	Supports LLRZ-S7 (Fences and standalone walls), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.227	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S7	Amend	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. FENZ therefore seeks an amendment to provide for this.	Amend LLRZ-S7 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: 1. No fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed : a. <u>Exceed</u> a maximum height of 2m above ground level where within 1m of any boundary; and b. <u>Exceed</u> the height in relation to boundary standard in LLRZ-S4; and c. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities</u>
Trelissick Park Group	168.25	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S8	Amend	Considers that a 60% permeable surface is too vague and should be amended to require at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Amend LLRZ-S8 (Permeable area) from 60% permeable surface to require neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.
Trelissick Park Group	168.26	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S8	Amend	Considers that it is essential that all building developments, including infill housing, require at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development, and so infringement provisions for stormwater should be deleted.	Amend LLRZ-S8 (Permeable area) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Any measures used to mitigate stormwater runoff; and 2. The capacity of, and effects on, the stormwater network.
Tyers Stream Group	221.76	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S8	Amend	Considers that development must not occur if rules cannot be followed.	Amend LLRZ-S8 (Permeable area) as follows: ... Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Any measures used to mitigate stormwater runoff; and 2. The capacity of, and effects on, the stormwater network.
Tyers Stream Group	221.77	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S8	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that LLRZ-S8 (Permeable area) is amended to stipulate neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.
Wellington City Council	266.152	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S8	Oppose in part	Considers that given this is not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this standard in the THW chapter. Note: HRZ-P9 and HRZ-S10 are to be relocated to THW – see new THW-P6 and THW-R7.	Delete LLRZ-S8 (Permeable area) in its entirety. Consequential renumbering of LLRZ-S9 and references to standards.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.10	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZS8	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the MRZ and HRZ policy and permeable surface rules are better suited to the Three Waters Chapter and support the amendments.	Allow

Rural Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tyers Stream Group	221.78	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S9	Amend	Considers that development must not occur if rules cannot be followed.	Amend LLRZ-S9 (On site services) as follows: ... Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:- 1. The engineering measure to provide on-site services and measures to maintain the health of future occupants and neighbouring properties; 2. The ability for the engineering measure to provide a level of service to support the proposed development; and 3. The ongoing maintenance of the engineering measure.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.228	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S9	Support in part	Supports the standard as it requires on-site water supply systems where a connection to Council's reticulated system is not available. However, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a standard requiring the provision of a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. The provision for an alternative method of firefighting water supply in the absence of a connection to a reticulated network is necessary in order to minimise the risk of loss of life, property damage and adverse effects on the wider environment (e.g. the spread of fire through surrounding vegetation).	Supports LLRZ-S9 (On-site services), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.229	Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S9	Amend	Supports the standard as it requires on-site water supply systems where a connection to Council's reticulated system is not available. However, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a standard requiring the provision of a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. The provision for an alternative method of firefighting water supply in the absence of a connection to a reticulated network is necessary in order to minimise the risk of loss of life, property damage and adverse effects on the wider environment (e.g. the spread of fire through surrounding vegetation).	Amend LLRZ-S9 (On-site services) as follows: ... 1. ... December 2021 and 2. ... disposal of stormwater; <u>and</u> 3. <u>Where a connection to Council's reticulated system is not available, an onsite firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, must be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.42	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S9	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.42	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Large Lot Residential Zone / LLRZ-S9	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Barry Ellis	47.2	Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Oppose	Supports District Plan Change 33 – Ridgelines and Hilltops (Visual Amenity) and Rural Area (2009) . The Council should abide by their District Plan Change 33 concerning the protection of ridgelines and hilltops.	Seeks that the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay incorporated into the operative District Plan (via Plan Change 33) be retained and opposes changing this overlay.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.165	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Oppose	Meridian accepts the delineation of ridgeline and hilltop overlays shown on the Plan maps.	Disallow
Margaret Ellis	48.2	Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Amend	Supports District Plan Change 33 –Ridgelines and Hilltops (Visual Amenity) and Rural Area (2009). The overlay protection of ridgelines and hilltops should be considered.	Seeks that the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay incorporated into the operative District Plan (via PC 33) be considered.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.166	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Oppose	Meridian accepts the delineation of ridgeline and hilltop overlays shown on the Plan maps.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rowan Hannah	84.2	Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Oppose	Supports District Plan Change 33 – Ridgelines and Hilltops (Visual Amenity) and Rural Area (2009) . The Council should abide by their District Plan Change 33 concerning the protection of ridgelines and hilltops.	Seeks that the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay incorporated into the operative District Plan (via Plan Change 33) be retained and opposes changing this overlay.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.167	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Oppose	Meridian accepts the delineation of ridgeline and hilltop overlays shown on the Plan maps.	Disallow
Rowan Hannah	84.3	Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Not specified	Considers that the changes to the District Plan (specifically intensification provisions) will change the look and feel of the rural area.	Seeks that intensification is not enabled in the General Rural Zone.
Rowan Hannah	84.4	Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Amend	Considers that the colour of houses could be darker colours (Blacks, dark greens, dark browns etc) so they blend more with the surrounding grassland, bush and forestry in the area.	Seeks that houses in rural areas are required to be darker colours. [Inferred decision requested]
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.36	Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Amend	Considers that the ODP Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay should be retained, with Marshall's ridge included in the overlay.	Seeks that the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay as in the Operative District Plan (introduced by Plan Change 33) is retained.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.168	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Oppose	Meridian accepts the delineation of ridgeline and hilltop overlays shown on the Plan maps.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.396	Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones / General point on Rural Zones	Support in part	Generally supportive with amendments specified to address wilding pines. [further detail provided in later parts of submission and summarised below]	Not specified.
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.8	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Amend	The GRZ chapter has no provisions for the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities.	Seeks that the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities is included in the Proposed District Plan as permitted activity in the General Rural Zone.
Helen Grove	197.2	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission.]	Seeks that the District Plan removes the objective of a compact city at the expense of the rural space around the city.
Wellington Branch of the New Zealand Deerstalkers	299.1	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Amend	Considers that the rifle range has been in use since 1960s and is the only not-for-profit range used by police, defence and community groups for the benefit of the wellington community. Considers that if the existing use rights of the rifle range are not recognised in the plan that the established land use (and activity) may become vulnerable to complaint from future land uses and activities. Considers that it is only fair that potential investors of land in the vicinity of the range are made aware of its existence.	Seeks that the General Rural Zone [Inferred from submission] provisions are amended to recognise the rifle range located at 109 Rifle Range Road and protect it from reverse sensitivity from future nearby land uses and activities.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.12	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Amend	The NOSZ chapter should be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for vehicle-based camping in the Wellington District. Campgrounds can easily meet the objectives, policies and intention of this zone.	Seeks that the GRUZ (General Rural Zone) chapter be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.264	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Support in part	Considers the approach taken in this zone aligns with Policy 56 of Proposed RPS Change 1 and gives effect to Policy 56 in the Operative RPS.	Retain chapter, subject to amendments outlined in other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.265	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Amend	Considers the approach taken in this zone aligns with Policy 56 of Proposed RPS Change 1 and gives effect to Policy 56 in the Operative RPS.	See submission point about flood hazard mapping for the General Rural Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.399	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Not specified	Considers areas zoned General Rural Zone as notified does not contain land accessed from state highway, if the extent of General Rural Zones area changes, Waka Kotahi may be interested.	Not specified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.25	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Support in part	Considers that General Rural Zones need to have a consenting pathway for the establishment of composting operations for the processing of household food waste.	Retain the General Rural Zone chapter with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.26	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Amend	Considers that General Rural Zones need to have a consenting pathway for the establishment of composting operations for the processing of household food waste.	Seeks that the General Rural Zone chapter has a consenting pathway for the establishment of composting operations for the processing of household food waste.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.5	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Oppose	This should not be created specifically for the rural area and the current provisions can satisfactorily assess any resource consent application.	Disallow
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.1	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / General GRUZ	Oppose	The requested amendments propose an expectation of industrialisation in the general rural zone and are not consistent with the rural values, environmental, character, amenity, or biodiversity objectives of the PDP.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.112	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Oppose in part	Considers the Plan establishes a policy framework that seeks to avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects for existing regionally significant infrastructure. One source of potential reverse sensitivity is allowing sensitive activities to establish close to existing wind farm turbines. Considers the policy intention (of avoiding reverse sensitivity effects) needs to be carried through into the rules for the General Rural Zone by requiring new sensitive activities (a defined term including dwellings) to be located a minimum distance away from existing wind turbines that will protect the amenity values of the sensitive activity. The distance should be established based on the noise contour endorsed for the resource consents for the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms.	Add a new standard GRUZ-S5 (Minimum setback for sensitive activities) as follows <u>New Standard GRUZ-S5:</u> <u>1. Minimum setback for sensitive activities</u> <u>Setback: no closer than the 40 dBA noise contour in relation to turbines in the existing West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms.</u> <u>[Refer to original submission for attachment of 40 dBA noise contour in relation to turbines in the existing West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms]</u>
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.7	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Oppose	The map appended in the further submission is insufficient to understand the impact of this requested inclusion. The maps as endorsed by the original resource consents for West Wind and Mill Creek (projected) are not necessarily the same as their post-establishment (actual) noise contours. The community needs to be able to consider any proposed new provision and its practical effects. The requested change potentially limits current and proposed activities on private land already provided for under the operational District Plan. [Refer to Further submission for full reason, including attachment]	Disallow
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.4	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Oppose	The proposal to establish a new 'noise setback' standard GRUZ-S5 would impose new restrictions on currently lawful activity for adjacent private land-owners. This could affect the amenity value of land without any consultation or compensation. The information on noise contours affecting land adjacent to West Wind is incomplete so the impact to the Mākara community cannot be assessed.	Disallow
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.60	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Amend	Seeks that a new policy is added to recognise and provide for the benefits of quarrying activities, noting that policy GRUZ-P5 relates to adverse effects and not benefits.	Add new policy to the General Rural Zone chapter as follows: <u>The benefits of quarrying activities to the city and region are recognised and provided for in the General Rural Zone.</u>
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.2	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Oppose	The requested amendments propose an expectation of industrialisation in the general rural zone and are not consistent with the rural values, environmental, character, amenity, or biodiversity objectives of the PDP.	Disallow
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.61	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Amend	Accepts the discretionary activity status for a new quarry. It is presumed the rule applies to all quarry activities, regardless of whether they are new or an extension. Clarification is required.	Add a new rule providing a Restricted Discretionary Activity status for the extension to an existing quarry.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.397	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Amend	<p>Considers the introduction to the general rural zone, in referencing other relevant regulations, states that the General Rural Zone provisions do not apply to plantation forestry: they note that the in this circumstance the NES-PF applies. This leaves a serious gap in the council's ability to control the weed risk associated with some forestry.</p> <p>Many land holders are now planting exotic species forests as carbon sinks (known as carbon farming) - planting exotic species that will not be harvested. These, sometimes extremely large scale forests are proving to be a serious wilding risk, e.g. non-sterile Douglas Fir and many other conifers and larches.</p> <p>The plan notes the importance of the rural zone for indigenous biodiversity: this will be at risk if forests of this nature are able to be established as of right. Rules to prevent the establishment of forests not captured within the NES definition are required: it is our view that plantations of exotic species known to cause wilding problems should be prohibited in Wellington's rural areas.</p>	Seeks to include a policy that signals the risk of wilding species from non-plantation forests (those not covered by the NES-PF) to the indigenous biodiversity of the rural zone, and encourage instead the planting of native species, or sterile exotic species.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.19	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Support	<p>Not specified. [Submitter references 377.97 in error]</p>	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.398	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Amend	<p>Considers the introduction to the general rural zone, in referencing other relevant regulations, states that the General Rural Zone provisions do not apply to plantation forestry: they note that the in this circumstance the NES-PF applies. This leaves a serious gap in the council's ability to control the weed risk associated with some forestry.</p> <p>Many land holders are now planting exotic species forests as carbon sinks (known as carbon farming) - planting exotic species that will not be harvested. These, sometimes extremely large scale forests are proving to be a serious wilding risk, e.g. non-sterile Douglas Fir and many other conifers and larches.</p> <p>The plan notes the importance of the rural zone for indigenous biodiversity: this will be at risk if forests of this nature are able to be established as of right. Rules to prevent the establishment of forests not captured within the NES definition are required: it is our view that plantations of exotic species known to cause wilding problems should be prohibited in Wellington's rural areas.</p>	<p>Seeks to include a related rule that has the effect of prohibiting establishment of exotic species forests and / or exotic species shelter belts of 1ha area or more, where such forests do not meet the criteria of a plantation forest as defined in the NES-PF (and are therefore not subject to the controls that the NES-PF sets out) and where the species sought to be planted are exotic and non-sterile. To tie this in with the NES-PF we recommend the rule use 1 ha continuous cover as its starting point.</p> <p>[See original submission for full relief sought]</p>
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.20	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Support	<p>Not specified. [Submitter references 377.98 in error]</p>	Allow
Ministry of Education	400.110	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Amend	<p>Considers that GRUZ rules do not sufficiently provide for additional infrastructure/educational facilities. Therefore, the submitter supports the inclusion of a new rule as sought.</p>	<p>Amend GRUZ to include a new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>GRUZ-RX Educational Facility</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion</u></p> <p><u>1. The matters in GRUZ-P4.</u></p>
Ministry of Education	400.111	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / New GRUZ	Amend	<p>Considers that GRUZ does not have a corresponding activity status for the construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated activities outside the purposes of rural and residential activities.</p> <p>Policy GRUZ-P4 enables potentially compatible buildings and structures where it can be demonstrated that they are compatible with the character and amenity values of the zone. However, there is no rule to support this policy. The Ministry considers that Educational Facilities, particularly schools and early childhood centres, should be provided for where there is potential for a population to support them.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason].</p> <p>The submitter therefore seeks a new rule which aims to ensure that Educational Facilities can operate in a way that positively contributes to the rural community.</p>	<p>Add new rule to GRUZ (General Rural Zone) as follows:</p> <p><u>GRUZ-RX – Construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with activities not otherwise listed.</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion</u></p> <p><u>a. The matters in GRUZ-P4.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. Compliance with GRUZ-S1, GRUZ-S2 and GRUZ-S5 is not achieved.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.62	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Support	Supports the recognition of other activities within the General Rural Zone which have a functional need.	Retain GRUZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.230	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Support	Supports this objective as it provides for other activities that have a functional need to be located in this zone.	Retain GRUZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.18	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Support in part	Supports the reference in GRUZ-01 with respect to the purpose of the GRUZ being to support its functional need.	Retain Objective 1 of General Rural Zone with amendment.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.19	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Amend	Considers that GRUZ-01 excludes quarrying and mining activities. The definition of Rural Activities mentioned in GRUZ-01 specifically excludes "quarrying and mining activities", which may inadvertently rule provision for them out of the General Rural Zone. Using the term 'primary production' instead of 'rural activities' could be one way to address this, as quarrying is included within the definition of primary production.	Amend Objective 1 of General Rural Zone to replace the mention of "rural activities" with "primary production".
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.3	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Support	Horokiwi supports the recognition of other activities within the General Rural Zone.	Allow
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.3	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Oppose	The requested amendments propose an expectation of industrialisation in the general rural zone and are not consistent with the rural values, environmental, character, amenity, or biodiversity objectives of the PDP.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.385	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Support in part	Considers the objective should refer to the need to maintain biodiversity.	Amend GRUZ-01 (Purpose): The General Rural Zone predominately provides for rural activities, complemented by informal outdoor recreation and other activities that have a functional need for a rural location, <u>and maintains biodiversity.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.399	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Support	Supports providing for rural activities, of the type described here, is well suited to the nature of the landscape.	Retain GRUZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.112	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Support in part	Supports GRUZ-01 in part.	Retain GRUZ-01 (Purpose) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.113	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-01	Amend	Seeks GRUZ-01 be amended. The submitter considers GRUZ-01 does not adequately provide for educational facilities within the GRUZ. Therefore the submitter supports the amendment to GRUZ-01 as sought for more explicit reference to schools. The submitter considers that Educational Facilities, particularly schools and early childhood centres, should be provided for where there is potential for a population to support them. Schools in within rural areas play an integral part in servicing the needs of the local rural community. Should there be increased pressure on existing school roles in future which trigger the need for new school sites or classrooms, it is critical this is provided for.	Amend GRUZ-01 (Purpose) as follows: The General Rural Zone predominately provides for rural activities, complemented by informal outdoor recreation, <u>educational facilities</u> and other activities that have a functional need for a rural location.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.386	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-02	Support in part	Considers the objective should refer to the need to maintain biodiversity.	Amend GRUZ-02 (Character and amenity values): Activities and development maintain or enhance the predominant character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone, including the prevalence of natural features over man-made features, a low density and scale of buildings and structures, and a general absence of urban infrastructure, <u>and maintains biodiversity.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.231	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-03	Support	Supports this objective as it encourages the management of effects from activities and developments within the zone which can provide for the health and safety of the community.	Retain GRUZ-03 (Managing effects) as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.387	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-03	Support in part	Considers the objective should refer to the need to maintain biodiversity.	Amend GRUZ-03 (Managing effects): Adverse effects from activities and development in the General Rural Zone are managed within the Zone and at the Zone interface, and rural activities are not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities and/or reverse sensitivity effects <u>and maintain biodiversity.</u>
Ministry of Education	400.114	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-03	Support	Support GRUZ-03 in that it promotes the effective management of adverse effects on activities within the GRUZ and protect them from incompatible activities and/or reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain GRUZ-03 (Managing effects) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.400	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-PREC01-O1	Support	Considers Makara Beach and Village is a unique part of Wellington with difficult access and subject to natural hazards. It is sensible that it has its own set of rules under a Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct.	Retain GRUZ-PREC01-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.401	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-PREC01-O2	Support	Considers Makara Beach and Village is a unique part of Wellington with difficult access and subject to natural hazards: densified use and development is inappropriate in this place for landscape, open space, hazard and climate change issues (most residents will require private vehicles to access amenities) therefore it is not an area in which further housing should be encouraged.	Retain GRUZ-PREC01-O2 (Character and amenity values) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.26	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P1	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain GRUZ-P1.2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.232	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P1	Support in part	Supports the policy as it enables a range of activities within the GRUZ. However, FENZ seeks the inclusion of emergency service facilities in the policy to provide for the establishment of fire stations with the GRUZ	Supports GRUZ-P1 (Enabled activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.233	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P1	Amend	Supports the policy as it enables a range of activities within the GRUZ. However, FENZ seeks the inclusion of emergency service facilities in the policy to provide for the establishment of fire stations with the GRUZ	Amend GRUZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable activities that are compatible with the purpose of the General Rural Zone, while ensuring that their design, scale and intensity is appropriate to the rural environment, including: 1. Rural activities; 2. Residential activities in lawfully established residential buildings; 3. Informal recreation activities; and 4. Small scale clean fill areas; and 5. <u>Emergency service facilities.</u>
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.27	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P1	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain GRUZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.28	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P1	Amend	Considers that the enablement of site(s) for the composting of organic waste needs to be added to GRUZ-P1.	Amend GRUZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable activities that are compatible with the purpose of the General Rural Zone, while ensuring that their design, scale and intensity is appropriate to the rural environment, including: 1. Rural activities; 2. Residential activities in lawfully established residential buildings; 3. Informal recreation activities; and 4. Small scale cleanfill areas. 5. <u>Composting of organic waste.</u>
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.6	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P1	Oppose	This should not be created specifically for the rural area and the current provisions can satisfactorily assess any resource consent application.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.402	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P1	Support	Supports providing for rural activities, of the type described here, is well suited to the nature of the landscape.	Retain GRUZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Te Marama Ltd	337.2	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Amend	Considers that GRUZ-P2 should be amended to reduce cost to landowners. Goats are already an important control agent for keeping exotic invasive species, such as gorse, under control. Also, SNAs are arbitrarily being introduced without any consideration to the potential cost to the landowner that this policy will incur, i.e. "managed to avoid adverse ecological effects within identified significant natural areas".	Amend GRUZ-P2 (Keeping of goats) as follows: Provide for the keeping of goats in the General Rural Zone where they are contained and managed to avoid adverse ecological effects within identified significant natural areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.8	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose	There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats. M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-58 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.	Disallow
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.5	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose	To control the feral goat population, the containment of farmed goats is supported. However MOCB understands that for landowners, the cost of fencing SNA areas is potentially prohibitive without incentives. We believe that control of feral deer and pigs should also be supported.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.388	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Support in part	Considers the policy should be more clear that goats must be excluded from SNAs.	Amend GRUZ-P2 (Keeping of goats): Provide for the keeping of goats in the General Rural Zone where they are contained and managed to <u>be excluded from and</u> avoid adverse ecological effects within identified significant natural areas.
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.6	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose	To control the feral goat population, the containment of farmed goats is supported. However MOCB understands that for landowners, the cost of fencing SNA areas is potentially prohibitive without incentives. We believe that control of feral deer and pigs should also be supported.	Disallow
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.5	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose in part	Considers that GRUZ-P2 should be amended to reduce cost to landowners. Goats are already an important control agent for keeping exotic invasive species, such as gorse, under control. Also, SNAs are arbitrarily being introduced without any consideration to the potential cost to the landowner that this policy will incur, i.e. "managed to avoid adverse ecological effects within identified significant natural areas".	Retain GRUZ-P2 (Keeping of goats) with amendments.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.10	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose	There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats. M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-58 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.	Disallow
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.12	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose	There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats. M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-58 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.6	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Amend	Considers that GRUZ-P2 should be amended to reduce cost to landowners. Goats are already an important control agent for keeping exotic invasive species, such as gorse, under control. Also, SNAs are arbitrarily being introduced without any consideration to the potential cost to the landowner that this policy will incur, i.e. "managed to avoid adverse ecological effects within identified significant natural areas".	Amend GRUZ-P2 (Keeping of goats) as follows: Provide for the keeping of goats in the General Rural Zone where they are contained and managed to avoid adverse ecological effects within identified significant natural areas.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.11	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose	There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats. M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-S8 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.	Disallow
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.13	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose	There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats. M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-S8 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.	Disallow
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.7	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose	To control the feral goat population, the containment of farmed goats is supported. However MOCB understands that for landowners, the cost of fencing SNA areas is potentially prohibitive without incentives. We believe that control of feral deer and pigs should also be supported.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.403	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Support	Considers goats are a pest in Wellington, causing damage to vegetation and habitat for native creatures. Keeping goats as livestock should be controlled for this reason.	Retain GRUZ-P2 (Keeping of goats) as notified.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.5	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose in part	Opposes policy as notified and considers that goats are an important control agent for keeping exotic invasive species, such as gorse, under control.	Seeks that the policy is amended.
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.8	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Oppose	To control the feral goat population, the containment of farmed goats is supported. However MOCB understands that for landowners, the cost of fencing SNA areas is potentially prohibitive without incentives. We believe that control of feral deer and pigs should also be supported.	Disallow
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.6	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P2	Amend	Opposes policy as notified and considers that goats are an important control agent for keeping exotic invasive species, such as gorse, under control.	Amend GRUZ-P2 (Keeping of goats) as follows: Provide for the keeping of goats in the General Rural Zone where they are contained and managed to avoid adverse ecological effects within identified significant natural areas.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.404	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P3	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-P3 (Residential visitor accommodation and home business) as notified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.20	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P4	Support	GRUZ-P4 is supported, especially sub-point 5 which specifically allows quarrying activities in the General Rural Zone where it can be demonstrated that the adverse effects can be managed through industry best practice, management plans, monitoring and self-reporting.	Retain GRUZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.4	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P4	Support	Horokiwi supports the policy recognition of quarrying activities in the General Rural Zone.	Allow
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.9	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P4	Oppose	Sub point 5 (of the provision) represents industrialisation of the general rural zone and is not consistent with the rural values, environment, character, amenity, or biodiversity objectives of the PDP.	Disallow
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.29	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P4	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain GRUZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.30	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P4	Amend	Considers that the addition of organic composting to this clause will promote a suitable consenting pathway for the processing of organic food waste.	Amend GRUZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) as follows: Only allow other activities in the General Rural Zone where it can be demonstrated that: ... 5. In relation to quarrying activities, mining, cleanfill areas, <u>organic composting</u> and intensive indoor primary production activities, any adverse effects can be managed through industry best practice, management plans, monitoring and self-reporting; ...
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.10	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P4	Oppose	Sub point 5 (of the provision) represents industrialisation of the general rural zone and is not consistent with the rural values, environment, character, amenity, or biodiversity objectives of the PDP.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.405	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P4	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.115	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P4	Support in part	Support GRUZ-P4 in part.	Retain GRUZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.116	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P4	Amend	Seeks GRUZ-P4 be amended. The submitter considers that GRUZ-P4 does not adequately provide for educational facilities. Therefore the submitter proposes an amendment to GRUZ-P4 to ensure that educational facilities are explicitly provided for as a compatible activity to other activities in the General Rural Zone.	Amend GRUZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) as follows: 9. Indigenous vegetation and visually prominent trees are retained where practicable; and <u>10. The activity provides for educational facilities as needed to support rural communities; and</u> 11. 10 -Any adverse effects on waterbodies and their margins are effectively managed.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.63	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P5	Amend	Considers that while the majority of the Horokiwi site is zoned Quarry zone, a portion (which has not been quarried) is zoned General Rural Zone. Notwithstanding the zoning of the land east of Horokiwi Road, Horokiwi supports the policy recognition within the General Rural Zone of new quarrying activities and the need for a detailed management plan. With respect to existing quarry sites that will change their use. Horokiwi is unclear how the policy would be applied if the change of use was to a permitted activity. Any requirement for site rehabilitation should be enforced through existing consent conditions and not a retrospective policy approach.	Amend GRUZ-P5 (Quarrying and mining site rehabilitation) as follows: GRUZ-P5 Quarrying and mining site rehabilitation Require any new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use on existing quarry or mining sites in the General Rural Zone to demonstrate, through a detailed management plan, how the site will be rehabilitated, having particular regard to: ...
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.21	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P5	Support	GRUZ-P5 is supported as it provides for adequate site rehabilitation. Aggregate extraction is a temporary land-use whereby the aggregate material is extracted and processed before the area is rehabilitated to a former use, or an alternative and/or enhanced use. Responsible environmental management using best practice approaches is an integral part of any aggregate extraction and processing venture.	Retain GRUZ-P5 (Quarrying and mining site rehabilitation) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.406	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P5	Support	Considers quarrying is a necessary activity: this policy signals how it needs to be conducted to minimise environmental effects in the rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-P5 (Quarrying and mining site rehabilitation) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.95	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P5	Support	Support policy direction stating the need to demonstrate the outcomes of any consultation with Taranaki Whānui.	Retain GRUZ-P5 (Quarrying and mining site rehabilitation) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.407	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P6	Support	Considers this policy is important to signal the incompatibility of urban development in the rural zone: this is essential if Wellington is to meet its goal to reduce its carbon footprint	Retain GRUZ-P6 (Incompatible activities) as notified.
Te Marama Ltd	337.3	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P7	Amend	Considers that GRUZ-P7 should be amended, as what causes a building's scale and location to compromise or be inconsistent with the Rural Design Guide is subjective. It is noted the industrial character of much of the Makara landscape has electricity substations (at least 2), wind turbines, radar domes (at least 2), and Transpower transmission lines criss-crossing the landscape. Therefore the rural character is already compromised and is in fact not rural but industrial.	Amend GRUZ-P7 (Rural buildings and structures) as follows: Provide for a range of buildings and structures associated with rural activities that are an integral part of the rural environment but ensure that their scale and location does not compromise the rural character and amenity prevalent within the General Rural Zone.
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.11	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P7	Oppose	The presence of national and regional energy infrastructure is not evidence of existing industrialisation of the rural character.	Disallow
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.7	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P7	Amend	Considers that GRUZ-P7 should be amended, as what causes a building's scale and location to compromise or be inconsistent with the Rural Design Guide is subjective. It is noted the industrial character of much of the Makara landscape has electricity substations (at least 2), wind turbines, radar domes (at least 2), and Transpower transmission lines criss-crossing the landscape. Therefore the rural character is already compromised and is in fact not rural but industrial.	Amend GRUZ-P7 (Rural buildings and structures) as follows: Provide for a range of buildings and structures associated with rural activities that are an integral part of the rural environment but ensure that their scale and location does not compromise the rural character and amenity prevalent within the General Rural Zone.
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.12	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P7	Oppose	The presence of national and regional energy infrastructure is not evidence of existing industrialisation of the rural character.	Disallow
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.7	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P7	Oppose	Opposes the policy as notified. Considers that the Makara landscape has an industrial character and that within the landscape exists electricity substations (at least 2), wind turbines, radar domes (at least 2), and Transpower transmission lines criss-crossing the landscape. Considers that the rural character is already compromised and is in fact not rural but industrial.	Seeks that the policy is amended.
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.13	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P7	Oppose	The presence of national and regional energy infrastructure is not evidence of existing industrialisation of the rural character.	Disallow
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.8	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P7	Amend	Opposes the policy as notified. Considers that the Makara landscape has an industrial character and that within the landscape exists electricity substations (at least 2), wind turbines, radar domes (at least 2), and Transpower transmission lines criss-crossing the landscape. Considers that the rural character is already compromised and is in fact not rural but industrial.	Amend GRUZ-P7 (Rural buildings and structures) as follows: Provide for a range of buildings and structures associated with rural activities that are an integral part of the rural environment but ensure that their scale and location does not compromise the rural character and amenity prevalent within the General Rural Zone.
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.14	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P7	Oppose	The presence of national and regional energy infrastructure is not evidence of existing industrialisation of the rural character.	Disallow
Te Marama Ltd	337.4	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Oppose	GRUZ-P8 is opposed in its entirety. Limiting the number of one residential unit per one allotment makes sense for some smaller lots, such as in Makara Beach where lots are c.800sqm. However it would make more sense to locate buildings together (i.e. next to the road) for larger lots (e.g. lots of 40 hectares+ in size) rather than spreading buildings across the landscape for the sake of restricting dwellings to "one unit per allotment".	Delete GRUZ-P8 (New residential buildings) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.22	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Oppose	<p>The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework.</p> <p>The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p> <p>M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p>	Disallow
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.8	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Oppose	<p>GRUZ-P8 is opposed in its entirety.</p> <p>Limiting the number of one residential unit per one allotment makes sense for some smaller lots, such as in Makara Beach where lots are c.800sqm. However it would make more sense to locate buildings together (i.e. next to the road) for larger lots (e.g. lots of 40 hectares+ in size) rather than spreading buildings across the landscape for the sake of restricting dwellings to “one unit per allotment”.</p>	Delete GRUZ-P8 (New residential buildings).
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.25	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Oppose	<p>The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework.</p> <p>The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p> <p>M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p>	Disallow
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.9	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Oppose	<p>Considers that limiting the number of one residential unit per one allotment makes sense for lots in, say, Makara Beach, that are c.800sqm. However in larger lots, for instance many lots in Makara are 40 hectares+ in size, it actually makes more sense to locate buildings together, for instance close to the road, than, for the sake of restricting dwellings to “one unit per allotment” spreading buildings across the landscape.</p>	Delete GRUZ-P8 (New residential buildings) in its entirety.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.29	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Oppose	<p>The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework.</p> <p>The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p> <p>M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.15	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Oppose	The existing limitation of one dwelling per allotment is in alignment with the speed of development provided for by the subdivision chapter and allows for reasonable regulation of the rate of development in the rural zone.	Disallow
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.10	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-R8 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The visitor accommodation operates within a residential unit; and b. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 40 20 guests per night.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.30	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Oppose	The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework. The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework. M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.	Disallow
Mākara-Ōhāriu Community Board	FS66.16	Part 3 / Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P8	Oppose	Any increase in the number of residential guests permissible should also take account of the potential noise and privacy impacts to neighbouring properties.	Disallow
Te Marama Ltd	337.5	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P9	Amend	Considers that GRUZ-P9 should be amended, as scale and location are subjective.	Amend GRUZ-P9 (Residential additions, alterations, accessory buildings, and structures) as follows: Enable alterations and additions to residential buildings within the General Rural Zone, along with the construction of associated accessory buildings and structures, provided that their scale and location does not compromise the character and amenity values of the local area.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.9	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P9	Amend	Considers that GRUZ-P9 should be amended, as scale and location are subjective.	Amend GRUZ-P9 (Residential additions, alterations, accessory buildings, and structures) as follows: Enable alterations and additions to residential buildings within the General Rural Zone, along with the construction of associated accessory buildings and structures, provided that their scale and location does not compromise the character and amenity values of the local area.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.11	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P9	Oppose	Considers that scale and location is subjective	Seeks that the policy is amended.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.12	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P9	Amend	Considers that scale and location is subjective	Amend GRUZ-P9 (Residential additions, alterations, accessory buildings, and structures) as follows: Enable alterations and additions to residential buildings within the General Rural Zone, along with the construction of associated accessory buildings and structures, provided that their scale and location does not compromise the character and amenity values of the local area.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Marama Ltd	337.6	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P10	Oppose	GRUZ-P10 is opposed in its entirety. Limiting the number of one residential unit per one allotment makes sense for some smaller lots, such as in Makara Beach where lots are c.800sqm. However it would make more sense to locate buildings together (i.e. next to the road) for larger lots (e.g. lots of 40 hectares+ in size) rather than spreading buildings across the landscape for the sake of restricting dwellings to “one unit per allotment”.	Delete GRUZ-P10 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures) in its entirety.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.23	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P10	Oppose	The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework. The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework. M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.389	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P10	Support in part	Supports the policy, particularly given the Council’s function of maintaining biodiversity, which applies more broadly than just in SNAs. We query whether ‘retaining vegetation where practicable’ fulfils that function however. Seek that this is deleted.	Amend GRUZ-P10 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures): Only allow other buildings and structures where it can be demonstrated that they are compatible with the character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone, having regard to: 1. The Rural Design Guide; 2. The nature and extent of any adverse effects on nearby properties, including outlook, privacy and shading; 3. Whether there is a functional need for a specific design or location within the site; 4. Whether indigenous vegetation and visually prominent trees are retained where practicable ; and 5. The ability to mitigate adverse effects through screening, planting and landscaping.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.10	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P10	Oppose	GRUZ-P10 is opposed in its entirety. Limiting the number of one residential unit per one allotment makes sense for some smaller lots, such as in Makara Beach where lots are c.800sqm. However it would make more sense to locate buildings together (i.e. next to the road) for larger lots (e.g. lots of 40 hectares+ in size) rather than spreading buildings across the landscape for the sake of restricting dwellings to “one unit per allotment”.	Delete GRUZ-P10 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures).
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.13	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes GRUZ-P10 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures) [See original submission for full reasons]	[Inferred decision requested] Delete GRUZ-P10 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures).
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.234	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P11	Support in part	Supports the policy provided it takes account of vegetation removal as a measure for the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life. It is important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property.	Supports GRUZ-P11 (Vegetation retention), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.235	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P11	Amend	Supports the policy provided it takes account of vegetation removal as a measure for the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life. It is important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property.	Amend GRUZ-P11 (Vegetation retention) as follows: Encourage the retention of existing vegetation in association with site development in the General Rural Zone, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected, except where it poses fire risk to the environment and the health and safety of people.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Marama Ltd	337.7	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P11	Amend	GRUZ-P11 is opposed, as it is subjective and arbitrary - it is unclear what qualifies exotic trees such as macrocarpa or Norfolk Pine as protected species.	Amend GRUZ-P11 (Vegetation retention) as follows: Encourage the retention of existing vegetation in association with site development in the General Rural Zone, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.390	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P11	Support in part	Supports the policy, particularly given the Council's function of maintaining biodiversity, which applies more broadly than just in SNAs.	Retain policy GRUZ-P11 (Vegetation retention) as notified.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.11	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P11	Amend	GRUZ-P11 is opposed, as it is unclear what qualifies exotic trees such as macrocarpa or Norfolk Pine as protected species.	Amend GRUZ-P11 (Vegetation retention) as follows: Encourage the retention of existing vegetation in association with site development in the General Rural Zone, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.408	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P11	Support	Considers this policy gives an important signal as to the importance of retaining, as far as possible, indigenous vegetation, to help safeguard habitat, protect soil, and protect waterways.	Retain GRUZ-P11 (Vegetation retention) as notified.
Director-General of Conservation	385.83	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P11	Support	Supports the use of policy which encourages the retention of existing vegetation (including native vegetation) that would otherwise be unprotected under the Proposed District Plan.	Retain GRUZ-P11 (Vegetation retention) as notified.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.14	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P11	Oppose	Considers that the policy is subjective and arbitrary.	Seeks that the policy is amended.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.15	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-P11	Amend	Considers that the policy is subjective and arbitrary.	Amend GRUZ-P11 (Vegetation retention) as follows: Encourage the retention of existing vegetation in association with site development in the General Rural Zone, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.409	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-PREC01-P1	Support	Considers Makara Beach and Village is a unique part of Wellington with difficult access and subject to natural hazards: densified use and development is inappropriate in this place for landscape, open space, hazard and climate change issues (most residents will require private vehicles to access amenities) therefore it is not an area in which further housing should be encouraged.	Retain GRUZ-PREC01-P1 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.410	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R1	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-R1 (Rural activities) as notified.
Te Marama Ltd	337.8	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-R2 (Keeping of goats) as follows: ... Matters of control are: 1. Annual inspection of fences by the consent holder and reporting of results to the Council; 2. Annual reporting of stock numbers; 3. Procedures for reporting fence breaches and escapes to the Council and neighbours; 4. Procedures for stock retrieval; 5. The method of stock identification; and 6. Methods of stock disposal if the activity ceases to operate. ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.391	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R2	Support in part	Seeks controlled status where the goats are kept outside of SNAs. Within SNAs, RDA is appropriate. The matters of discretion need to refer to the ECO policies	Amend GRUZ-R2 (Keeping of goats): 1. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of GRUZ-S8 is achieved. b. <u>Goats are kept outside of significant natural areas.</u> ... 3. <u>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: a. <u>Compliance with GRUZ-R2.1.b is not met.</u> <u>Matters of discretion:</u> 1. <u>[Relevant ECO policies]</u>
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.12	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-R2 (Keeping of goats) as follows: ... Matters of control are: 1. Annual inspection of fences by the consent holder and reporting of results to the Council; 2. Annual reporting of stock numbers; 3. Procedures for reporting fence breaches and escapes to the Council and neighbours; 4. Procedures for stock retrieval; 5. The method of stock identification; and 6. Methods of stock disposal if the activity ceases to operate. ...
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.411	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R2	Support	Considers goats are a pest in Wellington, causing damage to vegetation and habitat for native creatures. Keeping goats as livestock should be controlled for this reason.	Retain GRUZ-R2 (Keeping of goats) as notified.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.16	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R2	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	[Inferred decision requested] Delete GRUZ-R2 (Keeping of goats) in its entirety.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.15	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R2	Oppose	There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats. M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-S8 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.412	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R3	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-R3 (Cleanfill areas) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.27	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R4	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain GRUZ-R4 (Residential activity) as notified.
Te Marama Ltd	337.9	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R4	Amend	Considers that GRUZ-R4 should be amended. Limiting the number of one residential unit per one allotment makes sense for some smaller lots, such as in Makara Beach where lots are c.800sqm. However it would make more sense to locate buildings together (i.e. next to the road) for larger lots (e.g. lots of 40 hectares+ in size) rather than spreading buildings across the landscape for the sake of restricting dwellings to "one unit per allotment".	Amend GRUZ-R4 (Residential activity) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: No more than one residential unit occupies the site. ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.24	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R4	Oppose	<p>The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework.</p> <p>The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p> <p>M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p>	Disallow
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.13	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R4	Amend	<p>Considers that GRUZ-R4 should be amended. Limiting the number of one residential unit per one allotment makes sense for some smaller lots, such as in Makara Beach where lots are c.800sqm. However it would make more sense to locate buildings together (i.e. next to the road) for larger lots (e.g. lots of 40 hectares+ in size) rather than spreading buildings across the landscape for the sake of restricting dwellings to “one unit per allotment”.</p>	<p>Amend GRUZ-R4 (Residential activity) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where: No more than one residential unit occupies the site-</p> <p>...</p>
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.27	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R4	Oppose	<p>The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework.</p> <p>The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p> <p>M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p>	Disallow
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.17	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R4	Oppose	<p>Opposes GRUZ-R4 (Residential activity) as drafted</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the rule is amended.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.16	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R4	Oppose	<p>There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington’s rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats.</p> <p>M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-S8 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.18	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R4	Amend	Opposes GRUZ-R4 (Residential activity) as drafted [See original submission for full reasons]	Amend GRUZ-R4 (residential activity) as follows: Activity status: Permitted. No more than one residential unit occupies the site.
Te Marama Ltd	337.10	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-R5 (Recreation activity) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is an informal recreation activity; and b. Participation in the activity does not incur a fee, including any associated membership fee.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.14	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-R5 (Recreation activity) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is an informal recreation activity; and b. Participation in the activity does not incur a fee, including any associated membership fee.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.19	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R5	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-R5 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is an informal recreation activity; and b. Participation in the activity does not incur a fee, including any associated membership fee.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.413	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R6	Support	Considers this provision will help ensure as few barriers as possible to individuals and groups engaging in conservation work helping to safeguard habitat, protect soil, and protect waterways.	Retain GRUZ-R6 (Conservation activity) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.414	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R7	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here, and with the activity classes as described here, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-R7 (Home business) as notified.
Te Marama Ltd	337.11	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R8	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-R8 (Visitor accommodation) as follows: ... b. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 <u>20</u> guests per night.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.15	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R8	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-R8 (Visitor accommodation) as follows: ... b. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 <u>20</u> guests per night.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.28	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R8	Oppose	<p>The PDP as notified allows for 10 guests per night in temporary accommodation for one residential unit, and any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the discretionary framework.</p> <p>The PDP as notified retains the existing one household per allotment which is sufficient to encourage larger blocks to place that unit where it is most easily accessible or useful for their purposes. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p> <p>M&P Trust also submits that the intent of the subdivision provisions in the Rural Area, including their time-related requirement, is to anticipate a lower rate of residential development in than urban areas. Allowing more than one residential unit per allotment defeats the purpose of these subdivision provisions. Any number greater than this is sufficiently covered by the resource consent framework.</p>	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.415	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R8	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here, and with the activity classes as described here, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-R8 (Visitor accommodation) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.416	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R10	Support	Supports requiring discretion for intensive indoor primary production is necessary given the potential for significant adverse effects.	Retain GRUZ-R10 (Intensive indoor primary production) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.417	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R11	Support	Supports requiring discretion for intensive indoor primary production is necessary given the potential for significant adverse effects.	Retain GRUZ-R11 (Pet animal boarding and breeding and day-care) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.64	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R12	Amend	Considers that the discretionary activity status for a new quarry is acceptable. It is presumed the rule applies to all quarry activities, regardless of whether they are new or an extension. Clarification is required.	Clarify the intent of GRUZ-R12 (Quarrying or mining activities) as to whether the rule applies to all quarry activities, regardless of whether they are new or an extension.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.65	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R12	Support in part	Considers that the discretionary activity status for a new quarry is acceptable. It is presumed the rule applies to all quarry activities, regardless of whether they are new or an extension. Clarification is required.	Retain GRUZ-R12 (Quarrying or mining activities), subject to clarification it applies to new quarries.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.22	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R12	Support	GRUZ-R12 is supported as it provides a 'Discretionary' activity status for quarrying or mining activities in the General Rural Zone.	Retain GRUZ-R12 (Quarrying or mining activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.418	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R12	Support	Considers quarrying is a necessary activity that has major effects: discretion is necessary to ensure that it is to be conducted to minimise or mitigate environmental effects in the rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-R12 (Quarrying or mining activities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.236	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R13	Support	Supports the rule as it allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a discretionary land use activity. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate new fire stations within this zone.	Retain GRUZ-R13 (Emergency service facility) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.237	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R15	Support	Supports the rule as the maintenance and repair of buildings and structures within the GRUZ are a permitted activity.	Retain GRUZ-R15 (Repair and maintenance of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.238	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R16	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the GRUZ are a permitted activity.	Retain GRUZ-R16 (Demolition or removal of a building or structure) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.266	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R16	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain GRUZ-R16 (Demolition or removal of a building or structure) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.267	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R16	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend GRUZ-R16 (Demolition or removal of a building or structure)) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.113	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R17	Amend	Considers the Plan establishes a policy framework that seeks to avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects for existing regionally significant infrastructure. One source of potential reverse sensitivity is allowing sensitive activities to establish close to existing wind farm turbines. Considers the policy intention (of avoiding reverse sensitivity effects) needs to be carried through into the rules for the General Rural Zone by requiring new sensitive activities (a defined term including dwellings) to be located a minimum distance away from existing wind turbines that will protect the amenity values of the sensitive activity. The distance should be established based on the noise contour endorsed for the resource consents for the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms.	Amend Rule GRUZ-R17 (Construction, alteration or addition to buildings and structures associated with rural activities) to include new relief sought standard GRUZ-S5 (Minimum setback for sensitive activities) as a required standard.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.239	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R17	Support	Supports the rule as the addition or alteration to buildings and structures within the GRUZ are provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity.	Retain GRUZ-R17 (Construction, alteration, or addition to buildings and structures associated with rural activities) as notified.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.114	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R18	Amend	Considers the Plan establishes a policy framework that seeks to avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects for existing regionally significant infrastructure. One source of potential reverse sensitivity is allowing sensitive activities to establish close to existing wind farm turbines. Considers the policy intention (of avoiding reverse sensitivity effects) needs to be carried through into the rules for the General Rural Zone by requiring new sensitive activities (a defined term including dwellings) to be located a minimum distance away from existing wind turbines that will protect the amenity values of the sensitive activity. The distance should be established based on the noise contour endorsed for the resource consents for the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms.	Amend Rule GRUZ-R18 (Construction, addition or alteration to residential buildings and structures) to include new relief sought standard GRUZ-S5 (Minimum setback for sensitive activities) as a required standard.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.240	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R18	Support	Supports the rule as the addition or alteration to buildings and structures within the GRUZ are provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity.	Retain GRUZ-R18 (Construction, addition, or alteration to residential buildings and structures) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.57	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R18	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain GRUZ-R18.2 (Construction, addition or alteration to residential buildings and structures) and an amendment to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
Investore Property Limited	405.58	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-R18	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend GRUZ-R18.2 (Construction, addition or alteration to residential buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.240	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-PRECO1-R1	Support	Supports the rule as the addition or alteration to buildings and structures within the GRUZ are provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity.	Retain GRUZ-PRECO1-R1 (Construction, addition or alteration to residential buildings or structures in the Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.241	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S1	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Supports GRUZ-S1 (Maximum height), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.242	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S1	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Amend GRUZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: This standard does not apply to fences or standalone walls, <u>emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and associated hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Marama Ltd	337.12	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: ... 3. Buildings and structures associated with rural activities - 8m <u>10m</u> ...
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.16	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: ... 3. Buildings and structures associated with rural activities - 8m <u>10m</u> ...
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.419	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S1	Support	Supports providing for height limits on activities, of the type described here, and with the activity classes as described here, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.117	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S1	Support in part	Support GRUZ-S1 in part insofar as it aims to control height limits to maintain the rural amenity of the zone.	Retain GRUZ-S1 (Maximum height) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.118	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S1	Amend	Seeks that GRUZ-S1 be amended. The submitter seeks that a maximum building height limit is required under GRUZ-S1 for buildings and structures associated with other activities. This will support the submitter's feedback point which seeks to add a new rule for the construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with potentially compatible activities.	Amend GRUZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: Maximum height ... Building or structure 4. Buildings and structures associated with other activities Limit <u>8m</u>
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.20	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-S1 (Maximum height) Building or structures 3. Buildings and structures associated with rural activities - Limit - 8 <u>10m</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.420	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S2	Support	Supports providing for floor areas to the extent described here, and with the activity classes as described here, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape.	Retain GRUZ-S2 (Maximum gross floor area) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.119	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S2	Support in part	Supports GRUZ-S2 in part insofar as it aims to maintain the rural amenity of the zone.	Retain GRUZ-S2 (Maximum gross floor area) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.120	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S2	Amend	Seeks that GRUZ-S2 be amended so that a maximum gross floor area is required under GRUZ-S2 for buildings and structures associated with other activities. This will support the submitter's feedback point which seeks to add a new rule for the construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with potentially compatible activities.	Amend GRUZ-S2 (Maximum gross floor areas) as follows: Building or structure <u>3. Buildings and structures associated with other activities</u> Limit <u>a. maximum gross floor area of 400m² for a single building or structure; or</u> <u>b. an aggregated total of 800m² gross floor area for all buildings and structures on the site.</u>
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.32	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S4	Support	GRUZ-S4 is supported, as it is particularly useful to have clarity on how low decks and eaves are to be treated in relation to setbacks - exclusion of decks no more than 500mm above ground and also eaves up to 600mm (as applying at b & c in the Makara Beach & Makara Village precinct) could usefully be applied generally.	Retain GRUZ-S4 (Minimum boundary setbacks for residential buildings) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.421	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S4	Support	Supports providing for setbacks as described here, and with the activity classes proposed, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape	Retain GRUZ-S4 (Minimum boundary setbacks for residential buildings) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.422	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S5	Support	Supports providing for setbacks as described here, and with the activity classes proposed, is suitable in the context of a rural landscape	Retain GRUZ-S5 (Minimum boundary setbacks for rural buildings) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.121	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S5	Support in part	Support GRUZ-S5 in part. The submitter supports these setback standards insofar as they aim to maintain the rural amenity of the zone.	Retain GRUZ-S5 (Minimum boundary setbacks for rural buildings) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.122	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S5	Amend	Seeks GRUZ-S5 be amended as the submitter considers that minimum boundary setbacks are required under GRUZ-S5 for buildings and structures associated with other activities. This will support the submitter's feedback point which seeks to add a new rule for the construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with potentially compatible activities.	Amend GRUZ-S5 (Minimum boundary setbacks for rural buildings) as follows: Minimum boundary setbacks for rural buildings <u>and non-residential buildings</u> ...
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.243	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S6	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards	Supports GRUZ-S6 (Height in relation to boundary within the Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.244	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S6	Amend	Seeks an exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards	Amend GRUZ-S6 (Height in relation to boundary within the Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... <u>x. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.423	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S6	Support	Supports providing for height in relation to boundary as described here, and with the activity classes proposed, is suitable in the context of Makara beach and village.	Retain GRUZ-S6 (Height in relation to boundary within the Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.245	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S7	Support in part	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ.	Support GRUZ-S7 (Fences and standalone walls), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.246	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S7	Amend	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ.	Amend GRUZ-S7 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: 2. No fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed : a. <u>Exceed</u> a maximum height of 2m above ground level where within 1m of any boundary; and b. <u>Exceed</u> the height in relation to boundary standard in GRUZ-S6; <u>and</u> c. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u>
Te Marama Ltd	337.13	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S8	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Delete GRUZ-S8 (Fencing requirements for the keeping of goats) in its entirety.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.9	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S8	Oppose	There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats. M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-S8 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.392	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S8	Support in part	Seeks controlled status where the goats are kept outside of SNAs. Within SNAs, RDA is appropriate. The matters of discretion need to refer to the ECO policies	Amend GRUZ-S8 (Fencing requirements for keeping of goats): ... Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Whether the proposed alternative fence design or other means of containment (by enclosure or tether) will adequately contain the keeping of goats within the site. 2. <u>[Relevant ECO policies]</u>
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.17	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S8	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Delete GRUZ-S8 (Fencing requirements for the keeping of goats) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.14	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S8	Oppose	There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats. M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-S8 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.	Disallow
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.21	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S8	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that GRUZ-S8 is amended.
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.17	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S8	Oppose	There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats. M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-S8 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.	Disallow
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.22	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S8	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend GRUZ-S8 as follows: 1. All goats shall be contained within fenced areas that meet the following requirements:- a. A wire post and batten fence constructed with no internal or external stays and a minimum high-tensile 2.5mm diameter galvanised steel wire configuration as follows:- i. Nine wires, with the bottom wire placed no higher than 80mm above ground level and, above that, wires placed at the following intervals: 100, 100, 100, 110, 120, 135, 150 and 165mm. The top wire should be approximately 50mm below the top of the post; or ii. Seven wires, with the bottom wire barbed, and no higher than 80mm above ground level and, above that, wires placed at the following intervals: 100, 120, 140, 160, 210 and 250mm. The top wire should be approximately 50mm below the top of the post. An electric wire on an outrigger shall also extend for the full length of the fence; b. Posts must be at the following intervals:- i. Less than 30 degrees ground slope: 5m; ii. 20 degrees to less than 45 degrees: 4m; and iii. 45 degrees or more: 3m; c. Battens must be at 1m intervals; and d. A floodgate for any fencing crossing a waterbody that:- i. Is constructed of H3 treated 100mm x 50mm timber suspended from an overhead wire or rail in such a way that the spacings allow for the passage of water but not goats; ii. Is not constructed using wire netting; iii. Has a crossbar positioned in the top third of the structure; and iv. Is located on the downstream side of any culverted watercourse.

Commercial and Mixed use - General Points

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
M&P Makara Family Trust	FS41.18	Rural Zones / General Rural Zone / GRUZ-S8	Oppose	<p>There are various farming interests that must co-exist within the Rural Area, each of which can impinge on neighbouring farming rights if not carefully managed. The three main ones in Wellington's rural area into the future are traditional farming (agricultural), wind farming (renewable energy generation) and carbon farming (forestry in the ETS). Feral goats eat pasture that sheep and cattle otherwise graze and can decimate native and some exotic forestry crops especially in the establishment phase. As a result, M&P Trust supports the PDP as notified for the containment of farmed goats, and supports the culling of feral (uncontained) goats.</p> <p>M&P Trust also notes that where GRUZ-S8 is infringed, applicants are free to demonstrate other means of containment which satisfy the requirement.</p>	Disallow
Julie Patricia Ward	103.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that the height limit for all centres defined as LCZ's or NCZ's, other than heritage sites, should be consistent at 18 metres.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the height limit for all areas zoned as LCZ (Local Centre Zone) or NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone) is set at a consistent 18m, excluding heritage sites.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	<p>Supports the allowance for taller buildings around centres as this promotes growth and thriving, vibrant centres.</p> <p>Vibrant centres and public spaces are important to the growing student population and families.</p>	Not specified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the encouragement of residential development in centres and new, improved building standards that reflect health and safety standards, are cheaper in the long run, and ensure that the centres and businesses are more prepared for climate change and natural disasters.	Not specified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	<p>Supports that ground-floor level buildings in centres are used for non-residential activities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that ground-floor level buildings in centres are used for non-residential activities.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the continuation of providing for mixed-use areas that enable commercial, light industrial, recreational, and community activities to occur. This is profitable for centres and businesses, and makes students more comfortable about using mixed-use areas for their own purposes which has good flow-on effects.	Seeks that mixed-use areas continue to be provided for in Centres and Mixed Use Zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Airbnb	126.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the permitted activity status for visitor accommodation in the Centres zones.	Retain provisions providing for visitor accommodation as an Permitted Activity in the Centres Areas as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested]
Anne Lian	132.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested]
Ingo Schommer	133.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested]
Olivier Reuland	134.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested]
Braydon White	146.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments around Centres Zones. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Amos Mann	172.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	Supports a circular economy, space for innovation, education and behaviour change, and a low carbon future.	Seeks that multifunctional community spaces are created within centres as Climate Action Hubs.
Amos Mann	172.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].
Patrick Wilkes	173.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].
Pete Gent	179.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].
Peter Nunns	196.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested].
Andrew Flanagan	198.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that it is unclear whether multi-storey developments come with conditions that developers also create commercial opportunities for small, independent businesses to develop, or if they are only for residential purposes.	Clarify the conditions for developers of multi-storey buildings with regard to providing commercial opportunities.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested].
McDonald's	274.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	In general, the submitter (McDonald's) acknowledges the need for high quality building design.	Not specified.
McDonald's	274.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	Considers that while high quality building design is important, the active frontage controls in the PDP are overly prescriptive as currently worded.	Not specified.
McDonald's	274.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	Considers that while high quality building design is important, the consenting requirements for additions and alterations in the PDP are overly prescriptive as currently worded.	Not specified.
Steve Dunn	288.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that Newtown is suited to 3-4 storey housing along its transport spine [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that building heights in central Newtown are amended to 3-4 storeys. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve Dunn	288.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that to meet the objectives of a healthy living environment, the plan is amended to protect sunlight access for all outdoor living areas, not just public open space, as well as solar panels on roofs.	Seeks that the plan is amended to protect sunlight access for all outdoor living areas, not just public open space, as well as solar panels on roofs.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers the need for a Design Review Panels for all mixed use developments and centres where developments are over 3 levels. The wholesale adoption of the MDRS standards could well result in a drastic lowering of design standards of housing, given that there are no quality control standards applied at the same time. A solution would be a mandatory Design Panel Review, as it would encourage high quality design outcomes in the city. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a mandatory Design Panel Review be adopted for all mixed use developments and centres where developments are over 3 levels.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.223	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.223	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.268	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support in part	Considers the approach taken across these zones gives effect to operative RPS policy 30	Retain chapter, subject to amendments outlined in other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.269	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers for the provisions across these zones to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms.	Seeks to ensure the Commercial and Mixed-use Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	The "centres hierarchy" approach adopted by the higher order provisions of the PDP is supported, insofar as it recognises that centres can and should be the primary focal point for business activity in the District, noting the importance of supermarkets in helping to achieve prosperous centres.	Supports the Centres hierarchy, subject to amendments following the application of the proposed "centres plus" approach.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	The increase in intensity of the existing CMUZ land under the PDP is supported, as it is understood that the difference between the Centre Zones primarily relates to the height that is enabled in these zones.	Retain the Centre Zones as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Woolworths New Zealand	359.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	It is considered that the consent requirement across the CMUZ for supermarkets is not in accordance with the higher order strategic direction outlined in Objectives CEKP-O2 and CEKP-O3 where business needs are envisaged to be enabled within the CMUZ. As currently proposed, supermarkets are not permitted in any CMUZ by virtue of needing a consent for the building proper (as in, while the activity itself is permitted in all Centre zones irrespective of size, and in the Mixed-Use zone up to 1500m2 GFA, all buildings greater than 100m2 in all Centre zones and greater than 500m2 in the Mixed-Use zone need resource consent). This is at odds with the widely accepted role that supermarkets play in centres. Supermarkets act as anchor tenants, and as catalysts for investment in centres of all scales. The importance of convenient and efficient access to supermarkets as critical infrastructure or an essential service has also been recognised in other districts, most recently highlighted by the Covid-19 pandemic. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones have requirements for supermarkets that are in accordance with the higher order strategic direction outlined in Objectives CEKP-O2 and CEKP-O3 where business needs are envisaged to be enabled within these zones.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.501	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the Centre hierarchy should be reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board. Centre Zoning standards should be expanded to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops, and where necessary introduce a new chapter.	Seeks that the Centres hierarchy is reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.36	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.502	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that commercial intensification provisions in the Commercial (Centres) and Mixed-Use zones should be reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board. Centre Zoning standards should be expanded to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops, and where necessary introduce a new chapter.	Seeks that commercial intensification provisions in the Commercial (Centres) and Mixed-Use Zones are reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.37	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.503	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that new Town Centre chapter provisions should be added to the plan. [Refer to original submission, including Appendix 2]	Seeks that a Town Centre chapter is added to the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones classification.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.38	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.504	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that where standards are not referenced in building and structure activity rules, an activity status should be provided for non-compliance with the standard. It is sought that this activity status in Centre Zones is a Restricted Discretionary to be consistent with the general approach throughout the Plan.	Seeks that where City Centre Zone standards are not referenced in building and structure activity rules a Restricted Discretionary activity status is provided for non-compliance with the standard, to be consistent with the general approach throughout the Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.505	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support in part	Active frontage controls are generally supported, but it is considered that they should only apply where necessary, such as along principal roads/arterials not necessary along connecting streets.	Retain active frontage control provisions with amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.506	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support in part	The need for restrictions on the gross floor area of retail is supported, particularly within commercial (Centres) and mixed-use zones as this will ensure that there are appropriate opportunities for residential activities in these areas. However, is noted that the Integrated Retail Activity gross floor areas of 20,000m2 do not reflect the scale of the Centres hierarchy anticipated in the NPSUD and the National Planning Standards.	Retain gross floor area restrictions with amendment for Local Centre Zones and Neighbourhood Centre Zones.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].
David Cadman	398.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].
Investore Property Limited	405.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the provision of a range of commercial and mixed-use environments.	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the hierarchy of centres.	Not specified.

Commercial and Mixed use - Neighbourhood Centre Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose in part	Considers the 20m building depth standard in certain neighbourhood centres is too restrictive [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the 20m maximum building depth standard for certain neighbourhood centres be increased.
Kirsty Woods	437.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that intensification should occur in the suburban centre, combined with new developments in underutilised sites (for example Adelaide Road) would provide for predicted housing requirements.	Seeks that intensification is enabled around Centres and underutilised sites. [Inferred decision requested]
Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Concerned that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is not given consideration and referred to in any relevant rules for the Commercial and Mixed Use zones	Amend appropriate parts of the Commercial and Mixed use zone rules to reflect that they will give effect to the Commercial and Mixed Use Design Guide.
Aro Valley Community Council	87.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Oppose	Opposes zoning of 72, 82 and 84 Aro Street as NCZ. - This residence was built to be residential, and has always been occupied as residential. - Residential properties are more needed than NZC areas in Aro Valley. - NCZ at this address could cause loss of sunlight to functioning shops/cafe/bar/restaurant on the other "sunny" side of the street will destroy the businesses and defeat the purpose of the zoning. - The height in relation to the Heritage Precinct next door is inappropriate.	Seeks that the sites at 72, 82 and 84 Aro Street are zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.46	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Tawa Business Group	107.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of 105 Main Road, 107 Main Road, 109 Main Road, 111 Main Road, 113 Main Road, and 115 Main Road, Tawa as Neighbourhood Centre Zone. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Rezone 105 Main Road, 107 Main Road, 109 Main Road, 111 Main Road, 113 Main Road, and 115 Main Road, Tawa from Neighbourhood Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone.
David Stevens	151.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Support	Supports Ngaio being a Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Retain Ngaio being a Neighbourhood Centre Zone as notified.
Tawa Community Board	294.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Oppose	Opposes Neighbourhood Centre Zone at 105 - 115 Main Road, Tawa. Considers that if zoned as NCZ, 105 - 115 Main Road, Tawa they could be subject to specific controls around active frontage and non-residential activity, should the owners wish to amend their building in the future and could cause issues should they wish to sell. These properties currently contain residential-only buildings.	Opposes the zoning of 105, 107, 109, 111, 113 and 115 Main Road, Tawa as Neighbourhood Centre Zone and seeks amendment.
Roland Sapsford	305.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Amend	Considers that the site to the West of Aro Park being zoned NCZ allows development of an 8-storey building which would effectively remove a large amount of afternoon sun from the park.	Seeks that the site to the west of Aro Park not be classified as Neighbourhood Centre Zone. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.204	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Support	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.205	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>
Waka Kotahi	370.400	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Amend	Considers the term “roading network” is used in several places, and the term is not defined. Particularly supports the provision for public transport, consideration of function of the transport network, the discouragement of carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage and the quality design outcomes.	Amend the reference to “transport network”, to ensure that it captures all transport modes.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.424	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Support in part	Generally supportive with some amendments specified below.	Not specified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.507	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Support in part	Generally supports the introduction and application of a Neighbourhood Centre Zone in the Draft District Plan. However, considers that amendments required to remove references to Design Guides. Considers that Design Guides are too broad to be used as an assessment matter. Considers that a limited range of design criteria should be utilised instead and the focus for assessment should be effects beyond those anticipated by the zone.	Retain the introduction of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.508	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Amend	Generally supports the introduction and application of a Neighbourhood Centre Zone in the Draft District Plan. However, considers that amendments required to remove references to Design Guides. Considers that Design Guides are too broad to be used as an assessment matter. Considers that a limited range of design criteria should be utilised instead and the focus for assessment should be effects beyond those anticipated by the zone.	Amend the third paragraph of the introduction of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter as follows: High quality building design is a focus for the Neighbourhood Centres Zone. The transition to more intensive use in some neighbourhood centres will result in changes to existing amenity values in the centres and their surrounds. Consequently, redevelopment will be supported by a range of measures to promote good design and environmental outcomes, and address <u>amenity issues that are not anticipated in the zone.</u> Accordingly, most building activities will require a resource consent and an assessment against the <u>Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide key design criteria.</u> To enable intensification around existing neighbourhood centres, some of these will have increased building heights.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.93	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Amend	Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Oppose	Considers that there is not justification for the Neighbourhood Centre in Berhampore to be up-zoned for 22m permitted heights, and several adjacent blocks for 21m heights.	Opposes the Neighbourhood City Centre Zone in Berhampore.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Support in part	Generally supports the objectives and policies for the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, and specifically supports the recognition of medium and high-density development and the enablement of a wide range of activities.	Retain the Neighbourhood Centre Zone objectives and policies, with amendments. [Inferred decision requested].
Foodstuffs North Island	476.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Support	Supports the Metropolitan Centre Zoning of Pak'n'Save Kilbirnie (5 Onepu Road).	Retain Metropolitan Centre Zoning of Pak'n'Save Kilbirnie (5 Onepu Road) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.206	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Support	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.	Add the following new policies in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u> <u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.207	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u> <u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.208	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Support	As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ-R10). Considers that the Neighbourhood Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under NCZ-R18). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	<p>Add new 'Retirement villages' rule as follows:</p> <p><u>NCZ-RX Retirement villages</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.209	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Amend	As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ-R10). Considers that the Neighbourhood Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under NCZ-R18). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	<p>Add new 'Retirement villages' rule to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone as follows:</p> <p><u>NCZ-RX Retirement villages</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.509	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Amend	Considers that there is need for a new rule to allow for the construction of, or additions and alterations to residential buildings and structures as a permitted activity. Considers that NCZ-R18 does not provide for residential activities, or the standards associated.	<p>Seeks to Add the following new rule in the Neighbourhood Centres Zone chapter:</p> <p><u>NCZ-RX - The construction of, or additions and alterations to buildings and structures containing residential activities.</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted where:</u> <u>a. The activity is located:</u> <u>i. Above ground floor level;</u> <u>ii. At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as an active frontage; or</u> <u>iii. At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as a non-residential activity frontage; and</u> <u>iv. Complies with NCZ-R1, NCZ-R4, NCZ-S7, LCZ-S8 and LCZ-S9.</u> <u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where:</u> <u>b. Compliance with the requirements of NCZ-R10.1.a cannot be achieved.</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>1. The matters in NCZ-P7-P8.</u> <u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule NCZ-RX is precluded from being limited and publicly notified</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.35	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Oppose	Oppose residential activities on the ground floor to support vibrant streets.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O1	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O1	Amend	Considers that Neighbourhood Centres serve passers-by as well as their immediate residential neighbourhood. The amended wording is consistent with the current wording proposed in Policy NCZ-P2 and the proposed amendments to Objective CEKP-O2.	Amend Objective NCZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: The Neighbourhood Centre Zone meets the needs of communities, businesses and residents in the immediate residential neighbourhood <u>and passers-by</u> in a manner that supports the City's compact urban growth objectives and its role and function in the City's hierarchy of centres.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.425	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O1	Support	Support objective providing for sustainable, mixed use neighbourhood zones.	Retain NCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.510	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O1	Support	Generally supports NCZ-O1.	Retain NCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.247	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O2	Support	Supports the objective as it seeks to ensure that residential and commercial growth needs are met through land specifically zoned for this purpose with the provision of adequate infrastructure for housing and business use.	Retain NCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O2	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.426	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O2	Support	Support objective providing for sustainable, mixed use neighbourhood zones.	Retain NCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.511	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O2	Support	Generally supports NCZ-O2.	Retain NCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.123	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O2	Support in part	Supports NCZ-O2 in part.	Retain NCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.124	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O2	Amend	Seeks NCZ-O2 be amended to explicitly recognise and provide for educational activities in the NCZ as these activities are necessary to service growth.	Amend NCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Accommodating growth The Neighbourhood Centre Zone has sufficient serviced, resilient development capacity <u>and additional infrastructure</u> to meet residential and commercial growth needs.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O3	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.210	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O3	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of NCZ-O2 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Retain NCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.211	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O3	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of NCZ-O2 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Amend NCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as follows: Medium density, mixed-use development is achieved that positively contributes to creating a good quality, well-functioning urban environment that reflects the changing urban form and amenity values of the Neighbourhood Centres and their surrounding residential areas.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.427	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O3	Support	Support objective providing for sustainable, mixed use neighbourhood zones.	Retain NCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.512	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O3	Support in part	Supports NCZ-O3 but seeks a minor amendment to recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone. Amendments sought.	Retain NCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.513	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O3	Amend	Supports NCZ-O3 but seeks a minor amendment to recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone. Amendments sought.	Amend NCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as follows: Medium <u>to high</u> density, mixed-use development is achieved that positively contributes to creating a good quality, well-functioning urban environment that reflects the changing urban form and amenity values of the Neighbourhood Centres and their surrounding residential areas.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O4	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-O4 (Activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.428	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O4	Support	Support objective providing for sustainable, mixed use neighbourhood zones.	Retain NCZ-O4 (Activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.514	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O4	Support in part	Generally supports NCZ-O4.	Retain NCZ-O4 (Activities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P1	Support in part	Supports the objectives and policies for the Neighbourhood, Local and Metropolitan Centre zones, and specifically supports the recognition of medium and high-density development and the enablement of a wide range of activities.	Retain NCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth), subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P1	Amend	Submitter is opposed to the references on undermining the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the other Centre zones	Seek that NCZ-P1.1 (Accommodating growth) is amended as follows: 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Local Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centre Zone and primacy of the City Centre Zone <u>supports the purpose of the zone;</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.82	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the scale and primacy of Centres is critical in achieving a well-functioning urban environment and intensification outcomes.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P1	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.35	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-O1	Oppose	FSNI submission point 476.12 seeks an amendment. Submission point 349.61 seeks to retain NCZ-O1 as notified.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.212	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P1	Support	Supports NCZ-P1 and its accommodation for growth and a variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability, intensity, density, and efficient use of available sites.	Retain NCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.515	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P1	Support in part	Supports NCZ-P1 but seeks amendment to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Neighbourhood Centre. Amendments sought.	Retain NCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.516	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P1	Amend	Supports NCZ-P1 but seeks amendment to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Neighbourhood Centre. Amendments sought.	Amend NCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Provide for the use and development of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone to meet the City's needs for housing, business activities and community facilities, including: 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Local Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centre Zone and primacy of the City Centre Zone; 2. A mix of medium to high density housing; 3. Convenient access to active, public transport and rapid transit options; 4. Efficient, well integrated and strategic use of available development sites; and 5. Convenient access to a range of open spaces.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P1	Amend	Opposes the references in NCZ-P1.1. to undermining the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the other Centre zones. The Centres each fulfil a different purpose as detailed in Objective 1, and are of different scales to one another. Any development within the lower order Centres should be considered in its own right without the additional administrative burden of potentially requiring assessments of effects on the higher order Centres.	Amend NCZ-P1.1. (Accommodating growth) as follows: ... 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Local Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centre Zone and primacy of the City Centre Zone supports the purpose of the zone;
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.57	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the scale and primacy of Centres is critical in achieving a well-functioning urban environment and intensification outcomes.	Disallow
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P2	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain NCZ-P2.7 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P2	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain NCZ-P2.2 (Enabled activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.248	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it makes provision for the provision of emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment.	Retain NCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P2	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-P2 (Enabled Activities) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain NCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.517	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P2	Support	Supports NCZ-P2 as it enables residential activities in the NCZ and a range of activities to support residential growth.	Retain NCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.125	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P2	Support	Supports NCZ-P2 as it is important to recognise and provide for educational facilities which will service the surrounding residential catchments and other community/commercial activities.	Retain NCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as proposed.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P3	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-P3 (Managed Activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.518	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P3	Support	Supports NCZ-P3 .	Retain NCZ-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P4	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P4	Amend	Considers that NCZ-P4 is unclear as drafted and should be amended to clarify why matters 1-4 have been included within the policy. It is considered that these clauses do not need to be incorporated into Policy NCZ-P4. Potentially incompatible activities (being activities not contemplated by the zone, or ones that infringe the zone standards) should be able to be accommodated in the zone if there is a functional and operational need and effects on the Centre are managed.	Amend NCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the role and function of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, where they demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone; or will not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the vibrancy and amenity of the centre: _ 1. Carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; 2. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of vacant land; 3. Ground floor residential activities on street edges identified as having an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; and 4. Yard-based retail activities.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.33	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P4	Oppose	The policy as drafted is considered to give greater clarity over types of activities that may not be compatible in the zone.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.429	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P4	Amend	Considers that NCZ-P4 should be amended, as it seems unduly restrictive to limit all yard-based activities in neighbourhood centre zones - garden centres and plant sales for example would seem business that would fit perfectly within neighbour centres. Having a wide range of activities in local neighbourhoods is fundamental to limiting car use and this policy may hinder creating 'walkable' neighbourhoods where people can access a full range of goods and services.	Amend NCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the role and function of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on the vibrancy and amenity of the centre: ... 4. Yard-based retail activities.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.519	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P4	Support	Supports NCZ-P4.	Retain NCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P5	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.430	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P5	Amend	Considers that NCZ-P5 should be amended as 'Avoid' is too strong and prohibitive a policy test to apply, post the NZ King Salmon case. There are easily envisaged circumstances where some activities that would fit within the heavy industrial category would fit well with a neighbourhood centre. For example small scale waste collection or recycling. As cities move towards a 'circular economy' model there will be a need for community based waste and recycling and this may prohibit such activities and raise additional barriers to sustainable waste management.	Amend NCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities) as follows: <u>Only allow heavy industrial activities where they will not have an adverse effect on the vibrancy and amenity of the centre.</u> Avoid heavy industrial activities from locating in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.520	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P5	Support	Supports NCZ-P5.	Retain NCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P6	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-P6 (Housing Choice) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.213	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P6	Support in part	Generally supports NCZ-P6 and its enablement of medium density residential development that offers a range of housing price, type, size and tenure that caters to various ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that each individual development will not offer a range in those matters.	Retain NCZ-P6 (Housing choice) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.214	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P6	Amend	Generally supports NCZ-P6 and its enablement of medium density residential development that offers a range of housing price, type, size and tenure that caters to various ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that each individual development will not offer a range in those matters.	Amend NCZ-P6 (Housing choice) to read " Offers <u>Contributes</u> to a range of housing price, type, size and tenure".
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.521	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P6	Support in part	Generally supports NCZ-P6 but considers that an amendment is required to: (a) recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone, and to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Neighbourhood Centre. And; (b) Clarify that intent of the Neighbourhood Centre zone is to enable intensification and height, and therefore medium to high-density housing is the appropriate scale of development to encourage within the Neighbourhood Centre, particularly taking account of the location of some Neighbourhood Centres adjoining High Density Residential Zones. Furthermore, high density residential development can provide for a range of housing choices in itself. This position is consistent with NCZ-P1 and NCZ-P7 and the intent of the NCZ.	Retain NCZ-P6 (Housing choice) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.522	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P6	Amend	Generally supports NCZ-P6 but considers that an amendment is required to: (a) recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone, and to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Neighbourhood Centre. And; (b) Clarify that intent of the Neighbourhood Centre zone is to enable intensification and height, and therefore medium to high-density housing is the appropriate scale of development to encourage within the Neighbourhood Centre, particularly taking account of the location of some Neighbourhood Centres adjoining High Density Residential Zones. Furthermore, high density residential development can provide for a range of housing choices in itself. This position is consistent with NCZ-P1 and NCZ-P7 and the intent of the NCZ.	Amend NCZ-P6 (Housing choice) as follows: Enable medium <u>to high</u> density residential development that: 1. Contributes towards accommodating anticipated growth in the City; and 2. Offers a range of housing price, type, <u>and size and tenure</u> that is accessible to people of all ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities.
Historic Places Wellington	182.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission]	Retain NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.249	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to achieve quality design outcomes for new development in the zone. In order to achieve good quality design outcomes, which includes the provision of a safe environment and resilient urban environment, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy	Supports NCZ-P7 (Quality design - neighbourhood and townscape outcomes), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.250	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to achieve quality design outcomes for new development in the zone. In order to achieve good quality design outcomes, which includes the provision of a safe environment and resilient urban environment, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy	Amend NCZ-P7 (Quality design - neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone by: 1. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, including the extent to which the development: ... c. Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation enabled in this zone; and d. Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities; <u>and</u> e. <u>Is accessible for emergency service vehicles;</u>
McDonald's	274.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Support in part	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain NCZ-P7 (Quality design -neighbourhood and townscape outcomes), subject to amendments as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Amend	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Seeks addition of the following to NCZ-P7 (Quality design -neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: <u>Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-P7 (Quality Design) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.36	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Oppose	FSNI submission point 476.14 seeks an amendment. Submission point 349.67 seeks to retain NCZ-P7 as notified.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.215	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports the recognition in (1)(b) of optimising the development capacity of land and in (2)(e) of flexibility for ground floor space to be used for residential purposes.	Retain NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.431	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Support	NCZ-P8 is supported as the need for, and scope of, quality design matters specified.	Retain NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.523	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Support in part	Generally supports NCZ-P7, but seeks amendment to: (a) The policy name to better reflect the intent of the policy and the subsequent wording, which seeks to manage new developments contribution to the neighbourhood and townscape; and (b) The policy wording to better recognise the NCZ rule setting and the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect; and to simplify and clarify the neighbourhood and townscape outcomes that plan is seeking to manage.	Retain NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.524	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Amend	Generally supports NCZ-P7, but seeks amendment to: (a) The policy name to better reflect the intent of the policy and the subsequent wording, which seeks to manage new developments contribution to the neighbourhood and townscape; and (b) The policy wording to better recognise the NCZ rule setting and the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect; and to simplify and clarify the neighbourhood and townscape outcomes that plan is seeking to manage.	Amend NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: Quality design – Neighbourhood and townscape outcomes Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity <u>planned urban built form</u> of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone by: 1. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, including the extent to which the development: a. Acts as a positive catalyst for future change by reflecting <u>Reflects</u> the nature and scale of the development proposed enabled within the zone and in the vicinity, and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood; b. Optimises the development capacity of land, particularly sites that are: i. Large; or ii. Narrow; or iii. Vacant; or iv. Ground level parking areas; c. Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation enabled in this zone; and d. Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities; 2. Ensuring that the development, where relevant: a. Responds to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to: ...
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.77	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Support	Supports this policy to ensure that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Retain NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Support in part	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) with amendment.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P7	Amend	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Amend NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) to include the following: Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P8	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.432	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P8	Support	NCZ-P8 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.525	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P8	Support in part	Supports NCZ-P8 in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Amendments to remove communal outdoor space requirements are also sought as this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space.	Retain NCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.526	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P8	Amend	Supports NCZ-P8 in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Amendments to remove communal outdoor space requirements are also sought as this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space.	Amend NCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as follows: Achieve a good standard of amenity for residential activities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone by: 1. Providing residents with access to adequate outlook; and 2. Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.69	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P9	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.216	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P9	Support in part	Agrees that shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects on adjacent sites require management. However, the level of management needs to be informed by the development expectations for the zone.	Retain NCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.217	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P9	Amend	Agrees that shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects on adjacent sites require management. However, the level of management needs to be informed by the development expectations for the zone.	Add new "role of density standards" policy into the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter as follows: <u>MRZ-PX Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.433	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P9	Support	NCZ-P9 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.527	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P9	Support in part	Considers that an amendment is required to NCZ-P9 to specify that adverse effects that need consideration are those beyond what is anticipated in the zone, consistent with the proposed zone framework and in accordance with Policy 6 NPSUD.	Retain NCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.528	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P9	Amend	Considers that an amendment is required to NCZ-P9 to specify that adverse effects that need consideration are those beyond what is anticipated in the zone, consistent with the proposed zone framework and in accordance with Policy 6 NPSUD.	Amend NCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Recognise the evolving, higher density development context enabled in the Neighbourhood Centres Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects <u>beyond those anticipated within the zone</u> , including: 1. Shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects on adjacent sites; and 2. The impact of construction on the transport network.
McDonald's	274.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Seeks that NCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.
Property Council New Zealand	338.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.205	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.205	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.70	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (and the associated policy and matters of discretion linkages), do not recognise or provide for the functional or operational requirements of activities.</p> <p>The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p> <p>The Design Guide places unreasonable requirements on applicants on matters that are more appropriately dealt with at a national level (for example, reducing travel/shipping costs of materials to reduce carbon emissions, and installing insulation above minimum requirements). The imposition of "thresholds" for certain types of development result in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p>	<p>Amend NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience, and/or</p> <p>2-2. Incorporating...</p> <p>4-3. Incorporating...</p> <p>5-4. Enabling...</p>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.37	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	FSNI submission seeks to delete this policy in its entirety (476.15), FSNI submission 476.16 seeks that functional or operational requirements of activities and development are recognised in NCZ-P7. Submission point 349.70 just seeks to amend NCZ-P10.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.218	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of NCZ-P10 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. Considers that the policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) in its entirety.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that NCZ-P10 is unclear and should be amended. Notes that the policy contains an incorrect reference to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide document (should be G97 as opposed to G107). A review of the guideline indicates that G97 City Outcomes Contribution is only triggered for City Centre zone developments (under or over height development comprising 50 or more units or any comprehensive development) and for over height development comprising 25 or more units or any comprehensive development in the MCZ, NCZ, LCZ and HRZ. As such, the Policy as currently drafted implies that any non-residential development in the NCZ is subject to this policy which is incorrect. The above amendment seeks to align this Policy with the Guide document.	<p>Amend NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows:</p> <p>Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development <u>that are over height</u> in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107 <u>G97</u>, including through either:</p> <p>...</p>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.3	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	FSNI seeks to remove NCZ-P10 in it's entirety in submission point 476.15. Submission point 359.51 seeks to amend NCZ-P10 so opposes 476.15.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.434	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Support	NCZ-P10 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.529	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' in NCZ-P10 for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) It is inconsistent with the current legislative framework;</p> <p>(b) Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and</p> <p>(c) All of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to instead encourage positive outcomes of development.</p>	Opposes in part NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.152	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Not specified	The RVA oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission where The RVA sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by The RVA.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.152	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Not specified	Ryman oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission where Ryman sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by Ryman.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.530	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Amend	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' in NCZ-P10 for the following reasons: (a) It is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; (b) Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and (c) All of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. Seeks amendments to instead encourage positive outcomes of development.	Amend NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height, large scale residential, non residential and comprehensive Encourage development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone to contribute to positive outcomes deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development; where this is provided, legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.153	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Not specified	The RVA oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission where The RVA sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by The RVA.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.153	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Not specified	Ryman oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission where Ryman sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by Ryman.
Investore Property Limited	405.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks deletion of NCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety as notified.
VicLabour	414.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	Delete NCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	<p>Opposes NCZ-P10.</p> <p>While FSNI recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.</p>	Delete NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and consequential references in their entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.71	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R1	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.435	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R1	Support	NCZ-R1 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.436	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R2	Support	NCZ-R2 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R2 (Community facilities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.437	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R3	Support	NCZ-R3 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.126	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R3	Support	Support NCZ-R3 as the submitter considers it is important to recognise and provide for educational facilities which will service the surrounding residential catchments and other community/ commercial activities.	Retain NCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.438	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R4	Support	NCZ-R4 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R4 (Arts, culture and entertainment activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.251	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R5	Support	Supports the rule as it permits emergency service facilities in the NCZ.	Retain NCZ-R5 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.439	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R5	Support	NCZ-R5 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R5 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R6	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain NCZ-R6 (Community corrections activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.440	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R6	Support	NCZ-R6 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R6 (Community corrections activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.441	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R7	Support	NCZ-R7 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R7 (Visitor accommodation) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.442	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R8	Support	NCZ-R8 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R8 (Recreational activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.443	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R9	Support	NCZ-R9 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R9 (Public transport activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R10	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain NCZ-R10 (Residential activities) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.219	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R10	Oppose in part	Opposes limitations on ground level residential activities.	Opposes NCZ-R10 (Residential activities) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.220	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R10	Amend	Opposes limitations on ground level residential activities.	Seeks a retirement village specific rule.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.444	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R10	Support	NCZ-R10 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R10 (Residential activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.531	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R10	Support in part	Supports NCZ-R10 in part as residential activities should be enabled in Neighbourhood Centres, but seeks that: (a) The activity status for non-compliance is amended to Restricted Discretionary with preclusion for limited notification and appropriate matters of discretion are restricted to Policy 7 and 8 matters. (b) Rules related to verandah coverage are removed, as it is considered that residential activities should be provided for where verandah coverage is required, particularly when ground floor development is controlled on active frontages and non-residential activity frontages in accordance with NCZ-P4. (c) Reference to natural hazards is removed as these matters are controlled by Natural Hazard rules and the proposed wording is inconsistent with this approach and does not manage residential activity at ground-level in hazard overlay areas.	Supports in part NCZ-R10 (Residential activities) with amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.532	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R10	Amend	Supports NCZ-R10 in part as residential activities should be enabled in Neighbourhood Centres, but seeks that: (a) The activity status for non-compliance is amended to Restricted Discretionary with preclusion for limited notification and appropriate matters of discretion are restricted to Policy 7 and 8 matters. (b) Rules related to verandah coverage are removed, as it is considered that residential activities should be provided for where verandah coverage is required, particularly when ground floor development is controlled on active frontages and non-residential activity frontages in accordance with NCZ-P4. (c) Reference to natural hazards is removed as these matters are controlled by Natural Hazard rules and the proposed wording is inconsistent with this approach and does not manage residential activity at ground-level in hazard overlay areas.	Retain NCZ-R10 (Residential activities) and seeks amendment as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted where: a. The activity is located: i. Above ground floor level; ii. At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as an active frontage; or iii. At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as a non-residential activity frontage; or iv. At ground level along any street not identified as requiring verandah coverage; or v. At ground level on any site contained within a Natural Hazard Overlay. 2. Activity status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NCZ-R10.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in NCZ-P7-P8. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule NCZ-R10.2.a is precluded from being <u>limited and</u> publicly notified
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.34	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R10	Oppose	Oppose residential activities on the ground floor to support vibrant streets.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.445	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R11	Support	NCZ-R11 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-R11 (Integrated retail activity) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.533	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R11	Amend	Considers that the Integrated Retail Activity gross floor areas of 20,000m ² do not reflect the scale of the Centres hierarchy anticipated in the NPSUD and the National Planning Standards. In some cases, the size of the Zones would not be large enough to accommodate 20,000m ² GFA.	Seeks to reduce the Integrated Retail Activity Gross Floor Area in NCZ-R11 (Integrated retail activity) to better reflect the lower order of Neighbourhood Centres in the Centres hierarchy.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.534	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R11	Oppose	Opposes NCZ-R11 as the provision of integrated retail up to 20,000m ² is inconsistent with the centre hierarchy across the Plan and the zones are too small to accommodate an integrated retail activity of 20,000m ² .	Delete NCZ-R13 (Carparking activities) in its entirety as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.446	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R12	Amend	Considers that NCZ-R12 is far too restrictive and should be amended. Community waste collection and recycling could be key aspects of a more sustainable 'circular' economy. Non-complying status with compulsory public notification is a major barrier to any activity. This could be a major roadblock for community waste management, small scale composting or niche recycling activities. For example it is not clear a small scale bottle recycling and cleaning business would not be caught by this rule.	Amend NCZ-R12.2 (Industrial activities) as follows: 2. Activity Status: Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NCZ-R12.1 cannot be achieved. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule NCZ-R12.2 a must be publicly notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.535	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R12	Support	Generally supports NCZ-R12.	Retain NCZ-R12 (Industrial activities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Oppose in part	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements.	Retain NCZ-R13.2 (Carparking activities), subject to amendment outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Amend	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements.	Amend NCZ-R13.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NCZ-R13.1.a cannot be achieved.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Amend	Considers that NCZ-R13 should be amended so that the activity status of this standard infringement is changed to restricted discretionary. It is considered that this status, plus the suggested matters of discretion, will ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities are anticipated, such assessments will be rational and streamlined. Supermarkets often require car parking to be visible, both from commercial viability perspective but also given the requirements to separate loading and servicing activities from public interfaces. This site layout requires that loading is located to the rear of a store, with the building in front and the entrance accessible and legible from the car park and street frontage. The application of blanket urban design ideals in these standards is challenged such that the proposed amendment seeks to explicitly exclude supermarkets from complying with this standard.	Amend NCZ-R13 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity Status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NCZ-R13.1.a is not achieved. <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters in NCZ-P2, NCZ-P3, NCZ-P4, NCZ-P7, NCZ-P9 and NCZ-P10;</u> <u>2. The cumulative effect of the development on:</u> <u>a. The ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Zone ;</u> <u>b. The safety and efficiency of the transport network, including providing for a range of transport modes;</u> <u>c. The hierarchy of roads, travel demand or vehicle use; and</u> <u>3. The compatibility with other activities provided for in the zone.</u> <u>Note: Rule NCZ-R13 does not apply to new supermarkets or additions to existing supermarkets.</u>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.4	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Support	Submission point 359.52 supports submission points 476.16 and 476.17.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.106	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A "discretionary" activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9.	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.36	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Oppose	Space in the centres is valuable, but the use of that space can have a wide range of effects (negative and positive), including on the character, perceptions of safety, road user behaviour, walkability and choice of transport mode. It is considered appropriate that non-compliant car parking provision consider a wide range of effects.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.536	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Support	Generally supports NCZ-R13.	Retain NCZ-R13 (Carparking activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Oppose	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in NCZ-R13 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend NCZ-R13 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...
Foodstuffs North Island	476.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Amend	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in NCZ-R13 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend NCZ-R13 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.105	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R13	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A "discretionary" activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.147	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R14	Support in part	NCZ-R14 is supported in so much as the rule provides for yard-based retail activities as a discretionary activity. It is understood that an application for resource consent made in respect of this rule, however, must be publicly notified in accordance with the Notification Status. [Submitter identified NCZ-R15 (All other activities) instead of NCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities); submission points have been changed to refer to NCZ-R14]	Retain NCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities) with amendment.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.148	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R14	Amend	Considers that NCZ-R14 should be amended as the notification requirement is not supported as it may have a range of unintended outcomes. For instance, without clarification, it may require public notification for any operational change, upgrading or maintenance to an existing yard-based activity where public notification would be more appropriately determined through standard notification tests. It may therefore also discourage existing activities from undertaking important maintenance and upgrades, for instance, to meet requirements of HSNO / HSWA legislation, better accord with good practise, introduce new technologies, or necessary changes to meet demand. Ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrades of existing service stations / yard-based retail activities should not be subject to this notification requirement, which is not appropriate for existing lawful activities. It is considered that an additional exclusion to the notification status is appropriate only where the existing or new activity is located on the edge of the zone or adjacent to an arterial or collector road. These locations and/or interfaces do not have, nor should they expect, the same urban design outcomes and levels of visual amenity compared to a centrally located site in the CCZ for example. A service station, for example, would not impact the function and vitality of a centre zone if it were located on the edge of the zone where it can appropriately transition to the adjoining zone.	Amend NCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows: Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule NCZ-R14 must be publicly notified <u>except</u> : <u>a. The activity relates to the maintenance, operation and upgrading of an existing activity;</u> <u>b. The new or existing activity adjoins another commercial zone, a residential zone or an arterial or collector Road.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.447	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R14	Amend	Considers that NCZ-R14 should be amended, as it seems unduly restrictive to limit all yard-based activities in neighbourhood centre zones - garden centres and plant sales for example would seem business that would fit perfectly within neighbour centres. Having a wide range of activities in local neighbourhoods is fundamental to limiting car use and this policy may hinder creating 'walkable' neighbourhoods. It may even be appropriate to have some permitted activity rules for some yard based activities - for example a small garden centre. Drafting for this Rule is not specifically provided but it is considered this should be reconsidered as the 50% total area yard restriction appears to catch a wide range of activities, many of which may be appropriate and should be permitted in neighbourhood centres.	Amend NCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>The matters in NCZ-P1, NCZ-P2, NCZ-P3, and NCZ-P4;</u> Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LCZ-R14 must be publicly notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.537	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R14	Support	Generally supports NCZ-R14.	Retain NCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.252	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R16	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the NCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain NCZ-R16 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.72	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R16	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-R16 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.538	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R16	Support	Generally supports NCZ-R16.	Retain NCZ-R16 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.253	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R17	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the NCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain NCZ-R17 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.73	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R17	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-R17 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.539	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R17	Support in part	Supports NCZ-R17 in part but seeks an amendment to ensure the rule only applies to active and non-residential activity frontages. The notification status is supported.	Retain NCZ-R17 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment as follows.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.540	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R17	Amend	Seeks an amendment to ensure the rule only applies to active and non-residential activity frontages. The notification status is supported.	Retain NCZ-R17 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted where: a. The demolition or removal of a building <u>on a site that has an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage;</u>
Wellington City Council	266.153	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Amend	Considers a notification status statement is missing in relation to developments where all standards are met.	Amend NCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: Notification status: <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule NCZ-R18.2.a which complies with all standards is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. (...)</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.254	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Support	Supports the rule as the construction or, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures within the NCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain NCZ-R18 (Construction of or additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.74	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Oppose	Oppose Opposed to the cross reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide within the matters of discretion. The cross reference to the policies of the NCZ is sufficient to ensure that development achieves a “good quality, well-functioning environment” as required by NCZ-O3.	Amend NCZ-R18 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: ... 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height limit requirement at Ngaio, Berhampore and Aro Valley centres and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 4-3. ... 5-4. ... 6-5. ... 7-6. ...
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.221	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Support in part	Supports the construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures being a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under NCZ-R18. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the requirements of NCZ-R18.1. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 1, are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of NCZ-P10 in Clause 1, and the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to NCZ-P10 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides, their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under NCZ-R18 should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under NCZ-R18 that complies with NCZ-S1, NCZ-S2 and NCZ-S4 should be precluded from being limited notified.	Retain NCZ-R18 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.222	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Amend	Supports the construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures being a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under NCZ-R18. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the requirements of NCZ-R18.1. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 1, are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of NCZ-P10 in Clause 1, and the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to NCZ-P10 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides, their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under NCZ-R18 should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under NCZ-R18 that complies with NCZ-S1, NCZ-S2 and NCZ-S4 should be precluded from being limited notified.	<p>Amend NCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>⑧</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of NCZ-R18.1 cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The matters in NCZ-P6, NCZ-P7, NCZ-P8, NCZ-P9 and NCZ-P10 (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>);</p> <p>2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard;</p> <p>3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height limit requirement at Ngaio, Berhampore and Aro Valley centres and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages);</p> <p>4. The Residential Design Guide (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>);</p> <p>5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints;</p> <p>6. Construction impacts on the transport network; and</p> <p>7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure;</p> <p><u>8. For retirement villages:</u></p> <p><u>i. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>ii. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p><u>iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>iv. When assessing the matters in 2(a)(2), and 2(a)(8)(i) – (iii), consider:</u></p> <p><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>v. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p>Notification status:</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule NCZ-R18.2.a that complies with both NCZ-S3, NCZ-S7, NCZ-S8, NCZ-S9, NCZ-S10 and NCZ-S11 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule NCZ-R18.2.a that results from non-compliance with NCZ-S1, NCZ-S2, NCZ-S4, NCZ-S5 and NCZ-S6 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Amend	Considers that NCZ-R18 should be amended so that permitted activities include a baseline for supermarket operations within the NCZ that is greater than the current threshold of 100m ² for new buildings on account of the general operational requirements of the stores. This proposed baseline of 450m ² aligns with the Auckland Unitary Plan provisions in the Neighbourhood Centre zone and is considered a commensurate response given the typical scale of supermarket buildings.	Amend NCZ-R18.1 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted b. The construction of any building or structure: i. Is not located on a site with an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; or ii. Is not visible from a public space; and iii. Will have a gross floor area of less than 100m ² <u>except where specified in iv below</u> ; and iv. <u>Will have a gross floor area of less than 450m² where it accomodates a supermarket</u> ; and iv. Will result in a total coverage (together with other buildings) of no more than 20 percent of the site; and vi. Comply with effects standards NCZ-S1, NCZ-S2, NCZ-S3, NCZ-S4, NCZ-S5 and NCZ-S6; and vii. Does not involve the construction of a new building for residential activities.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Amend	Considers that NCZ-R18 restricted discretionary activities should exclude new supermarket buildings. There are concerns around the inclusion of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide within these matters of discretion on account of the unnecessary scope this introduces in a restricted discretionary consenting framework. As such, it is specifically sought that that this is excluded from the matters of discretion for new supermarket buildings.	Amend NCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: 1. Compliance with any of the requirements of NCZ-R18.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in NCZ-P6, NCZ-P7, NCZ-P8, NCZ-P9 and NCZ-P10, <u>excluding for supermatkets exceeding NCZ-R18 (b)(iv)</u> ; 2 <u>2. For supermarkets exceeding NCZ-R18(b)(iv), the matters in NCZ-P3, NCZ-P4, NCZ-P7, NCZ-P9;</u> 3 <u>3. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard;</u> 4 <u>4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 97 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height limit requirement at Ngaio, Berhampore and Aro Valley centres and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (excluding supermarkets);</u> 5 <u>5. The Residential Design Guide;</u> 6 <u>6. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints;</u> 7 <u>7. Construction impacts on the transport network; and</u> 8 <u>8. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.541	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Support in part	Supports NCZ-R18 in part, but seeks: (a) amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead rely on the urban design outcomes that are outlined by the policy references and amended standards, and (b) to remove reference to the "City Outcomes Contribution" as this will unduly limit intensive development and height infringements should be assessed on its effects as provided for under the Resource Management Act, instead reference to NCZ-P10 in the matters of discretion is sufficient.	Retain NCZ-R18 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.542	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Amend	Seeks: (a) amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead rely on the urban design outcomes that are outlined by the policy references and amended standards, and (b) to remove reference to the “City Outcomes Contribution” as this will unduly limit intensive development and height infringements should be assessed on its effects as provided for under the Resource Management Act, instead reference to NCZ-P10 in the matters of discretion is sufficient.	Amend NCZ-R18 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted where: a. Alterations or additions to a building or structure: ... iii. Do not result in the creation of new residential units; and ... b. The construction of any building or structure: ... <u>vii. any building for residential activities complies with effects standards NCZ-S7 and NCZ-S8.</u> 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of NCZ-R18.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: ... 3. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height limit requirement at Ngaio, Berhampore and Aro Valley centres and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 4. The Residential Design Guide; 53. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 64. Construction impacts on the transport network; and 75. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule NCZ-R18.2.a that complies with both NCZ-S3, NCZ-S7, and NCZ-S8, NCZ-S9, NCZ-S10 and NCZ-S11 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. ...
Investore Property Limited	405.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain NCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.83	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.83	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend NCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.84	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.84	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Fabric Property Limited	425.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R18	Amend	<p>Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	<p>Amend NCZ-R18.2.3 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height limit requirement at Ngaio, Berhampore and Aro Valley centres and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building;</p> <p>...</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.255	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	Supports NCZ-R19 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.256	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Amend	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	<p>Amend NCZ-R19 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) as follows:</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The matters in NCZ-P1, NCZ-P3, NCZ-P6 and NCZ-P8; 2. The extent of compliance with standards NCZ-S7, NCZ-S8 and NCZ-S9 and satisfaction of associated assessment criteria; 3. The Residential Design Guide; and 4. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, <u>including for firefighting purposes.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.543	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports NCZ-R19 in part, and particularly supports the preclusion of public and limited notification. Kāinga Ora seek amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide as the matters in the relevant policies include those matters articulated through the design guides.	Retain NCZ-R19 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.544	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Amend	Supports NCZ-R19 in part, and particularly supports the preclusion of public and limited notification. Kāinga Ora seek amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide as the matters in the relevant policies include those matters articulated through the design guides.	Amend NCZ-R19 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in NCZ-P1, NCZ-P3, NCZ-P6, <u>NCZ-P7</u> and NCZ-P8; 2. The extent of compliance with standards NCZ-S7, NCZ-S8 and NCZ-S9 and satisfaction of associated assessment criteria; and 3. The Residential Design Guide; and
Investore Property Limited	405.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain NCZ-R19.1 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.85	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.85	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend NCZ-R19.1 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.86	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.86	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.257	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R20	Support in part	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Supports NCZ-R20 (Outdoor storage areas), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.258	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-R20	Amend	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Amend NCZ-R20 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site. <u>b. Screening does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Stephen	82.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the 22m maximum height limit in the Centres zones should be reduced.	Seeks that the 22m minimum height for Height Control Area 2 at NCZ-S1 (Minimum building height) is reduced.
David Stevens	151.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend NCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) so that the Ngaio Centre has a height limit of 11m. [Inferred decision requested].
David Stevens	151.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. Access for deliveries to local businesses is already constrained in Khandallah Village limiting any scope for expansion.	Amend NCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) so that the Khandallah Centre (rezoned as a NCZ) has a height limit of 11m. [Inferred decision requested].
Wellington City Council	266.154	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Amend	Considers there needs to be an increase in the height of the neighbourhood centre on the corner of Mersey Street and The Parade, Island Bay shops from 12m to 14m. This is because the PDP building neighbourhood centre heights are lower than the surrounding residential areas (14m). This is inconsistent with the approach taken to building heights in other centres and adjoining residential areas.	Amend NCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) as per table included in full submission. [Refer to original submission for table version of amendment sought]
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.259	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports NCZ-S1 (Maximum height), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.260	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend NCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m; and d. Lift overruns provided these do not exceed the height by more than 4m; <u>and</u> e. <u>Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that the 22m height limit is not appropriate for the Khandallah centre.	Opposes NCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) with respect to Khandallah being in Height Control Area 2 (22m).
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the 22m height limit is not appropriate for the Khandallah centre.	Seeks that Khandallah Centre is moved to Height Control Area 1 (12m) under NCZ-S1 (Maximum height).
James Coyle	307.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain NCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.75	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.545	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Support in part	Generally supports NCZ-S1 particularly as it enables six storey development in a number of centres. However, seeks amendment to enable fence heights of up to 2 metres to align with the Building Act.	Retain NCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.546	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Amend	Generally supports NCZ-S1 particularly as it enables six storey development in a number of centres. However, seeks amendment to enable fence heights of up to 2 metres to align with the Building Act.	Amend NCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) as follows: ... 2. Fences and standalone walls must not exceed a maximum height of 1.8 2 metres (measured above ground level).
Rachel Underwood	458.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes the provision to allow six-storey buildings considering that it will result in cold, sunless, wind canyons.	Amend NCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) to retain existing low-rise or one-level buildings adjacent to the roadside with three-storey (or six-storey) buildings set back.
McDonald's	274.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete NCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.76	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S2	Oppose	Oppose There are many buildings with a height less than the required minimum that will contribute positively to a well-functioning urban environment. The proposed standard will result in too many buildings requiring resource consent and is not an efficient or effective method to implement the policies of the Proposed District Plan.	Delete NCZ-S2 (Maximum building height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.38	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S2	Support	Submission point 349.76 supports FSNI submission point 476.18.	Allow
Woolworths New Zealand	359.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S2	Oppose	NCZ-S2 is opposed in its entirety and should be deleted, as it seeks to impose minimum building heights in the Neighbourhood and Local Centre zones of 7m. This requirement is overly prescriptive and unnecessary and should be deleted. The standard is overly onerous, when the PDP should be promoting development in the Centres. If this is to be retained in some degree, it should be refined to be a building frontage height standard and limited to specified streets as identified on the planning maps to achieve centre vibrancy and amenity.	Delete NCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.5	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S2	Support	Submission point 359.55 supports FSNI submission point 476.18.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.547	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S2	Support	Generally supports NCZ-S2.	Retain NCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S2	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete NCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
McDonald's	274.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete NCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.77	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S3	Oppose	Oppose Opposed to the minimum floor-to-floor ceiling heights for new development. The standard is overly prescriptive, does not provide for the specific requirements of drive-through facilities, and is unworkable from an operational perspective, and will only serve to increase the cost and/or regulatory processes of the development.	Delete NCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.39	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S3	Support	Submission point 349.77 supports FSNI submission point 476.19.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.548	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S3	Support	Generally supports NCZ-S3.	Retain NCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S3	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete NCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.261	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S4	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for emergency facilities and associated hose drying towers as noted in above submission point.	Supports NCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.262	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S4	Amend	Seeks an exemption for emergency facilities and associated hose drying towers as noted in above submission point.	Amend NCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: These standards do not apply to: ... c. Solar power and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 500mm; and d. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 3m measured vertically; and <u>e. Emergency facilities up to 9m in height and associated hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S4	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.549	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S4	Support	Generally supports NCZ-S4.	Retain NCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S5	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-S5 (Verandah control) as notified.
McDonald's	274.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose in part	Considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls in Centres and Mixed Use Zones are overly prescriptive.	Retain NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls), subject to amendment outlined other submission points.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McDonald's	274.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity. It would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Amend NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows: 1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage or a non-residential activity frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building. must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; b. Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and c. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; 2. Any <u>new building or ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that:</u> a. Is more than 4 <u>3</u> metres wide; and b. Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; <u>and</u> <u>c. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u> 3. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent; and 4. Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a non-residential activity frontage control must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and b. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.178	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. The RVA considers that residential activities, including retirement villages, should be permitted at ground floor.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.178	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages, should be permitted at ground floor.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.40	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose	Submission point 349.80 seeks to retain NCZ-S6 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.20 - 476.21 seeks this standard is amended.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Support in part	The restricted discretionary activity status to infringe the active frontage standards of MCZ-S6, NCZ-S6, and LCZ-S6 is supported. Notwithstanding, it is noted that supermarkets are unlikely to comply with these standards in any circumstance (being built up to the street edge on all street boundaries; a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; 50% visually transparent shutter doors), owing to genuine operational reasons. Whilst Woolworths acknowledges that the assessment criteria associated with the standard enable the consideration of those operational and functional needs, the standard represents another circumstance whereby consents would always be required for supermarkets, despite supposedly being encouraged with the relevant CMUZ.	Retain NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.6	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Support	Submission point 359.56 partly supports FSNI submission points 476.20 and 476.21.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose in part	Opposes the application of the standard to new or extended supermarkets.	Oppose in part NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) and request amendment.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.7	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Support	Submission point 359.57 partly supports FSNI submission point 476.20 and 476.21.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Amend	<p>Considers that supermarkets are unlikely to comply with the restricted discretionary standards of NCZ-S6 in any circumstance, owing to genuine operational reasons.</p> <p>While the assessment criteria associated with the standard enable the consideration of those operational and functional needs, the standard represents another circumstance whereby consents would always be required for supermarkets, despite supposedly being encouraged with the relevant CMUZ. This standard should be amended to not apply to new or extended supermarkets. The restricted discretionary activity status to infringe this standard is supported.</p>	<p>Amend NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any new building or addition to an existing building (<u>excluding new supermarkets or additions to an existing supermarket</u>) on an identified street with an active frontage must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; Any ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> is more than 3 metres wide; and extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building <u>on a site located on an identified street with an active frontage</u> must be at least 50% visually transparent; and Any new building or addition to an existing building (<u>excluding new supermarkets or additions to an existing supermarket</u>) on a site with a non-residential activity frontage control must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.8	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Support	Submission point 359.58 partly supports FSNI submission point 476.20 and 476.21.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.550	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Amend	<p>Considers that NCZ-S6 should be amended so that active frontage controls only apply where necessary, such as along principal roads/arterials not necessary along connecting streets. Only buildings that are located along any street edge should be controlled, rather than buildings on the whole site where an active frontage applies. Active frontage controls on streets and buildings where these matters do not apply should be deleted.</p> <p>These amendments recognise that active frontage controls are useful to achieve well-functioning urban environments where they are specifically applied on key roads where character and amenity values anticipated by underlying zoning are present.</p>	Amend NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) to only apply for buildings that are located along principal roads/arterials and along any street edge.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.551	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Support	Generally supports NCZ-S6.	Retain NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose in part	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.</p> <p>Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage or a non-residential activity frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building, must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; Any new building or ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is more than 4 metres wide; and Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; and Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent; and Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a nonresidential activity frontage control must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.43	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.43	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested								
Foodstuffs North Island	476.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Amend	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.</p> <p>Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend NCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage or a non-residential activity frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building, must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; Any new building or ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is more than 4 metres wide; and Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; and Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent; and Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a nonresidential activity frontage control must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary. 								
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.44	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow								
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.44	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S6	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow								
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.552	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S7	Support in part	Supports NCZ-S7 in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility.	Retain NCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) and seeks amendment.								
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.553	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S7	Amend	Supports NCZ-S7 in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility.	<p>Amend NCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) as follows:</p> <p>1. Residential units, including dual key units, must meet the following minimum sizes</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Residential Unit Type</th> <th>Minimum Net Floor Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a. Studio unit</td> <td>30.5m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. 1 or more bedroom unit</td> <td>40m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. 2+ bedroom unit</td> <td>55m²</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Residential Unit Type	Minimum Net Floor Area	a. Studio unit	30.5m ²	b. 1 or more bedroom unit	40m ²	c. 2+ bedroom unit	55m²
Residential Unit Type	Minimum Net Floor Area												
a. Studio unit	30.5m ²												
b. 1 or more bedroom unit	40m ²												
c. 2+ bedroom unit	55m²												
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.223	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S8	Oppose in part	Considers retirement villages should be excluded from this standard as in the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Opposes NCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) and seeks amendment.								
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.224	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S8	Amend	Considers retirement villages should be excluded from this standard as in the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Amend NCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) to exclude retirement villages.								

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.554	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S8	Support	Generally supports NCZ-S8.	Retain NCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.555	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S9	Oppose	Opposes NCZ-S9 as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living and is inconsistent with the scale of high density development.	Delete NCZ-S9 (Minimum outlook space for multi-unit housing) in its entirety as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.225	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S10	Oppose in part	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 10 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for retirement villages are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes NCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.226	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S10	Amend	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 10 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for retirement villages are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend NCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows: 1..... [figure] This standard does not apply to Neighbourhood centres other than Aro Valley, Berhampore and Ngaio Centres, or retirement villages.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.556	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S10	Oppose	Opposes NCZ-S10 as it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves. The zones are small and generally have limited depth which will place natural constraints on development and separations. Furthermore, considers that these standards are not triggered by any rule and so should be deleted.	Delete NCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) in its entirety as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S11	Support	Support	Retain NCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.72	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S11	Oppose	Submission point 349.81 seeks to retain NCZ-S11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.83 seeks to delete NCZ-S11 in its entirety.	Disallow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.227	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S11	Oppose in part	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for NCZ-R18 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes NCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.228	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S11	Amend	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for NCZ-R18 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend NCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) as follows: 1..... [figure] This standard does not apply to Neighbourhood centres other than Aro Valley, Berhampore and Ngaio Centres, or retirement villages.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S11	Amend	Considers that NCZ-S11 should be amended to introduce operational and functional requirements to infringements to maximum building depth since continuous external wall depth greater than 25m may be difficult to avoid in some larger scale proposals. Development of that scale may warrant consent and assessment, so long as that assessment is commensurate to the scale of the proposal, its context and those operational and functional requirements.	Amend NCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) as follows: ... Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. The extent to which the design mitigates the effect of a long featureless building elevation; and 2. Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites. 3. The extent to which any non-compliance is necessary to provide for the functional needs or operational needs of a proposed activity
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.557	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S11	Oppose	Opposes NCZ-S11 as it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves. The zones are small and generally have limited depth which will place natural constraints on development and separations. Furthermore, considers that these standards are not triggered by any rule and so should be deleted.	Delete NCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety as notified.

Commercial and Mixed use - Local Centre Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.83	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-S11	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Centre standards which sets a maximum 25m continuous depth of any external side wall.</p> <p>The word "continuous" is defined as forming an unbroken whole, without being interrupted. It is unclear whether the standard would still apply if the side wall was modulated.</p> <p>It would appear that the intent of these standards relates to privacy and dominance effects on neighbours and preventing a long featureless building façade. Privacy and dominance effects are more appropriately dealt with via the height, height in relation to boundary and outlook space standards. Furthermore, any new building in a Centre zone that is visible from the public realm requires consent and consideration of objectives and policies that also address amenity and design.</p> <p>Considers that the standards on maximum building depth are unnecessary and will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design.</p>	Delete NCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.
David Stephen	82.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre Zone.	Seeks that Khandallah is rezoned Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Hugh Good	90.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Supports Khandallah being a Local Centre Zone.	Retain Khandallah as a Local Centre Zone as notified.
Ian Law	101.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre Zone.	Seeks that Khandallah is rezoned as a Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Julie Patricia Ward	103.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre Zone.</p> <p>Considers that the Khandallah Shopping Village in Ganges Road is a neighbourhood centre to which Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD applies and therefore the PDP is required to enable 'commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services' required..</p> <p>Considers that the neighbouring suburbs of Ngaio, Broadmeadows and Kaiwharawhara are not reliant on services/commercial activities in Khandallah, which only service the needs of the immediate area (Khandallah) and therefore comes under the definition of a LCZ.</p> <p>Presence or absence of a supermarket is not a defining character of an LCZ.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons.]</p>	Seeks that Khandallah is rezoned NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone).
Julie Patricia Ward	103.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	<p>Oppose LCZ (Local Centre Zone) zoning at corner of Box Hill and Baroda Street and wants it rezoned to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone).</p> <p>Considers that there are two cafes and a car repair business at this location and should therefore be rezoned to NCZ.</p>	Seeks that the LCZ (Local Centre Zone) at corner of Box Hill and Baroda Street be rezoned to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone)
Brian McKenna	113.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the zoning of Khandallah Village as Local Centre Zone.</p> <p>Considers that this area is not significantly different in size or level of business than any other "Centre" zones in the North-western suburbs.</p> <p>It is significantly smaller than the Karori "Local Centre".</p>	Amend the zoning of Khandallah Village from Local Centre Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pam Wilson	120.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of Khandallah Village as Local Centre Zone.	Amend the zoning of Khandallah Village from LCZ (Local Centre Zone) to NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone).
Janice Young	140.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes Khandallah being zoned as a Local Centre and wants it to be zoned as a Neighbourhood Centre.	Opposes Khandallah being zoned Local Centre Zone.
David Stevens	151.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre Zone. Considers that Khandallah is essentially a small village which serves its local community. Neither Ngaio or Johnsonville rely on Khandallah for retail or business services. Access for deliveries to local businesses is already constrained in Khandallah Village limiting any scope for expansion.	Seeks that Khandallah is rezoned as a Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
David Stevens	151.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes Crofton Downs being a Local Centre Zone.	Seeks that Crofton Downs is rezoned as a Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
David Stevens	151.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Considers that the area at the junction of Box Hill/Burma Road/Station Road has mistakenly been classified as a 14m LCZ.	Seeks that the area at the junction of Box Hill/Burma Road/Station Road is rezoned as a MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) with a height limit of 11m.
Brian Sheppard	169.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Considers that LCZ are defined as having easy access to rapid transit public transport and that Churton Park should not be zoned as LCZ as its meagre bus service cannot be considered rapid transit public transport.	Seeks that Churton Park is not zoned as a Local Centre Zone.
Emma Baines	185.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre Zone. Khandallah has no more amenities than Ngaio or Crofton Downs and should not be treated differently to these other Neighbourhood Centres. The submitter travels from Khandallah to either Johnsonville or Crofton Downs to use the larger Countdown supermarkets and petrol stations.	Seeks that Khandallah is rezoned as a Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Emma Baines	185.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes the Station Road area being a Local Centre Zone. Considers that making this area of one café, a garage, and a restaurant a Local Centre Zone is completely overstated and must be an error given the number of shops in Ngaio which is still considered a neighbourhood centre.	Seeks that the Station Road area is rezoned as a Neighbourhood Centre Zone. [Inferred decision requested].
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes Khandallah Village being a Local Centre Zone. Considers that Khandallah is similar to Ngaio, and Ngaio has an NCZ. All the elements required of an NCZ are present in Khandallah. There is a large distinction between Khandallah and other suburbs with LCZ. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Khandallah Village is rezoned Neighbourhood Centre Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes Station Road/Baroda Street satellite shops being a Local Centre Zone. Considers that LCZ is inappropriate zoning for this area. This area is consistent with the PDP's description of NCZ. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Station Road/Baroda Street satellite shops are rezoned Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes the Local Centre Zone at Khandallah Centre. Considers that Khandallah Centre does not "Commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services" required by NPS-UD Policy 3 (d).	Opposes the Local Centre Zoning in the Khandallah Centre and seeks that it is rezoned to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes the Local Centre Zone at Box Hill Road. Considers that the zoning of LCZ here is an error in the District Plan. This extends the MRZ beyond reasonable limits. Also, there is no footpath that makes the southern end of Simla Crescent accessible in its entirety within a reasonable walking catchment of the Khandallah centre.	Opposes the Local Centre Zoning at Box Hill Road, Khandallah and seeks that it is rezoned to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Wilma Sherwin	306.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Opposes Khandallah being a Local Centre Zone. Khandallah village has a small village hub with limited vehicular access and only a small number of businesses. It is not big enough to be called a Local Centre and should instead be zoned Neighbourhood Centre.	Seeks that Khandallah is rezoned Neighbourhood Centre Zone.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	346.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Amend	Supports the Local Centre Zone at Ryman's site at 192 Adelaide Road, Newtown, provided the provisions applicable to the Local Centre Zone are amended to better enable retirement villages, as outlined in the submission from the Retirement Village Association of New Zealand. Namely, seeking a fit for purpose retirement village framework in the Local Centre Zone that recognises the unique needs of retirement villages, compared to other residential typologies. Finally, opposing restrictions on residential activities at ground floor level to the extent they would apply to retirement villages. [Refer to submission 350].	Supports the Local Centre Zone in Newtown, with amendment. [Refer to submission 350]
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.229	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required.	Add the following new policies in the Local Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u> <u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.230	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Local Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p><u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p><u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p><u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u></p> <p><u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u></p> <p><u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>
Z Energy Limited	361.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	The LCZ is generally supported, as it provides for a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. These centres service the needs of the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs.	Retain Local Centre Zone chapter as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.401	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Amend	Considers the term "roading network" is used in several places, and the term is not defined. Particularly supports the provision for public transport, consideration of function of the transport network, the discouragement of carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage and the quality design outcomes.	Amend the reference to "transport network", to ensure that it captures all transport modes.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.448	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support in part	Generally supportive with some amendments specified below.	Not specified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.558	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Amend	Considers that notified Local Centres in Miramar, Tawa and Newtown should be classified as Town Centre zones for their role and function within Wellington City. The spatial extent of these and other Centre Zones should be expanded to support the plan-enabled residential intensification surrounding them to and support a well-functioning urban environment.	Seeks that the Miramar, Tawa and Newtown Local Centre Zones be classified as Town Centre Zones.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.39	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.559	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support in part	Generally supports the introduction and application of a Local Centre Zone in the Draft District Plan. The Local Centre Zone description states "These centres serve the needs of the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs". Considers that this is inconsistent with the National Planning Standards description which limits this to the "residential catchment". The Planning Standards description of Town Centres includes the "immediate and neighbouring suburbs". Accordingly, Seeks that a Town Centre category is added to the Hierarchy of Centres to include Karori, Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown and the description of Local Centres is amended to better reflect the Planning Standards. Considers that is unclear why the High Density Residential Zone only applies to "most" centres so this should be amended to include all local centres to help support their core functions. At the moment the MDRS (11m) applies to Karori, Crofton Downs, Khandallah, Churton Park. 14m applies to Miramar, Hataitai, Island Bay, Brooklyn, and Newlands. High Density applies to Newtown, Kilburn, Linden and Tawa. Notes that reference is made to assessment against Design Guides. Design Guides are too broad to be used as an assessment matter.	Retain the introduction of the Local Centre Zone chapter and seeks amendment.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.11	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Considers it is not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington. Seeks to retain hierarchy of centres and definition of Local Centres as notified.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.40	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.560	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Amend	Generally supports the introduction and application of a Local Centre Zone in the Draft District Plan. The Local Centre Zone description states "These centres serve the needs of the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs". Considers that this is inconsistent with the National Planning Standards description which limits this to the "residential catchment". The Planning Standards description of Town Centres includes the "immediate and neighbouring suburbs". Accordingly, Seeks that a Town Centre category is added to the Hierarchy of Centres to include Karori, Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown and the description of Local Centres is amended to better reflect the Planning Standards. Considers that is unclear why the High Density Residential Zone only applies to "most" centres so this should be amended to include all local centres to help support their core functions. At the moment the MDRS (11m) applies to Karori, Crofton Downs, Khandallah, Churton Park. 14m applies to Miramar, Hataitai, Island Bay, Brooklyn, and Newlands. High Density applies to Newtown, kelburn, Linden and Tawa. Notes that reference is made to assessment against Design Guides. Design Guides are too broad to be used as an assessment matter.	Amend the introduction of the Local Centre Zone chapter as follows: 1. Introduce a Town Centre category in the Centres hierarchy and include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown in a new Town Centre chapter. [See Appendix 2 of submission for further detail]. 2. Amend the introduction text as follows: The purpose of the Local Centre Zone is to provide for a range commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. These centres service the needs of the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs . Local centres support the role and function of other Centre Zones in the hierarchy of centres. The Local Centre Zone is distributed across the city and will play a crucial role in accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth. The <u>Medium Density and High Density Residential Zone</u> surrounds most local centres. These zones enable intensification due to the capacity of the area to absorb more housing with enablers of growth such as walkability, access to public transport, community facilities and services.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p>High quality building design is a focus for the Local Centres Zone. The transition to more intensive use in some local centres will result in changes to existing amenity values in the centres and their surrounds. Consequently, redevelopment will be supported by a range of measures to promote good design and environmental outcomes, and address amenity issues <u>that are not anticipated in the Zone</u>. Accordingly, most building activities will require a resource consent and an assessment against <u>the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide key design criteria</u>. To enable intensification around existing neighbourhood centres, some of these will have substantial building heights.</p> <p>There is an identified need for residential intensification within and around local centres. These centres are subject to the intensification policies 3 (c) and (d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). Accordingly, residential activity is permitted above ground floor or where not visible at ground level within these centres. To support a mix of activities within the zone, activities that have off-site effects, such as industrial activities and different retail formats, will need to be managed. There is however a desire for larger scale retail to locate in centres, where these are of an appropriate form and scale, rather than at out-of-centre locations, to support the vitality and viability of centres.</p>
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.12	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Considers it is not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington. Seeks to retain hierarchy of centres and definition of Local Centres as notified.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.41	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.94	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Amend	Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support in part	Generally supports the objectives and policies for the Local Centre Zone, and specifically supports the recognition of medium and high-density development and the enablement of a wide range of activities.	Retain the Local Centre Zone objectives and policies, with amendments. [Inferred decision requested].
Foodstuffs North Island	476.84	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Newtown (195 Riddiford Street).	Retain Local Centre Zoning of New World Newtown (195 Riddiford Street) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.85	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Miramar (54 Miramar Avenue).	Retain Local Centre Zoning of New World Miramar (54 Miramar Avenue) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.86	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Island Bay (8 Medway Street).	Retain Local Centre Zoning of New World Island Bay (8 Medway Street) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.87	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Karori (236 Karori Road).	Retain Local Centre Zoning of New World Karori (236 Karori Road) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.88	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Khandallah (26 Ganges Road).	Retain Local Centre Zoning of New World Khandallah (26 Ganges Road) as notified.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.7	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission - 283].	Disallow / Seeks Neighbourhood Centre Zoning.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.89	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Newlands (1 Bracken Road).	Retain Local Centre Zoning of New World Newlands (1 Bracken Road) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.90	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Churton Park (103 Westchester Drive).	Retain Local Centre Zoning of New World Churton Park (103 Westchester Drive) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.91	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Support	Supports the Local Centre Zoning of New World Tawa (37 Oxford Street).	Retain Local Centre Zoning of New World Tawa (37 Oxford Street) as notified.
Ben Barrett	479.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ	Amend	Considers that Constable Street is not a major transport corridor. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that appropriate building planning needs to be had along Constable Street, varying in height, with building heights reducing as the elevation of the road rises.
Simon Ross	37.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / New LCZ	Amend	Considers that Mixed Used Zones (i.e. Local Centre Zones) in Karori are too small. The biggest missed opportunity is to make mixed use along the full length between Marsden Village and the west end of Karori Village.	Seeks that the Local Centre Zone extends along the length of Karori Road and/or between Morley Street and Tringham Street.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.231	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / New LCZ	Support	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required.	Add the following new policies in the Local Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u> <u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.232	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / New LCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Local Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.233	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / New LCZ	Support	As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Local Centre Zone (LCZ-R10). Considers that the Local Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under LCZ-R18). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	<p>Add a new 'Retirement villages' in the Local Centres Zone chapter rule as follows: <u>LCZ-RX Retirement villages</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.234	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / New LCZ	Amend	As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Local Centre Zone (LCZ-R10). Considers that the Local Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under LCZ-R18). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	<p>Add a new 'Retirement villages' in the Local Centres Zone chapter rule as follows: <u>LCZ-RX Retirement villages</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.561	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / New LCZ	Amend	Seeks a new rule to allow for the Conversion of Buildings, or parts of buildings for Residential activities as a permitted activity. Residential activities are considered an appropriate activity within the LCZ, and the effects can be controlled through the standards.	<p>Seeks to Add the following new rule in the Local Centres Zone chapter: <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>where:</u> <u>a. The conversion of Buildings, or parts of buildings for Residential activities:</u> <u>i. Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; and</u> <u>ii. Complies with LCZ-S7, LCZ-S8 and LCZ-S9.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.126	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / New LCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial and mixed use zones that do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Add new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>LCZ-SX:</u> <u>Boundary setbacks.</u> <u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u></p> <p>AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.37	Part 3 / Commercial and Mixed Use Zones / Local Centre Zone / New LCZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O1	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O1	Amend	Considers that LCZ-O1 should be amended to recognise that Local Centres, like Neighbourhood Centres, also serve passers-by.	<p>Amend Objective LCZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows:</p> <p>The Local Centre Zone meets the needs of communities, businesses, and residents in the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs, <u>and passers-by</u>, in a manner that supports the City's compact urban growth objectives and its role and function in the City's hierarchy of centres.</p>
Z Energy Limited	361.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O1	Support	Supports Objectives LCZ-O1 to LCZ-O2 which seek to meet the needs of communities, businesses and residents in the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs and their contribution in achieving a high quality and well-functioning urban environment.	Retain LCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.449	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O1	Amend	Objective LCZ-O1 is generally supported, especially the statement on the need to support compact urban growth. But an amendment is suggested to expand the Objective and capture that in providing the needs of the community it should do so in a way that supports sustainable transport choices.	<p>Amend Objective LCZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows:</p> <p>The Local Centre Zone meets the needs of communities, businesses and residents in the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs in a manner that supports the City's compact urban growth objectives, <u>sustainable transport</u>, and its role and function in the City's hierarchy of centres.</p>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.28	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O1	Support	This amendment aligns well with Waka Kotahi strategic direction around mode choice and safe systems planning.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.562	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O1	Support in part	Generally supports LCZ-O1 apart from the need to reflect the place of Local Centres under Town Centres in the Centres hierarchy by primarily serving surrounding residential areas instead of suburbs.	Retain LCZ-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.563	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O1	Amend	Generally supports LCZ-O1 apart from the need to reflect the place of Local Centres under Town Centres in the Centres hierarchy by primarily serving surrounding residential areas instead of suburbs.	<p>Amend LCZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows:</p> <p>The Local Centre Zone meets the needs of communities, businesses and residents in the surrounding residential catchment <u>and neighbouring suburbs</u> in a manner that supports the City's compact urban growth objectives and its role and function in the City's hierarchy of centres.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.263	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O2	Support	Supports the objective as it seeks to ensure that residential and commercial growth needs are met through land specifically zoned for this purpose with the provision of adequate infrastructure for housing and business use.	Retain LCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.83	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O2	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O2	Support	Supports Objectives LCZ-O1 to LCZ-O2 which seek to meet the needs of communities, businesses and residents in the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs and their contribution in achieving a high quality and well-functioning urban environment.	Retain LCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.450	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O2	Support	Objective LCZ-O2 is supported.	Retain Objective LCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.564	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O2	Support	Generally supports LCZ-O2.	Retain LCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.127	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O2	Support in part	Support LCZ-O2 in part.	Retain LCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.128	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O2	Amend	Seeks LCZ-O2 be amended to explicitly recognise and provide for educational activities to in the LCZ which are necessary to accommodate growth.	Amend LCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Accommodating growth The Local Centre Zone has an important role in accommodating growth and has sufficient serviced, resilient development capacity <u>and additional infrastructure</u> to meet residential and commercial growth needs.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.84	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O3	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain LCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.451	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O3	Support	Objective LCZ-O3 is supported.	Retain Objective LCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.565	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O3	Support in part	Supports LCZ-O3 but seeks a minor amendment to recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone.	Retain LCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.566	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O3	Amend	Supports LCZ-O3 but seeks a minor amendment to recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone.	Amend LCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as follows: Medium <u>to high</u> density mixed-use development is achieved that positively contributes to creating a high quality, well-functioning urban environment that reflects the changing urban form and amenity values of the Local Centres and their surrounding residential areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.85	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O4	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-O4 (Activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain LCZ-O4 (Activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.452	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O4	Amend	Objective LCZ-O4 is generally supported, but an amendment is suggested to expand the Objective and capture that the activities provided for should provide choices that support walkable neighbourhoods.	Amend Objective LCZ-O4 (Activities) as follows: Activities will be of an appropriate scale and type to enhance the vibrancy and viability of Local Centres, <u>support walkable neighbourhoods</u> and support their local purpose.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.29	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O4	Support	This amendment aligns with Waka Kotahi strategic direction around modal choice.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.567	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-O4	Support	Generally supports LCZ-O4.	Retain LCZ-O4 (Activities) as notified.
Brian Sheppard	169.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Not specified	Considers that the provision of appropriate public facilities and infrastructure has not kept pace with the extensive housing development of Churton Park. This is most noticeable in the small community centre which, even when built 10 years ago, was not large enough to accommodate the community needs of our rapidly expanding population.	Seeks that adequate provision is made for the good use of public space in Churton Park. [Inferred decision requested].
McDonald's	274.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Support in part	Supports the objectives and policies for the Neighbourhood, Local and Metropolitan Centre zones, and specifically supports the recognition of medium and high-density development and the enablement of a wide range of activities.	Retain LCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth), subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Amend	Submitter is opposed to the references on undermining the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the other Centre zones	Seek that LCZ-P1.1 (Accommodating growth) is amended as follows: 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Local Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centre Zone and primacy of the City Centre Zone supports the purpose of the zone;
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.83	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the scale and primacy of Centres is critical in achieving a well-functioning urban environment and intensification outcomes.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.86	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.41	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Oppose	Submission point 349.86 seeks to retain LCZ-P1 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.23 seeks this standard is amended.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.235	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Support	Supports LCZ-P1 and its accommodation for growth and a variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability, intensity, density, and efficient use of available development sites.	Retain LCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Support in part	LCZ-P1 is partially supported as it recognises the role of the LCZ to accommodate future growth in residential, commercial and community services and agrees that providing such development capacity should include the matters included in 1-5 of the Policy.	Retain LCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Amend	Considers that Local Centres also need to enable a broad range of commercial activities that support the medium-density business and residential intensification sought.	Amend LCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Provide for the use and development of the Local Centre Zone to meet the City's needs for housing, business activities and community facilities, including: 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the viability and vibrancy of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and the primacy of the City Centre Zone; 2. Forms of medium density housing; 3. Convenient access to active, public transport and rapid transit options; 4. Efficient, well integrated and strategic use of available development sites; and 5. Convenient access to a range of commercial service and open spaces .
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.453	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Support	The policy framework of the LCZ is supported as it allows the management of Local Centre Zones in a way that provides for the needs to the local neighbourhood and wider city.	Retain LCZ-P1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.568	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Support in part	Generally supports LCZ-P1 but seeks amendment to: (a) recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone, and to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Local Centre. And; (b) Clarify that intent of the Local Centre Zone is to enable significant intensification and height, and therefore medium to high-density housing is the appropriate scale of development to encourage within the Local Centre. (c) recognise the place of Local Centres under Town Centres in the Centres hierarchy.	Retain LCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.569	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Amend	Generally supports LCZ-P1 but seeks amendment to: (a) recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone, and to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Local Centre. And; (b) Clarify that intent of the Local Centre Zone is to enable significant intensification and height, and therefore medium to high-density housing is the appropriate scale of development to encourage within the Local Centre. (c) recognise the place of Local Centres under Town Centres in the Centres hierarchy.	Amend LCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Provide for the use and development of the Local Centre Zone to meet the City's needs for housing, business activities and community facilities, including: 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the viability and vibrancy of <u>the Town Centre Zone</u> , the Metropolitan Centre Zone and the primacy of the City Centre Zone; 2. Forms of medium <u>to high</u> density housing; 3. Convenient access to active, public transport and rapid transit options; 4. Efficient, well integrated and strategic use of available development sites; and 5. Convenient access to a range of open spaces.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Amend	Opposes the references in LCZ-P1.1. to undermining the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the other Centre zones. The Centres each fulfil a different purpose as detailed in Objective 1, and are of different scales to one another. Any development within the lower order Centres should be considered in its own right without the additional administrative burden of potentially requiring assessments of effects on the higher order Centres.	Amend LCZ-P1.1. (Accommodating growth) as follows: ... 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the viability and vibrancy of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and the primacy of the City Centre Zone <u>supports the purpose of the zone</u> ; ...
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.58	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the scale and primacy of Centres is critical in achieving a well-functioning urban environment and intensification outcomes.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P2	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain LCZ-P2.7 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P2	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain LCZ-P2.2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.264	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it makes provision for emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment.	Retain LCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.87	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P2	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P2	Support	LCZ-P2 is supported as it enables a wide-range of activities, including commercial activities (as defined).	Retain LCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.454	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P2	Support	The policy framework of the LCZ is supported as it allows the management of Local Centre Zones in a way that provides for the needs to the local neighbourhood and wider city.	Retain LCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.570	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P2	Support	Supports LCZ-P2 as it enables residential activities in the LCZ and a range of activities to support residential growth.	Retain LCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.129	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P2	Support	Supports LCZ-P2 as it is important to recognise and provide for educational facilities which will service the surrounding residential catchments and other community/commercial activities.	Retain LCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.88	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P3	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-P3 (Managed Activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P3	Support	LCZ-P3 is supported as it enables a wide-range of activities, including commercial activities (as defined).	Retain LCZ-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.455	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P3	Support	The policy framework of the LCZ is supported as it allows the management of Local Centre Zones in a way that provides for the needs to the local neighbourhood and wider city.	Retain LCZ-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.571	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P3	Support	Supports LCZ-P3.	Retain LCZ-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.89	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P4	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P4	Amend	Considers that LCZ-P4 is unclear as drafted and should be amended to clarify why matters 1-4 have been included within the policy. It is considered that these clauses do not need to be incorporated into Policy LCZ-P4. Potentially incompatible activities (being activities not contemplated by the zone, or ones that infringe the zone standards) should be able to be accommodated in the zone if there is a functional and operational need and effects on the Centre are managed.	Amend LCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the role and function of the Local Centre Zone, where they demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone; or will not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the vibrancy and amenity of the centre. ± 1. Carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; 2. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of vacant land; 3. Ground floor residential activities on street edges identified as having an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; and 4. Yard-based retail activities.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.30	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P4	Oppose	The policy as drafted is considered to give greater clarity over types of activities that may not be compatible in the zone.	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P4	Support in part	LCZ-P4 is supported for its intent in relation to new activities. Policy LCZ-P4 identifies potentially incompatible activities with the purpose of the LCZ, including yard-based retail, ground level carparking and residential activities, and vacant sites and seeks to only allow these activities where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity.	Retain LCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P4	Amend	Considers that LCZ-P4 is too specific and should be amended. LCZ-P4 is too specific and it will impact on the continued operation, maintenance and upgrade of a range of existing activities. It is considered that some yard-based activities, like service stations, play a key role in providing essential services to enable a well-functioning urban environment.	Amend LCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow <u>new</u> activities that are potentially incompatible with the role and function of the Local Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on the vibrancy and amenity of the centre: 1. Carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; 2. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of unutilised vacant land; 3. Ground floor residential activities on street edges identified as having an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; and 4. <u>Some</u> yard-based retail activities
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.456	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P4	Amend	Considers that LCZ-P4 should be amended as it seems unduly restrictive to limit all yard-based activities in Local Centre Zones - garden centres and plant sales for example would seem business that would fit perfectly within local centres. Having a wide range of activities in local neighbourhoods is fundamental to limiting car use and this policy may hinder creating 'walkable' neighbourhoods.	Amend LCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the role and function of the Local Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on the vibrancy and amenity of the centre: ... 4. Yard-based retail activities.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.572	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P4	Support	Supports LCZ-P4.	Retain LCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.90	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P5	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P5	Support	LCZ-P5 is supported as it seeks to avoid heavy industrial activities in the LCZ.	Retain LCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.457	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P5	Amend	Considers that LCZ-P5 should be amended as 'Avoid' is too strong and prohibitive a policy test to apply, post the NZ King Salmon case. There are easily envisaged circumstances where some activities that would fit within the heavy industrial category would fit well with a local centre. For example small scale waste collection or recycling. As cities move towards a 'circular economy' model there will be a need for community based waste and recycling and this may prohibit such activities and raise additional barriers to sustainable waste management.	Amend LCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities) as follows: <u>Only allow heavy industrial activities where they will not have an adverse effect on the vibrancy and amenity of the centre.</u> Avoid heavy industrial activities from locating in the Local Centre Zone.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.573	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P5	Support	Supports LCZ-P5.	Retain LCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.91	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P6	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-P6 (Housing choice) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.236	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P6	Amend	Generally supports LCZ-P6 and its enablement of medium density residential development that offers a range of housing price, type, size and tenure that caters to various ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that each individual development will not offer a range in those matters.	Retain LCZ-P6 (Housing choice) and seeks amendment to read "Offers Contributes to a range of housing price, type, size and tenure" ..
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.237	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P6	Support	Generally supports LCZ-P6 and its enablement of medium density residential development that offers a range of housing price, type, size and tenure that caters to various ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that each individual development will not offer a range in those matters.	Retain LCZ-P6 (Housing choice) and seeks amendment to read "Offers <u>Contributes to</u> a range of housing price, type, size and tenure" ..
Z Energy Limited	361.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P6	Support	LCZ-P6 is supported as it seeks to provide for a range of medium density residential development.	Retain LCZ-P6 (Housing choice) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.458	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P6	Support	The policy framework of the LCZ is supported as it allows the management of Local Centre Zones in a way that provides for the needs to the local neighbourhood and wider city.	Retain LCZ-P6 (Housing choice) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.574	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P6	Support in part	Generally supports LCZ-P6 but seeks amendment to: (a) recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone, and to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Local Centre. And; (b) Clarify that intent of the Local Centre zone is to enable significant intensification and height, and therefore medium to high-density housing is the appropriate scale of development to encourage within the Local Centre and high-density residential development can provide for a range of housing choices in itself. This position is consistent with LCZ-P7 and the intent of the LCZ	Retain LCZ-P6 (Housing choice) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.575	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P6	Amend	Generally supports LCZ-P6 but seeks amendment to: (a) recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone, and to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Local Centre. And; (b) Clarify that intent of the Local Centre zone is to enable significant intensification and height, and therefore medium to high-density housing is the appropriate scale of development to encourage within the Local Centre and high-density residential development can provide for a range of housing choices in itself. This position is consistent with LCZ-P7 and the intent of the LCZ	Amend LCZ-P6 (Housing choice) as follows: Enable medium <u>to high</u> density residential development that: 1. Contributes towards accommodating anticipated growth in the City; and 2. Offers a range of housing price, type, <u>and size and tenure</u> that is accessible to people of all ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.265	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to achieve quality design outcomes for new development in the zone. In order to achieve good quality design outcomes, which includes the provision of a safe environment and resilient urban environment, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy.	Supports LCZ-P7 (Quality design - neighbourhood and townscape outcomes), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.266	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to achieve quality design outcomes for new development in the zone. In order to achieve good quality design outcomes, which includes the provision of a safe environment and resilient urban environment, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy.	Amend LCZ-P7 (Quality design - neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of Local Centre Zone by: 1. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, including the extent to which the development: <u>x. is accessible for emergency service vehicles</u>
McDonald's	274.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Support in part	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain LCZ-P7 (Quality design -neighbourhood and townscape outcomes), subject to amendments as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Amend	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Seeks addition of the following to LCZ-P7 (Quality design -neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: <u>Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.92	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-P7 (Quality design) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.42	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Oppose	Submission point 349.92 seeks to retain LCZ-P7 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.24 and 476.25 seeks this standard is amended.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.238	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports the recognition in (1)(b) of optimising the development capacity of land and in (2)(e) of flexibility for ground floor space to be used for residential purposes	Retain LCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Support in part	LCZ-P7 is supported for its intent, which requires new development and additions and alterations, to positively contribute to the sense of space and form, quality and amenity of the LCZ.	Retain LCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Amend	Considers that LCZ-P7 should be amended to recognise that alternative design responses are necessary for functional requirements of a range of activities, including existing service stations.	Amend LCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: ... 2. Ensuring that the development, where relevant: ... <u>f. Recognises that alternative design responses are necessary for functional requirements of a range of activities, including existing service stations.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.459	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Support	The policy framework of the LCZ is supported as it allows the management of Local Centre Zones in a way that provides for the needs to the local neighbourhood and wider city.	Retain LCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.576	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Support in part	Generally supports LCZ-P7, but seeks amendment to: (a) The policy name to better reflect the intent of the policy and the subsequent wording, which seeks to manage new developments contribution to the neighbourhood and townscape; and (b) The policy wording to better recognise the MCZ rule setting and the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect; and to simplify and clarify the neighbourhood and townscape outcomes that plan is seeking to manage.	Retain LCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.577	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Amend	Generally supports LCZ-P7, but seeks amendment to: (a) The policy name to better reflect the intent of the policy and the subsequent wording, which seeks to manage new developments contribution to the neighbourhood and townscape; and (b) The policy wording to better recognise the MCZ rule setting and the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect; and to simplify and clarify the neighbourhood and townscape outcomes that plan is seeking to manage.	Amend LCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: Quality design – Neighbourhood and townscape outcomes Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and <u>planned urban built form and function amenity</u> of the Local Centre Zone by: 1. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, including the extent to which the development: a. Acts as a positive catalyst for future change by reflecting <u>Reflects</u> the nature and scale of the development proposed enabled <u>enabled</u> within the zone and in the vicinity and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood; b. Optimises the development capacity of land, particularly sites that are: i. Large; or ii. Narrow; or iii. Vacant; or iv. Ground level parking areas; c. Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation enabled in this zone; and d. Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities; and 3. Ensuring that the development, where relevant: a. Responds to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to: I. A scheduled site of significance to tangata whenua or other Māori; ii. Heritage buildings, heritage structures and heritage areas; iii. An identified character precinct; ...
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Support	Supports this policy to ensure that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Retain LCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Support in part	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain LCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) with amendment.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P7	Amend	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Amend LCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) to include the following: Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.93	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P8	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P8	Support	LCZ-P8 is supported as it seeks to achieve a good standard of amenity for residential activities.	Retain LCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.460	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P8	Support	The policy framework of the LCZ is supported as it allows the management of Local Centre Zones in a way that provides for the needs to the local neighbourhood and wider city.	Retain LCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.578	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P8	Support in part	Supports LCZ-P8 in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Amendments to remove communal outdoor space and outlook requirements are also sought as this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space and outlook requirements should not be mandatory in a higher density living situation.	Retain LCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.579	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P8	Amend	Supports LCZ-P8 in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Amendments to remove communal outdoor space and outlook requirements are also sought as this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space and outlook requirements should not be mandatory in a higher density living situation.	Amend LCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as follows: Achieve a good standard of amenity for residential activities in the Local Centre Zone by <u>ensuring access to convenient outdoor space</u> :- 1. Providing residents with access to adequate outlook; and 2. Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.94	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P9	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.239	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P9	Oppose in part	Agrees that shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects on adjacent sites require management. However, the level of management needs to be informed by the development expectations for the zone.	Opposes LCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.240	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P9	Amend	Agrees that shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects on adjacent sites require management. However, the level of management needs to be informed by the development expectations for the zone.	Seeks to Add new "role of density standards" policy in the Local Centre Zone chapter as follows: <u>MRZ-PX Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>
Z Energy Limited	361.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P9	Support	LCZ-P9 I supported as it seeks to manage adverse effects relating to shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects as well as effects on the transport network.	Retain LCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.461	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P9	Support	The policy framework of the LCZ is supported as it allows the management of Local Centre Zones in a way that provides for the needs to the local neighbourhood and wider city.	Retain LCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.580	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P9	Support in part	Considers that an amendment is required to LCZ-P9 to specify that adverse effects that need consideration are those beyond what is anticipated in the zone, is consistent with the proposed zone framework and in accordance with Policy 6 NPSUD.	Retain LCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.581	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P9	Amend	Considers that an amendment is required to LCZ-P9 to specify that adverse effects that need consideration are those beyond what is anticipated in the zone, is consistent with the proposed zone framework and in accordance with Policy 6 NPSUD.	Amend LCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Recognise the evolving, higher density development context enabled in the Local Centres Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects <u>beyond those anticipated within the zone</u> , including: 1. Shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects on adjacent sites; and 2. The impact of construction on the transport network.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McDonald's	274.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Seeks that LCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.
Property Council New Zealand	338.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.206	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.206	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	Oppose The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (and the associated policy and matters of discretion linkages), do not recognise or provide for the functional or operational requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide places unreasonable requirements on applicants on matters that are more appropriately dealt with at a national level (for example, reducing travel/shipping costs of materials to reduce carbon emissions, and installing insulation above minimum requirements). The imposition of "thresholds" for certain types of development result in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Amend LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: ... Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the Local Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3-2. Incorporating ... 4-3. Incorporating ... 5-4. Enabling ...
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.43	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	FSNI submission point 476.26 seeks to delete this policy in its entirety, FSNI submission point 476.25 seeks that functional or operational requirements of activities and development are recognised in LCZ-P7. Submission point 349.95 seeks to amend LCZ-P10.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.241	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of LCZ-P10 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. Considers that the policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) in its entirety.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that LCZ-P10 is unclear and should be amended. The policy contains an incorrect reference to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide document (should be G97 as opposed to G107). A review of the guideline indicates that G97 City Outcomes Contribution is only triggered for City Centre zone developments (under or over height development comprising 50 or more units or any comprehensive development) and for over height development comprising 25 or more units or any comprehensive development in the Metropolitan Centre zone (MCZ), Neighbourhood Centre zone (NCZ), Local Centre zone (LCZ) and High Density Residential zone (HRZ). As such, the Policy as currently drafted implies that any non-residential development in the LCZ is subject to this policy which is incorrect. The above amendment seeks to align this Policy with the Guide document.	Amend LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development that are over height in the Local Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107 G97, including through either:

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.9	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	Submission point 359.62 seeks to amend LCZ-P10. FSNI submission point 476.26 seeks to delete LCZ-P10 in it's entirety.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Z Energy Limited	361.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Support in part	LCZ-P10 is supported as it seeks to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107. However, the policy should also recognise the existing environment. [Submitter identified LCZ-P11 instead of LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution); submission points have been changed to refer to LCZ-P10]	Retain LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that LCZ-P10 should be amended to recognise the existing environment. [Submitter identified LCZ-P11 instead of LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution); submission points have been changed to refer to LCZ-P10]	Amend LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the Local Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, <u>while recognising the existing environment</u> including through either: ...
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.462	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Support	The policy framework of the LCZ is supported as it allows the management of Local Centre Zones in a way that provides for the needs to the local neighbourhood and wider city.	Retain LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.582	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose in part	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' for development in LCZ-P10. This policy has the potential to disincentivise residential development. 'Over height' developments should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. Deletion sought. Kāinga Ora opposes this policy for the following reasons: (a) all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development; (b) Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; (c) Notwithstanding the above, there is no definition for large-scale residential, which creates ambiguity within the plan	Retain LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.154	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Not specified	The RVA oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission where The RVA sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by The RVA.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.154	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Not specified	Ryman oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission where Ryman sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by Ryman.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.583	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Amend	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' for development in LCZ-P10. This policy has the potential to disincentivise residential development. 'Over height' developments should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. Deletion sought. Kāinga Ora opposes this policy for the following reasons: (a) all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development; (b) Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; (c) Notwithstanding the above, there is no definition for large-scale residential, which creates ambiguity within the plan	Amend LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive Encourage development within the Local Centre Zone in the Local Centre Zone to contribute to positive outcomes deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development, where this is provided, legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.155	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Not specified	The RVA oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission where The RVA sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by The RVA.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.155	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Not specified	Ryman oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission where Ryman sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by Ryman.
Investore Property Limited	405.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks that LCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) is deleted in its entirety as notified.
VicLabour	414.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]
Fabric Property Limited	425.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide. Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.	Delete LCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-P10	Oppose	<p>Opposes LCZ-P10.</p> <p>While FSNI recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.</p>	Delete LCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and consequential references in their entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R1	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.73	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R1	Support	Submission point 349.96 supports FSNI submission point 476.92.	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.463	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R1	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.92	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R1	Support	Supports supermarket as a permitted activity in the LCZ.	Retain LCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.464	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R2	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R2 (Community facilities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.465	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R3	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.130	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R3	Support	Supports LCZ-R3 as it is important to recognise and provide for educational facilities which will service the surrounding residential catchments and other community/commercial activities.	Retain LCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.466	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R4	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R4 (Arts, culture and entertainment activities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.267	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R5	Support	Supports the rule as it permits emergency service facilities in the LCZ.	Retain LCZ-R5 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.467	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R5	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R5 (Emergency services facilities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R6	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain LCZ-R6 (Community corrections activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.468	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R6	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R6 (Community corrections activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.469	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R7	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R7 (Visitor accommodation) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.470	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R8	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R8 (Recreational activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.471	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R9	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R9 (Public transport activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain LCZ-R10 (Residential activities) as notified.
Friends of Khandallah	252.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Amend	Considers that developers will abuse LCZ-R10 without the amendment. No developers have built residential on top of commercial in Wellington and developers do not like doing retail development. Retain rents in Khandallah are insufficient to justify the development of new retail space in Khandallah. People do not like purchasing/leasing residential above food-courts or premises. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that LCZ-R10 (Residential Activities) is amended so that the entire ground floor needs to be non-residential.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.51	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.51	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.242	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Oppose in part	Opposes limitations on ground level residential activities.	Opposes LCZ-10 (Residential Activities) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.243	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Amend	Opposes limitations on ground level residential activities.	Seeks a the addition of a Rule specific to retirement villages.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.31	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Oppose	Waka Kotahi supports the limitation of residential activities at ground floor to retain the commercial centre vibrancy and walkability.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.472	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R10 (Residential activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.584	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Support in part	Supports LCZ-R10 in part as residential activities should be enabled in Local Centres, but seeks that: (a) The activity status for non-compliance is amended to Restricted Discretionary with preclusion for limited notification and appropriate matters of discretion are restricted to Policy 7 and 8 matters. (b) Rules related to verandah coverage are removed, as it is considered that residential activities should be provided for where verandah coverage is required, particularly when ground floor development is controlled on active frontages and non-residential activity frontages in accordance with LCZ-P4. (c) Reference to natural hazards is removed as these matters are controlled by Natural Hazard rules and the proposed wording is inconsistent with this approach and does not manage residential activity at ground level in hazard overlay areas	Retain LCZ-R10 (Residential activities) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.585	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R10	Amend	Supports LCZ-R10 in part as residential activities should be enabled in Local Centres, but seeks that: (a) The activity status for non-compliance is amended to Restricted Discretionary with preclusion for limited notification and appropriate matters of discretion are restricted to Policy 7 and 8 matters. (b) Rules related to verandah coverage are removed, as it is considered that residential activities should be provided for where verandah coverage is required, particularly when ground floor development is controlled on active frontages and non-residential activity frontages in accordance with LCZ-P4. (c) Reference to natural hazards is removed as these matters are controlled by Natural Hazard rules and the proposed wording is inconsistent with this approach and does not manage residential activity at ground level in hazard overlay areas	Amend LCZ-R10 (Residential activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is located: i. Above ground floor level; ii. At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as an active frontage; <u>and</u> iii. At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as a non-residential activity frontage; iv. At ground level along any street not identified as requiring verandah coverage; or v. At ground level on any site contained within a Natural Hazard Overlay. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of LCZ-R10.1.a cannot be achieved. <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>1. The matters in LCZ-P7 and LCZ-P8.</u> Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LCZ-R10.2.a is precluded from being <u>limited and</u> publicly notified
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.473	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R11	Support	The strong rule framework of this Rule in managing local centres and operationalising the objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone chapter is supported.	Retain LCZ-R11 (Integrated retail activity) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.44	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R11	Oppose	<p>Considers that the rule was introduced by the WCC to block the original Johnsonville Mall development and was retained in the DPC72. Considers that WCC does not have either the responsibility or capability to regulate the normal market process. It should not impose its own centres hierarchy that restricts where and when retail businesses can locate. Considers the incorporation of the rules specifically protecting retailers on the Golden Mile from legal competition is not only specifically part of the strategy of the WCC, it is even specifically prohibited under the Resource Management Act. As follows:</p> <p>(3) In preparing or changing any district plan, a territorial authority must not have regard to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.</p> <p>Resource Management Act 1991 (as at 15 November 2021), Part 5, Section 74</p> <p>It is also noted that, while the Golden Mile is the only retail with specific protection under the proposed policies and rules, there is no supporting justification for why this huge retail area needs such protection under the district plan. The continued presence of this economic protection rule is a significant reason why the Johnsonville Mall has not been developed. The continued inclusion of this rule in the PDP essentially ensures any future Johnsonville retail development is restricted or even blocked when such development would have a major positive contribution to North Wellington City and the city in general.</p>	Disallow / Delete LCZ-R11 (Integrated Retail Activity) in its entirety.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.586	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R11	Amend	<p>Considers that the Integrated Retail Activity gross floor areas of 20,000m2 do not reflect the scale of the Centres hierarchy anticipated in the NPSUD and the National Planning Standards. In some cases, the size of the Zones would not be large enough to accommodate 20,000m2 GFA.</p>	Seeks to reduce the Integrated Retail Activity Gross Floor Area in LCZ-R11 (Integrated retail activity) to better reflect their lower order of Local Centres in the Centres hierarchy.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.37	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R11	Oppose	<p>Considers that the rule was introduced by the WCC to block the original Johnsonville Mall development and was retained in the DPC72. Considers that WCC does not have either the responsibility or capability to regulate the normal market process. It should not impose its own centres hierarchy that restricts where and when retail businesses can locate. Considers the incorporation of the rules specifically protecting retailers on the Golden Mile from legal competition is not only specifically part of the strategy of the WCC, it is even specifically prohibited under the Resource Management Act. As follows:</p> <p>(3) In preparing or changing any district plan, a territorial authority must not have regard to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.</p> <p>Resource Management Act 1991 (as at 15 November 2021), Part 5, Section 74</p> <p>It is also noted that, while the Golden Mile is the only retail with specific protection under the proposed policies and rules, there is no supporting justification for why this huge retail area needs such protection under the district plan. The continued presence of this economic protection rule is a significant reason why the Johnsonville Mall has not been developed. The continued inclusion of this rule in the PDP essentially ensures any future Johnsonville retail development is restricted or even blocked when such development would have a major positive contribution to North Wellington City and the city in general.</p>	Disallow / Delete LCZ-R11 (Integrated Retail Activity) in its entirety.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.587	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R11	Support in part	<p>Supports controlling integrated retail in Centres in LCZ-R11 but considers that 20,000m2 is too big for the scale of Local Centres and should be reviewed to provide an appropriate retail hierarchy to match the Centres hierarchy and ensure that opportunities for housing are not limited in Centres.</p>	Retain LCZ-R11 (Integrated retail activity) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.38	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R11	Oppose	<p>Considers that the rule was introduced by the WCC to block the original Johnsonville Mall development and was retained in the DPC72. Considers that WCC does not have either the responsibility or capability to regulate the normal market process. It should not impose its own centres hierarchy that restricts where and when retail businesses can locate. Considers the incorporation of the rules specifically protecting retailers on the Golden Mile from legal competition is not only specifically part of the strategy of the WCC, it is even specifically prohibited under the Resource Management Act. As follows:</p> <p>(3) In preparing or changing any district plan, a territorial authority must not have regard to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.</p> <p>Resource Management Act 1991 (as at 15 November 2021), Part 5, Section 74</p> <p>It is also noted that, while the Golden Mile is the only retail with specific protection under the proposed policies and rules, there is no supporting justification for why this huge retail area needs such protection under the district plan. The continued presence of this economic protection rule is a significant reason why the Johnsonville Mall has not been developed. The continued inclusion of this rule in the PDP essentially ensures any future Johnsonville retail development is restricted or even blocked when such development would have a major positive contribution to North Wellington City and the city in general.</p>	Disallow / Delete LCZ-R11 (Integrated Retail Activity) in its entirety.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.588	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R11	Amend	Supports controlling integrated retail in Centres in LCZ-R11 but considers that 20,000m2 is too big for the scale of Local Centres and should be reviewed to provide an appropriate retail hierarchy to match the Centres hierarchy and ensure that opportunities for housing are not limited in Centres.	Amend LCZ-R11 (Integrated retail activity) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted where: a. The total gross floor area does not exceed ±10,000m2.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.39	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R11	Oppose	<p>Considers that the rule was introduced by the WCC to block the original Johnsonville Mall development and was retained in the DPC72. Considers that WCC does not have either the responsibility or capability to regulate the normal market process. It should not impose its own centres hierarchy that restricts where and when retail businesses can locate. Considers the incorporation of the rules specifically protecting retailers on the Golden Mile from legal competition is not only specifically part of the strategy of the WCC, it is even specifically prohibited under the Resource Management Act. As follows:</p> <p>(3) In preparing or changing any district plan, a territorial authority must not have regard to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.</p> <p>Resource Management Act 1991 (as at 15 November 2021), Part 5, Section 74</p> <p>It is also noted that, while the Golden Mile is the only retail with specific protection under the proposed policies and rules, there is no supporting justification for why this huge retail area needs such protection under the district plan. The continued presence of this economic protection rule is a significant reason why the Johnsonville Mall has not been developed. The continued inclusion of this rule in the PDP essentially ensures any future Johnsonville retail development is restricted or even blocked when such development would have a major positive contribution to North Wellington City and the city in general.</p>	Disallow / Delete LCZ-R11 (Integrated Retail Activity) in its entirety.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R11	Oppose	<p>Considers that LCZ-R11 (Integrated Retail Activity) which restricts large retail developments outside of the CBD, was introduced to block Johnsonville Mall Development.</p> <p>Considers that rules introduced to block competition to the Golden Mile are illegal.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete LCZ-R11 (Integrated Retail Activity) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.474	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R12	Amend	Considers that LCZ-R12 is far too restrictive and should be amended. Community waste collection and recycling could be key aspects of a more sustainable 'circular' economy. Non-complying status with compulsory public notification is a major barrier to any activity. This could be a major roadblock for community waste management, small scale composting or niche recycling activities. For example it is not clear a small scale bottle recycling and cleaning business would not be caught by this rule.	Amend LCZ-R12.2 (Industrial activities) as follows: 2. Activity Status: Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: Compliance with the requirements of LCZ-R12.1.a cannot be achieved. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LCZ-R12.2.a must be publicly notified.
McDonald's	274.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Oppose in part	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements.	Retain LCZ-R13.2 (Carparking activities), subject to amendment outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Amend	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements.	Amend LCZ-R13.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of LCZ-R1.1.a cannot be achieved.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Amend	Considers that LCZ-R13 should be amended so that the activity status of this standard infringement is changed to restricted discretionary. It is considered that this status, plus the suggested matters of discretion, will ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities are anticipated, such assessments will be rational and streamlined. Supermarkets often require car parking to be visible, both from commercial viability perspective but also given the requirements to separate loading and servicing activities from public interfaces. This site layout requires that loading is located to the rear of a store, with the building in front and the entrance accessible and legible from the car park and street frontage. The application of blanket urban design ideals in these standards is challenged such that the proposed amendment seeks to explicitly exclude supermarkets from complying with this standard.	Amend LCZ-R13.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: 2. Activity status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of LCZ-R13.1.a is not achieved. <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters in LCZ-P2, LCZ-P3, LCZ-P4, LCZ-P7, LCZ-P9 and LCZ-P10;</u> <u>2. The cumulative effect of the development on:</u> <u>a. The ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Zone ;</u> <u>b. The safety and efficiency of the transport network, including providing for a range of transport modes;</u> <u>c. The hierarchy of roads, travel demand or vehicle use; and</u> <u>3. The compatibility with other activities provided for in the zone.</u> <u>Note: Rule LCZ-R13 does not apply to new supermarkets or additions to existing supermarkets.</u>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.10	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Support	Submission point 359.63 partly supports FSNI submission points 476.27 and 476.28.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.107	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A "discretionary" activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9.	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.32	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Oppose	Space in the centres is valuable, but the use of that space can have a wide range of effects (negative and positive), including on the character, perceptions of safety, road user behaviour, walkability and choice of transport mode. It is considered appropriate that non-compliant car parking provision consider a wide range of effects	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.589	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Support	Generally supports LCZ-R13.	Retain LCZ-R13 (Carparking activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Oppose	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in LCZ-R13 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend LCZ-R13 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...
Foodstuffs North Island	476.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Amend	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in LCZ-R13 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend LCZ-R13 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.104	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R13	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A “discretionary” activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.
Z Energy Limited	361.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R14	Support in part	LCZ-R14 is supported in so much as it provides for yard-based retail activities (the definition of which includes service stations) as a discretionary activity.	Retain LCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R14	Amend	Considers that LCZ-R14 should be amended to make changes to the notification status to exclude activities relating to the operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing activities and activities adjoining specific areas.	Amend LCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Discretionary Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R15 must be publicly notified <u>except:</u> <u>a. The activity relates to the maintenance, operation and upgrading of an existing activity;</u> <u>b. The new or existing activity adjoins another commercial zone, a residential zone or an arterial or collector Road.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.149	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R14	Support in part	LCZ-R14 is supported in so much as the rule provides for yard-based retail activities as a discretionary activity. It is understood that an application for resource consent made in respect of this rule, however, must be publicly notified in accordance with the Notification Status. [Submitter identified LCZ-R16 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) instead of LCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities); submission points have been changed to refer to LCZ-R14]	Retain LCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.150	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R14	Amend	<p>Considers that LCZ-R14 should be amended as the notification requirement is not supported as it may have a range of unintended outcomes. For instance, without clarification, it may require public notification for any operational change, upgrading or maintenance to an existing yard-based activity where public notification would be more appropriately determined through standard notification tests. It may therefore also discourage existing activities from undertaking important maintenance and upgrades, for instance, to meet requirements of HSNO / HSWA legislation, better accord with good practise, introduce new technologies, or necessary changes to meet demand.</p> <p>Ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrades of existing service stations / yard-based retail activities should not be subject to this notification requirement, which is not appropriate for existing lawful activities.</p> <p>It is considered that an additional exclusion to the notification status is appropriate only where the existing or new activity is located on the edge of the zone or adjacent to an arterial or collector road. These locations and/or interfaces do not have, nor should they expect, the same urban design outcomes and levels of visual amenity compared to a centrally located site in the CCZ for example. A service station, for example, would not impact the function and vitality of a centre zone if it were located on the edge of the zone where it can appropriately transition to the adjoining zone.</p>	<p>Amend LCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows:</p> <p>Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LCZ-R14 must be publicly notified <u>except</u>:</p> <p><u>a. The activity relates to the maintenance, operation and upgrading of an existing activity;</u> <u>b. The new or existing activity adjoins another commercial zone, a residential zone or an arterial or collector Road.</u></p>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.475	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R14	Amend	<p>Considers that LCZ-R14 should be amended as it seems unduly restrictive to limit all yard-based activities in neighbourhood centre zones. For example, garden centres and plant sales would seem a business that would fit perfectly within neighbour centres. Having a wide range of activities in local neighbourhoods is fundamental to limiting car use and this policy may hinder creating 'walkable' neighbourhoods. It may even be appropriate to have some permitted activity rules for some yard based activities - for example a small garden centre. Drafting for this policy was not specifically provided but it is considered this should be reconsidered as the 50% total area yard restriction appears to catch a wide range of activities, many of which may be appropriate and should be permitted in neighbourhood centres.</p>	<p>Amend LCZ-R14 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters in LCZ-P1, LCZ-P2, LCZ-P3 and LCZ-P4;</u></p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LCZ-R15 must be publicly notified.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.268	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R16	Support	<p>Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the LCZ are a permitted activity.</p>	<p>Retain LCZ-R16 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.</p>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R16	Support	<p>Support</p>	<p>Retain LCZ-R16 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.</p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.590	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R16	Support	<p>Generally supports LCZ-R16.</p>	<p>Retain LCZ-R16 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.269	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R17	Support	<p>Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the LCZ are a permitted activity.</p>	<p>Retain LCZ-R17 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.</p>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R17	Support	<p>Support</p>	<p>Retain LCZ-R17 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.270	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R17	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain LCZ-R17 (Demolition or removal of a buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.271	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R17	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend LCZ-R17 (Demolition or removal of a buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.591	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R17	Support in part	Supports LCZ-R17 in part but seeks an amendment to ensure the rule only applies to active and non-residential activity frontages. The notification status is supported.	Retain LCZ-R17.1 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.592	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R17	Amend	Supports LCZ-R17 in part but seeks an amendment to ensure the rule only applies to active and non-residential activity frontages. The notification status is supported.	Amend LCZ-R17.1 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. <u>The demolition or removal of a building on a site that has an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage:</u>
Investore Property Limited	405.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R17	Support in part	Seeks amendments to LCZ-R17 to provide for demolition that does not comply with the permitted conditions as a Restricted Discretionary activity. While the submitter supports the intention of the rule, and supports the preclusion of public and limited notification, the submitter has concerns that as notified it may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a larger site to enable development. Considers that a restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.	Retain LCZ-R17.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R17	Amend	Seeks amendments to LCZ-R17 to provide for demolition that does not comply with the permitted conditions as a Restricted Discretionary activity. While the submitter supports the intention of the rule, and supports the preclusion of public and limited notification, the submitter has concerns that as notified it may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a larger site to enable development. Considers that a restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.	Amend LCZ-R17.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to be a restricted discretionary activity status with a notification preclusion requirement.
Wellington City Council	266.155	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Amend	Considers a notification status statement is missing in relation to developments where all standards are met.	Amend LCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: Notification status: <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LCZ-R18.2.a which complies with all standards is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. (...)</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.243	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point subject to the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.243	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.270	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Support	Supports the rule as the construction or, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures within the LCZ are a permitted activity.	Retain LCZ-R18 (Construction of or additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as notified.
McDonald's	274.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Oppose in part	Oppose the requirement for restricted discretionary consent where additions and alterations change the exterior to the building above veranda level and are visible from public spaces.	Retain LCZ-R18 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures), subject to amendment as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Amend	Considers where compliance can be achieved with the relevant standards, this should be a permitted activity otherwise McDonald's considered there to be a risk that this will result in the perverse outcome of parts of exterior facades not being updated.	Seeks the following amendment to LCZ-R18 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: 1 a. Any alterations or additions to a building or structure: i. Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; or ii. Relate to a building frontage below veranda level, including entranceways and glazing and compliance with LCZ-S5; or iii. Do not result in the creation of new residential units; and iv. Are not visible from public spaces; and v. i. Comply with effects standards LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3, LCZ-S4, LCZ-S5 and LCZ-S6.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Oppose	Opposed to the cross reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide within the matters of discretion. The cross reference to the policies of the LCZ is sufficient to ensure that development achieves a "good quality, well-functioning environment" as required by LCZ-O3.	Amend LCZ-R18 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height limit requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 4-3. 5-4. 6-5. 7-6.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.244	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Support in part	Supports the construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures being a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under LCZ-R18. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the requirements of LCZ-R18.1. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 1, are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of LCZ-P10 in Clause 1, and the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to LCZ-P10 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides, their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under LCZ-R18 should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under LCZ-R18 that complies with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2 and LCZ-S4 should be precluded from being limited notified.	Retain LCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.245	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Amend	Supports the construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures being a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under LCZ-R18. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the requirements of LCZ-R18.1. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 1, are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of LCZ-P10 in Clause 1, and the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to LCZ-P10 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides, their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under LCZ-R18 should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under LCZ-R18 that complies with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2 and LCZ-S4 should be precluded from being limited notified.	Amend LCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of LCZ-R18.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in LCZ-P6, LCZ-P7, LCZ-P8, LCZ-P9 and LCZ-P10 (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3, LCZ-S4, LCZ-S5, LCZ-S6, LCZ-S7, LCZ-S8, LCZ-S9, LCZ-S10 and LCZ-S11; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height limit requirement at Ngaio, Berhampore and Aro Valley centres and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); 4. The Residential Design Guide (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. Construction impacts on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure; 8. For retirement villages: i. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; ii. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length; iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; iv. When assessing the matters in 2(a)(2), and 2(a)(8)(i) – (iii), consider: a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. 9. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p><u>v. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p>Notification status:</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LCZ-R18.2.a that complies with LCZ-S3, LCZ-S7, LCZ-S8, LCZ-S9, LCZ-S10 and LCZ-S11 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LCZ-R18.2.a that results from non-compliance with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S4, LCZ-S5 and LCZ-S6 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule NCZ-R18.2.a is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule NCZ-R18.2.b where compliance is achieved with NCZ-S1, NCZ-S2 and NCZ-S4 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>
Woolworths New Zealand	359.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Amend	Considers that LCZ-R18 should be amended to establish a baseline for supermarket operations within the LCZ that is greater than the current threshold of 100m ² for new buildings on account of the general operational requirements of the stores. This proposed baseline of 2000m ² aligns with the Auckland Unitary Plan provisions in the Local Centre zone and is considered a commensurate response given the typical scale of supermarket buildings in this zone.	<p>Amend LCZ-R18.1 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>...</p> <p>b. The construction of any building or structure:</p> <p>i. Is not located on a site with an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; or</p> <p>ii. Is not visible from a public space; and</p> <p>iii. Will have a gross floor area of less than 100m² <u>except where specified in iv below;</u></p> <p><u>iv. Will have a gross floor area of less than 2000m² where it accommodates a supermarket; and</u></p> <p>iv. Will result in a total coverage (together with other buildings) of no more than 20 percent of the site; and</p> <p>vi. Comply with effects standards LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3, LCZ-S4, LCZ-S5 and LCZ-S6; and</p> <p>vii. Does not involve the construction of a new building for residential activities</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Amend	Considers that LCZ-R18 restricted discretionary activities should exclude new supermarket buildings. The submitter is concerned around the inclusion of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide within these matters of discretion on account of the unnecessary scope this introduces in a restricted discretionary consenting framework. As such, it is specifically sought that that this is excluded from the matters of discretion for new supermarket buildings.	Amend LCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: 1. Compliance with any of the requirements of LCZ-R18.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in LCZ-P6, LCZ-P7, LCZ-P8, LCZ-P9 and LCZ-P10; <u>excluding for supermarkets exceeding LCZ-R18(b)(iv);</u> 2. For supermarkets exceeding LCZ-R18(b)(iv), the matters in LCZ-P3, LCZ-P4, LCZ-P7, LCZ-P9; 3. The extent and effect of non-compliance with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3, LCZ-S4, LCZ-S5, LCZ-S6, LCZ-S7, LCZ-S8, LCZ-S9, LCZ-S10 and LCZ-S11; 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107-97 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (<u>excluding supermarkets</u>); 5. The Residential Design Guide; 6. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 7. Construction impacts on the transport network; and 8. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.593	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Support in part	Supports LCZ-R18 in part, particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification.	Retain LCZ-R18 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.594	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Amend	Supports LCZ-R18 in part, particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seeks: (a) amendments to remove direct reference to the design guides given their breadth and to instead rely on the urban design outcomes that are outlined by the policy references and amended standards, and (b) to remove reference to the “City Outcomes Contribution” as this will unduly limit intensive development and height should be assessed on its effects. (c) The removal of reference to residential units as the use is controlled by the activity rules.	Amend LCZ-R18 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted where: a. Any alterations or additions to a building or structure: ... <u>iii. Do not result in the creation of new residential units; and</u> ii. Are not visible from public spaces; and iv. Comply with effects standards LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3, LCZ-S4, LCZ-S5 and LCZ-S6. ... 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of LCZ-R18.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in LCZ-P6, LCZ-P7, LCZ-P8, <u>and</u> LCZ-P9 <u>and</u> LCZ-P10; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3, LCZ-S4, LCZ-S5, LCZ-S6, LCZ-S7, <u>and</u> LCZ-S8, LCZ-S9, LCZ-S10 <u>and</u> LCZ-S11; 3. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 4. The Residential Design Guide; 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. Construction impacts on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.156	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with The RVA's primary submission to have these references removed, however it does not support the new urban design outcomes inserted as a result in various policies and standards.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.156	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with Ryman's primary submission to have these references removed, however it does not support the new urban design outcomes inserted as a result in various policies and standards.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.69	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain LCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.87	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.87	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.70	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend LCZ-R18.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replaced with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.88	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.88	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Fabric Property Limited	425.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R18	Amend	<p>Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	<p>Amend LCZ-R18.2.3 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building.</p> <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.271	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	Supports LCZ-R19 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.272	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Amend	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	Amend LCZ-R19 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) as follows: Matters of discretion are: 5. The matters in NCZ-P1, NCZ-P3, NCZ-P6 and NCZ-P8 6. The extent of compliance with standards NCZ-S7, NCZ-S8 and NCZ-S9 and satisfaction of associated assessment criteria; 7. The Residential Design Guide; and 8. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, <u>including for firefighting purposes.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.595	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports LCZ-R19 in part, and particularly supports the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seek amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide as the matters in the relevant policies include those matters articulated through the design guides.	Retain LCZ-R19 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.596	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Amend	Supports LCZ-R19 in part, and particularly supports the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seek amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide as the matters in the relevant policies include those matters articulated through the design guides.	Amend LCZ-R19 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in LCZ-P1, LCZ-P3, LCZ-P6, <u>LCZ-P7</u> and LCZ-P8; 2. The extent of compliance with standards LCZ-S7, LCZ-P8 and LCZ-S9 and satisfaction of associated assessment criteria; <u>and</u> 3. The Residential Design Guide; and 43. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule LCZ-R19.1 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.71	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain LCZ-R19.2 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, to residential activities) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.89	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.89	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.72	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend LCZ-R19.2 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, to residential activities) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.90	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.90	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.273	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R20	Support in part	Considers it important that the screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Supports LCZ-R20 (Outdoor storage areas), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.274	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-R20	Amend	Considers it important that the screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Amend LCZ-R20 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site. b. Screening does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.
John L Morrison	28.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that height restrictions in the Churton Park Local Centre should be reduced to 11m to match with the surrounding residential area, instead of the proposed 22m. The area does not meet the rapid transit criteria and the construction of 22m high buildings would be out of character with the surrounding low rise residential areas.	Amend LCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) to remove Churton Park from Height Control Area 3.
David Stephen	82.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the 22m maximum height limit in the Centres zones should be reduced.	Seeks that the 22m minimum height for Height Control Area 3 at LCZ-S1 (Minimum building height) is reduced.
Ian Law	101.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	The 22m height limit in LCZ-S1 (maximum height) is too high and needs to be amended.	Seeks that the height limit in LCZ-S1 (maximum height) should be reduced.
Julie Patricia Ward	103.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the height limit for all centres defined as LCZ's, other than heritage sites, should be 14 metres. Considers that this limit would establish an appropriate step down to surrounding existing one and two storey buildings and any three storey buildings which are added in the future. Considers that a 22m height limit would create a wind tunnel.	Seeks that the height limit around all LCZ (Local Centre Zone), other than heritage sites, is set at a consistent 14m, excluding heritage sites.
Brian McKenna	113.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the maximum height in Khandallah should be amended from 22m and set at 14m. Considers that given the narrow one-lane road in most of the village centre, 22m height buildings will create a road-blocked wind tunnel and increased business activities will not survive. Even Karori has a limit of 18 metres.	Amend the maximum height of Khandallah Village to 14m.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Pam Wilson	120.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to reduce the 22m maximum height in Khandallah.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes Height Control Area 2 - LCZ-S1 (22m) in Khandallah Village. 22m is not appropriate due to the scale of commercial activity and demand for commercial activity in the future. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height control area 3 - 22m in Khandallah Village.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the maximum height in Khandallah Village should be 14m	Amend LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to set a maximum height of 14 m in Khandallah Village
Friends of Khandallah	252.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes 21m height limits within the Khandallah centre and seeks amendment.	Seeks that the height limits in the Khandallah local centre zone are amended.
Friends of Khandallah	252.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that large scale residential will lead to erosion of commercial by residential. Theoretical planning from other cities is not necessarily good for Khandallah. Commercial areas need to be protected in Khandallah for resilience and emergencies. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the height limits in the Khandallah LCZ (Local Centre Zone) are reduced from 22m- 35m (as part of a resource consent) to 8m. [Inferred decision requested]
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.275	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports LCZ-S1 (Maximum height), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.276	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m; and d. Lift overruns provided these do not exceed the height by more than 4m; and e. <u>Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Wilma Sherwin	306.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes 22m Height Limit in Khandallah village centre and wants development heights kept to 14m. The area currently only has 3-storey buildings. Heights of 22m for business and residential use far exceeds what a small street like Ganges Road can practically cope with.	Opposes LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height control area 3 (22m) with respect to Khandallah Village
Wilma Sherwin	306.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Opposes 22m Height Limit in Khandallah village centre and wants development heights kept to 14m. The area currently only has 3-storey buildings. Heights of 22m for business and residential use far exceeds what a small street like Ganges Road can practically cope with.	Seeks that the height specified for LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is reduced to 14m in Khandallah Village
James Coyle	307.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested																																								
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.																																								
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.597	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Support in part	Supports LCZ-S1 in part, and particularly as it enables six storey development in a number of centres. Seeks amendment to enable six storey development in Local Centres noting that Newtown, Miramar, and Tawa should be reclassified as Town Centres. Kāinga Ora considers that the zone building heights should not be reduced because of a heritage area and there is no justification for building heights of less than six storeys in the Karori centre. If heights for specific areas are to be reduced for heritage reasons this should apply through the heritage overlay provisions.	Retain LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and seeks amendment.																																								
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.105	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers enabling six storey development in local centres is inconsistent with amenity value, level of commercial activity and community expectations for the local centre zones.	Disallow																																								
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.42	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.																																								
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.598	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Support in part	Supports LCZ-S1 in part, and particularly as it enables six storey development in a number of centres. Seeks amendment to enable six storey development in Local Centres noting that Newtown, Miramar, and Tawa should be reclassified as Town Centres. Kāinga Ora considers that the zone building heights should not be reduced because of a heritage area and there is no justification for building heights of less than six storeys in the Karori centre. If heights for specific areas are to be reduced for heritage reasons this should apply through the heritage overlay provisions.	Amend LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: 1. Maximum Height limits above ground level of 22m must be complied with. The following maximum height limits above ground level must be complied with: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Limit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Height Control Area 1</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Newtown Local Centre Heritage Area</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Island Bay Local Centre Heritage Area</td> <td>12 metres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hataitai Local Centre Heritage Area</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Height Control Area 2</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Karori</td> <td>18 metres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Height Control Area 3</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brooklyn</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Churton Park</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crofton Downs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Island Bay</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kelburn</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Khandallah</td> <td>22 metres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Linden</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Miramar</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Newlands</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hataitai</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Newtown</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tawa</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> 2. Fences and standalone walls must not exceed a maximum height of 1.8 2 metres (measured above ground level).	Location	Limit	Height Control Area 1		Newtown Local Centre Heritage Area		Island Bay Local Centre Heritage Area	12 metres	Hataitai Local Centre Heritage Area		Height Control Area 2		Karori	18 metres	Height Control Area 3		Brooklyn		Churton Park		Crofton Downs		Island Bay		Kelburn		Khandallah	22 metres	Linden		Miramar		Newlands		Hataitai		Newtown		Tawa	
Location	Limit																																												
Height Control Area 1																																													
Newtown Local Centre Heritage Area																																													
Island Bay Local Centre Heritage Area	12 metres																																												
Hataitai Local Centre Heritage Area																																													
Height Control Area 2																																													
Karori	18 metres																																												
Height Control Area 3																																													
Brooklyn																																													
Churton Park																																													
Crofton Downs																																													
Island Bay																																													
Kelburn																																													
Khandallah	22 metres																																												
Linden																																													
Miramar																																													
Newlands																																													
Hataitai																																													
Newtown																																													
Tawa																																													
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.106	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers enabling six storey development in local centres is inconsistent with amenity value, level of commercial activity and community expectations for the local centre zones.	Disallow																																								

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.43	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.36	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Retain height limits as notified in local centre zones as these are appropriate to the suburb.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.35	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Retain height limits as notified in local centre zones as these are appropriate to the suburb.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	405.73	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Support	Supports the 22 m maximum height standard.	Retain LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.
The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the current height control areas in the Newtown Local Centre Zone are too low to achieve good urban design and to create a well-functioning livable environment.	Seeks that the Height Control Areas in the Newtown Local Centre Zone is increased. [Inferred decision requested].
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.60	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Rachel Underwood	458.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes the provision to allow six-storey buildings considering that it will result in cold, sunless, wind canyons.	Amend LCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) to retain existing low-rise or one-level buildings adjacent to the roadside with three-storey (or six-storey) buildings set back.
Catharine Underwood	481.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	The 22m limit in the Brooklyn local centre is opposed. 22m on both sides of the street will make it a very unattractive place to be, destroying the streetscape and sunlight and make it very shady and windy and takes not notice of th topography.	Amend LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to remove 5 and 2 Todman street, 28 Cleveland Street Brooklyn from Height Area 3 (22m).
Catharine Underwood	481.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the height limits in the central Brooklyn Zone be limited to 14m on the south side and 11m on the north side. Any higher than this will impact on sunlight onto the street, create a canyon effect for what is a narrow street and cause much shading on the street.	Seeks that the height specified for Brooklyn in LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is reduced to 14m on the south side and 11m on the north side.
Catharine Underwood	481.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the north side of Upland Road in the Kelburn Village zone should be limited to 11m in height and the south side be limited to 14m. 22m height is way out of proportion to the available area, will destroy to street scape, will reduce sunlight on the south side of the street. And not provide a 'transition' between the centre and the houses.	Seeks that the height specified for LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is reduced to 11m on the North side of Upland Road and 14 m on the South side of Upland Road in Kelburn Village.
Catharine Underwood	481.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that he proposed height limit of 18m for the local centre in Karori should be increased to match those of the other centres at 22m. Karori has more shops, more room, flatter land and a catchment that is almost fully catered for without leaving the suburb. Brooklyn Village, Aro Village and Kelburn Village seem to be being pushed for development when to do the buildings at the proposed height will impact the liveability, sunshine, shading, biodiversity. If Karori cannot be increased, Kelburn and Aro St should be reduced.	Seeks that the height specified for LCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is increased to 22m in Karori.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ciampa Family Trust	165.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S2	Amend	Considers that it is unclear in LCZ-S2 whether the minimum building height applies to all buildings on a site zoned Local Centre Zone or whether it only applies to the building that directly adjoins/addresses the street. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Clarify whether the LCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) applies to all buildings on a site zoned Local Centre Zone or whether it only applies to the building that directly adjoins/addresses the street.
McDonald's	274.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete LCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety..
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S2	Support	Oppose There are many buildings with a height less than the required minimum that will contribute positively to a well-functioning urban environment. The proposed standard will result in too many buildings requiring resource consent and is not an efficient or effective method to implement the policies of the Proposed District Plan.	Delete LCZ-S2 (Maximum building height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.44	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S2	Support	Submission point 349.101 supports FSNI submission point 476.29.	Allow
Woolworths New Zealand	359.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S2	Oppose	LCZ-S2 is opposed in its entirety and should be deleted as it seeks to impose minimum building heights in the Neighbourhood and Local Centre zones of 7m. This requirement is overly prescriptive and unnecessary and should be deleted. The standard is overly onerous, when the PDP should be promoting development in the Centres. If this is to be retained in some degree ,it should be refined to be a building frontage height standard and limited to specified streets as identified on the planning maps to achieve centre vibrancy and amenity.	Delete LCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.11	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S2	Support	Submission point 359.66 supports FSNI submission point 476.29.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.599	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S2	Support	Generally supports LCZ-S2.	Retain LCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S2	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete LCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Ciampa Family Trust	165.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that it would not be necessary in LCZ-S3 to require a 4m minimum ground floor height for buildings behind the street-facing street. Currently it is unclear in LCZ-S3 whether the 4m minimum ground floor height applies to all buildings on a site zoned Local Centre Zone or just the building that directly adjoins/addresses the street.	Seeks that LCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) should not apply to buildings behind the street-facing building.
McDonald's	274.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete LCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S3	Support	Oppose Opposed to the minimum floor-to-floor ceiling heights for new development. The standard is overly prescriptive, does not provide for the specific requirements of drive-through facilities, and is unworkable from an operational perspective, and will only serve to increase the cost and/or regulatory processes of the development.	Delete LCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.45	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S3	Support	Submission point 349.102 supports FSNI submission point 476.30. [Inferred reference to submission point 349.102]	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.600	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S3	Support	Generally supports LCZ-S3.	Retain LCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S3	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete LCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.277	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S4	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for emergency facilities and associated hose drying towers for the reasons set out in the previous feedback point on LCZ-S1.	Supports LCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.278	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S4	Amend	Seeks an exemption for emergency facilities and associated hose drying towers for the reasons set out in the previous feedback point on LCZ-S1.	Amend LCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... c. Solar power and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 500mm; and d. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 3m measured vertically; and e. <u>Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Steve Dunn	288.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S4	Amend	Considers that building height at 42a Riddiford Street should be similar to that enabled in the operative district plan.	Seeks that the height in relation to boundary calculation at 42a Riddiford Street be taken at the street frontage or allow a building at the frontage only.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.103	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S4	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.601	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S4	Support in part	Considers that amendments to LCZ-S4 are needed to achieve consistency with any recommended changes to the height in relation to boundary rules and height for the residential zones.	Retain LCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) and seeks to amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.602	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S4	Amend	Considers that amendments to LCZ-S4 are needed to achieve consistency with any recommended changes to the height in relation to boundary rules and height for the residential zones.	Seeks to amend the standard to align with changes sought to LCZ-S1.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Cheryl Robilliard	409.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S4	Amend	Considers that building height at 42a Riddiford Street should be similar to that enabled in the operative district plan. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the height in relation to boundary calculation at 42a Riddiford Street be taken at the street frontage or allow a building at the frontage only.
McDonald's	274.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S5	Oppose in part	Opposes the requirement for a veranda along the frontage of the site at 190 Riddiford Street, Newtown.	Seeks that the site at 190 Riddiford Street, Newtown is exempt from LCZ-S5 (Veranda control).
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.104	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S5	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-S5 (Verandah control) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S5	Support in part	LCZ-S5 is partially supported as relates to specific sites identified on the Planning Maps with a 'verandah control'.	Retain LCZ-S5 (Verandah control) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S5	Amend	Considers that LCZ-S5 should recognise situations where functional requirements which necessitate site design where verandahs and buildings on boundaries cannot be achieved, such as service stations. (Option A)	Amend LCZ-S5 (Verandah control) as follows: 1. Verandahs must be provided on building elevations on identified street frontages <u>except where there is a functional requirement for a building to not contain a verandah.</u>
Z Energy Limited	361.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S5	Amend	Considers that LCZ-S5 should recognise situations where functional requirements which necessitate site design where verandahs and buildings on boundaries cannot be achieved, such as service stations. (Option B)	Amend LCZ-S5 (Verandah control) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Any scheduled building identified in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings; b. Any building where compliance with the standard results in an encroachment into the dripline of an existing street tree. <u>c. Service stations</u>
Z Energy Limited	361.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S5	Amend	Considers that LCZ-S5 should recognise situations where functional requirements which necessitate site design where verandahs and buildings on boundaries cannot be achieved, such as service stations. (Option C)	Amend LCZ-S5 (Verandah control) as follows: ... 1. The extent to which any non-compliance: a. Will adversely affect the comfort and convenience of pedestrians; b. Will result in further street trees being added to public space as part the development; and <u>c. Is required for on-site functional or operational needs</u>
McDonald's	274.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Oppose in part	Considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls in Centres and Mixed Use Zones are overly prescriptive.	Retain LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls), subject to amendment outlined other submission points.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McDonald's	274.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity. It would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Amend LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows: 1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage or a non-residential activity frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building. must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; b. Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and c. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; 2. Any <u>new building or ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that:</u> a. Is more than <u>4.3 metres wide; and</u> b. Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; <u>and</u> c. <u>Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u> 3. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent; and 4. Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a non-residential activity frontage control must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and b. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.179	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. The RVA considers that residential activities, including retirement villages, should be permitted at ground floor.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.179	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages, should be permitted at ground floor.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.46	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Oppose	Submission point XXX seeks to retain LCZ-S6 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.31 and 476.32 seeks to amend LCZ-S6. [Inferred reference to submission point 349.105]	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Support in part	The restricted discretionary activity status to infringe the active frontage standards of MCZ-S6, NCZ-S6, and LCZ-S6 is supported. Notwithstanding, it is noted that supermarkets are unlikely to comply with these standards in any circumstance (being built up to the street edge on all street boundaries; a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; 50% visually transparent shutter doors), owing to genuine operational reasons. Whilst Woolworths acknowledges that the assessment criteria associated with the standard enable the consideration of those operational and functional needs, the standard represents another circumstance whereby consents would always be required for supermarkets, despite supposedly being encouraged with the relevant CMUZ.	Retain LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.12	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Support	Submission point 359.67 partly supports FSNI submission point 476.31 and 476.32.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Amend	<p>Considers that supermarkets are unlikely to comply with the restricted discretionary standards of LCZ-S6 in any circumstance, owing to genuine operational reasons.</p> <p>While the assessment criteria associated with the standard enable the consideration of those operational and functional needs, the standard represents another circumstance whereby consents would always be required for supermarkets, despite being encouraged with the relevant CMUZ. This standard should be amended to not apply to new or extended supermarkets. The restricted discretionary activity status to infringe this standard is supported.</p>	<p>Amend LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any new building or addition to an existing building (<u>excluding new supermarkets or additions to an existing supermarket</u>) on an identified street with an active frontage must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; b. Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and c. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; 2. Any ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is more than 3 metres wide; and b. Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; 3. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on a site located on an identified street with an active frontage must be at least 50% visually transparent; and 4. Any new building or addition to an existing building (<u>excluding new supermarkets or additions to an existing supermarket</u>) on a site with a non-residential activity frontage control must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and b. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.13	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Support	Submission point 359.68 partly supports FSNI submission point 476.31 and 476.32.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Z Energy Limited	361.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Support in part	LCZ-S6 is partially supported for its intent as it requires that buildings are built up to the street edge along the full width of the site, that glazing is provided and that the principal entrance is located on the front road boundary.	Retain LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that LCZ-S6 should be amended to recognise situations where functional requirements which necessitate site design where verandahs and buildings on boundaries cannot be achieved, such as service stations.	Amend LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows: 1. Any new building or addition to an existing building adjoining an identified street with an active frontage control must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for that building to be set back from the street edge. In this case, 1b would not apply;</u> b. Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage c. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for the principal entrance to not front the street.</u> ... 4. Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a non-residential activity frontage control must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for that building to be set back from the street edge.</u> b. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for the principal entrance to not front the street.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.603	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that LCZ-S6 should be amended so that active frontage controls only apply where necessary, such as along principal roads/arterials not necessary along connecting streets. Only buildings that are located along any street edge should be controlled, rather than buildings on the whole site where an active frontage applies. Active frontage controls on streets and buildings where these matters do not apply should be deleted. These amendments recognise that active frontage controls are useful to achieve well-functioning urban environments where they are specifically applied on key roads where character and amenity values anticipated by underlying zoning are present.	Amend LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) to only apply for buildings that are located along principal roads/arterials and along any street edge.
Investore Property Limited	405.74	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Support in part	Supports the intent of the standard, but considers that there is insufficient exceptions for functional requirements such as vehicle entrances.	Retain LCZ-S6.1.a (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) and seeks amendment
Investore Property Limited	405.75	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Amend	Supports this control and associated provisions in part but considers that it provides insufficient exceptions for functional requirements such as vehicle entrances. Seeks amendments to the active frontage controls and all associated provisions so, in order to allow for functional requirements such as for a vehicle or pedestrian entrance or public space.	Amend LCZ-S6.1.a (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows: 1. Any new building or addition to an existing building adjoining an identified street with an active frontage must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary, <u>excluding vehicle and pedestrian access and public open spaces;</u> ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Oppose in part	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.</p> <p>Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage or a non-residential activity frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building. must- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; Any <u>new building or</u> ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is more than 4 <u>3</u> metres wide; and Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; <u>and</u> Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent. <p>a. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent; and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any <u>new building or</u> addition to an existing building on a site with a nonresidential activity frontage control must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary;
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.45	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.45	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested										
Foodstuffs North Island	476.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Amend	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.</p> <p>Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend LCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <p>1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage or a non-residential activity frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building. must-</p> <p>a) Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary;</p> <p>b) Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and</p> <p>c) Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary;</p> <p>2. Any <u>new building or</u> ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that:</p> <p>a) Is more than 4 <u>3</u> metres wide; and</p> <p>b) Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; and</p> <p><u>c) Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u></p> <p>a. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent; and</p> <p>4. Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a nonresidential activity frontage control must-</p> <p>a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and</p> <p>b. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.</p>										
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.46	Part 4 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow										
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.46	Part 4 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S6	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow										
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.604	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S7	Support in part	Supports LCZ-S7 in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility and decrease the minimum floor area for studio units.	Retain LCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) and seeks amendment.										
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.605	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S7	Amend	Supports LCZ-S7 in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility and decrease the minimum floor area for studio units.	<p>Amend LCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) as follows:</p> <p>Residential units, including dual key units must meet the following minimum sizes:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Residential unit type</th> <th>Minimum net floor area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a. Studio unit</td> <td>30m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. 1 or more bedroom unit</td> <td>40m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. 2+ bedroom unit</td> <td>55m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>...</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Residential unit type	Minimum net floor area	a. Studio unit	30m ²	b. 1 or more bedroom unit	40m ²	c. 2+ bedroom unit	55m²	...	
Residential unit type	Minimum net floor area														
a. Studio unit	30m ²														
b. 1 or more bedroom unit	40m ²														
c. 2+ bedroom unit	55m²														
...															
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.246	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S8	Oppose in part	Considers retirement villages should be excluded from this standard as in the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Opposes LCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) and seeks amendment.										
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.247	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S8	Amend	Considers retirement villages should be excluded from this standard as in the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Amend LCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) to exclude retirement villages.										

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.606	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S8	Support in part	Supports LCZ-S8 in part but is opposed to requiring communal outdoor living space in addition to private outdoor living space. As notified, it is not clear whether communal outdoor living space is required in addition to, or as an alternative to private outdoor living space. Seeks amendments to either: - clarify that communal outdoor living space is not required but can be provided as an alternative to private outdoor living space, or - to remove the requirement to provide communal outdoor living space. Seeks to amend the minimum dimension.	Retain LCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.607	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S8	Amend	Supports LCZ-S8 in part but is opposed to requiring communal outdoor living space in addition to private outdoor living space. As notified, it is not clear whether communal outdoor living space is required in addition to, or as an alternative to private outdoor living space. Seeks amendments to either: - clarify that communal outdoor living space is not required but can be provided as an alternative to private outdoor living space, or - to remove the requirement to provide communal outdoor living space. Seeks to amend the minimum dimension.	Amend LCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) to either: 1. Clarify that communal outdoor living space is not required but can be provided as an alternative to private outdoor living space; or 2. Amend as follows: ... 3.where communal outdoor living space is provided it does not need to be in a single continuous space but it must be: ... c. Free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing and manoeuvring areas. Living space type <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum area ² Minimum dimension a. Private i. Studio unit and 1-bedroom unit 5m ² 1.8m ii. 2+ bedroom unit 8m ² 1.8m b. Communal i. For every 5 units — 10m² — 8m
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.608	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S9	Oppose	Opposes LCZ-S9 as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living.	Delete LCZ-S9 (Minimum outlook space for multi-unit housing) in its entirety as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.248	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S10	Oppose in part	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 10 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for retirement villages are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes LCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows: 1..... [figure] <u>This standard does not apply to retirement villages.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.249	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S10	Amend	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 10 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for retirement villages are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend LCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows: 1..... [figure] <u>This standard does not apply to retirement villages.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.609	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S10	Oppose	Opposes LCZ-S10 as it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves. The zones are small and generally have limited depth which will place natural constraints on development and separations. Furthermore, these standards are not triggered by any rule and so should be deleted.	Delete LCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) in its entirety as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.106	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S11	Support	Support	Retain LCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.74	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S11	Oppose	Submission point 349.106 seeks to retab LCZ-S11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.93 seeks to delete LCZ-S11 in its entirety.	Disallow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.250	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S11	Oppose in part	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for LCZ-R18 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes LCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) and seeks amendment

Commercial and Mixed use - Commercial Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.251	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S11	Amend	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for LCZ-R18 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend LCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) t as follows: 1..... [figure] <u>This standard does not apply to retirement villages.</u>
Woolworths New Zealand	359.69	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S11	Amend	Considers that LCZ-S11 should be amended to introduce operational and functional requirements to infringements to maximum building depth since continuous external wall depth greater than 25m may be difficult to avoid in some larger scale proposals. Development of that scale may warrant consent and assessment, so long as that assessment is commensurate to the scale of the proposal, its context and those operational and functional requirements.	Amend LCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. The extent to which the design mitigates the effect of a long featureless building elevation; and 2. Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites. <u>3. The extent to which any non-compliance is necessary to provide for the functional needs or operational needs of a proposed activity</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.610	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S11	Oppose	Opposes LCZ-S11 as it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves. The zones are small and generally have limited depth which will place natural constraints on development and separations. Furthermore, these standards are not triggered by any rule and so should be deleted.	Delete LCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.93	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / LCZ-S11	Oppose	Opposes the Centre standards which sets a maximum 25m continuous depth of any external side wall. The word “continuous” is defined as forming an unbroken whole, without being interrupted. It is unclear whether the standard would still apply if the side wall was modulated. It would appear that the intent of these standards relates to privacy and dominance effects on neighbours and preventing a long featureless building façade. Privacy and dominance effects are more appropriately dealt with via the height, height in relation to boundary and outlook space standards. Furthermore, any new building in a Centre zone that is visible from the public realm requires consent and consideration of objectives and policies that also address amenity and design. Considers that the standards on maximum building depth are unnecessary and will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design.	Delete LCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / General COMZ	Oppose	Considers that the zone frameworks (Commercial and General Industrial) do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default “all other activities” rules (COMZ-R4 and GIZR6). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage. Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in commercial and industrial zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.	Amend the land use activity rule framework for the Commercial Zone as notified and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Prime Property Group	256.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / General COMZ	Amend	Considers the Height Control Area over 55-85 Curtis St to be inconsistent with the NPS-UD and more restrictive than the residential area around. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the objective, policy and rule framework be amended to enable a permitted height of 12m in the Commercial Zone.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.252	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / General COMZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required.	Add the following new policies in the Commercial Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u> <u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.402	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / General COMZ	Not specified	Considers this zone seems to apply only to a block of land on Curtis Street. The submitter would like the policy direction to be clearer about expectations for this area, especially the integration of active and public transport in its development (and especially given that it is currently a vacant site). [Position is neutral on provision].	Retain the Commercial Zone chapter as notified.
Prime Property Group	FS93.5	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / General COMZ	Support	Prime Property Group also require the policy direction to be clearer about the expectations of this site.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / General COMZ	Amend	Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / New COMZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the zone frameworks (Commercial and General Industrial) do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (COMZ-R4 and GIZR6). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification.</p> <p>Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage.</p> <p>Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in commercial and industrial zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.</p>	<p>Amend the land use activity rule framework for the Commercial Zone to include a permitted rule applying to "community corrections activities" as follows:</p> <p><u>COMZ-RX Community corrections activities</u></p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.253	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / New COMZ	Amend	<p>Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required.</p>	<p>Add the following new policies in the Commercial Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</p> <p>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</p> <p>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</p> <p>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p> <p><u>Changing communities</u></p> <p>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p> <p><u>Larger sites</u></p> <p>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.254	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / New COMZ	Amend	<p>As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Local Centre Zone (COMZ-R2). Considers that the Local Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under COMZ-R9). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>	<p>Add new 'Retirement villages' in the Commercial Zone chapter rule as follows:</p> <p><u>COMZ-RX Retirement villages</u></p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p>
Ministry of Education	400.131	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / New COMZ	Amend	<p>Seeks that in accordance with the submitter's amendments to COMZ-P1, a new associated rule is created for COMZ to provide for educational facilities. The submitter requests the inclusion of a new rule as sought.</p>	<p>Add new rule to COMZ (Commercial Zone) as follows:</p> <p><u>Educational Facilities</u></p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.107	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-O1	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.108	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-O2	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-O2 (Activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.109	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-O3	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.255	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-O3	Oppose in part	Considers that the current drafting of COMZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Opposes COMZ-O3 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment as follows: Development in the Commercial Zone is achieved that positively contributes to creating a good quality, well-functioning urban environment and is compatible with the surrounding residential context
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P1	Oppose	<p>Considers that the zone frameworks (Commercial and General Industrial) do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (COMZ-R4 and GIZR6). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification.</p> <p>Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage.</p> <p>Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in commercial and industrial zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.</p>	Opposes COMZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P1	Amend	<p>Considers that the zone frameworks (Commercial and General Industrial) do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (COMZ-R4 and GIZR6). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification.</p> <p>Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage.</p> <p>Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in commercial and industrial zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.</p>	<p>Amend COMZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>Enabled activities</p> <p>Enable a ranges of activities in the Commercial Zone that contribute positively to the purpose of the zone including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commercial activities; 2. Retail activities, except for large-scale integrated retail activities; 3. Carparking activities; and 4. Residential activities, except for large-scale integrated retail activities; <u>and</u> 5. <u>Community corrections activities</u>
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P1	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain COMZ-P1.4 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.110	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P1	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.132	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P1	Support in part	Supports COMZ-P1 in part wherein it provides a range of activities.	Retain COMZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.133	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P1	Amend	Seeks COMZ-P1 be amended as the submitter seeks clarification that educational activities are provided for in the COMZ.	<p>Amend COMZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>Enabled activities</p> <p>...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Carparking activities; and 4. Residential activities, except for large-scale integrated retail activities; <u>and</u> 5. <u>Educational facilities</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.111	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P2	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-P2 (Managed activities) as notified.
Prime Property Group	256.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P3	Oppose	Opposes restriction on residential activity at ground floor level in the Commercial Zone.	Seeks amendment to be more enabling of residential activity.
Prime Property Group	256.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P3	Amend	<p>Considers it appropriate to allow residential use on the ground floor in the Commercial Zones.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend COMZ-P3 (residential activities) so that residential activity is permitted at ground floor level outside of 12m from the centreline of transmission lines on the site.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.37	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P3	Oppose	Oppose residential activities on the ground floor to support vibrant streets and retain walkable centres.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.112	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P3	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.113	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P4	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-P4 (Avoiding industrial activities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P5	Support in part	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain COMZ-P5 (Quality design -neighbourhood and townscape outcomes), subject to amendments as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P5	Amend	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Seeks addition of the following to COMZ-P5 (Quality design -neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: <u>Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.114	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P5	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-P5 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.47	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P5	Oppose	Submission point 349.114 seeks to retain COMZ-P5 as notified. FSNI submission points 476.33 and 476.34 seek that COMZ-P5 is amended.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P5	Support in part	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain COMZ-P5 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) with amendment.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P5	Amend	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Amend COMZ-P5 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) to include the following: <u>Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.115	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P6	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-P6 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.116	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-P7	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-P7 (Zone interfaces) as notified.
McDonald's	274.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R1	Support	Supports that commercial activities (McDonald's restaurants) are permitted activities in the COMZ, MUZ and GIZ	Retain MUZ-R1.1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.117	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R1	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R2	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain COMZ-R2 (Residential Activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.118	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R7	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-R7 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.119	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R8	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-R8 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.272	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R8	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain COMZ-R8 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.273	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R8	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend COMZ-R8 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.120	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R9	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-R9 (Construction of, or additions or alterations to, buildings and structures) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.256	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R9	Amend	Supports the construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures being a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under COMZ-R9. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the requirements of COMZ-S1 - COMZ-S8. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 1, are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 1, are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides, their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions /alterations to retirement villages under COMZ-R9 should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under COMZ-R9 that complies with COMZ-S1 and COMZ-S2 should be precluded from being limited notified.	Retain COMZ-R9 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in COMZ-P5, COMZ-P6 and COMZ-P7(<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>); 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with COMZ-S1, COMZ-S2, COMZ-S3, COMZ-S4, COMZ-S5, COMZ-S6, COMZ-S7 and COMZ-S8; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>); and 4. The Residential Design Guide for any part of a building used for residential activities (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>); 5. For retirement villages: i. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> ii. <u>The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> iii. <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> iv. <u>When assessing the matters in 1(a)(2), and 1(a)(5)(i) – (iii), consider:</u> a. <u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> b. <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> v. <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u> <u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u> <u>Notification status:</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule COMZ-R9 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule COMZ-R9 where compliance is achieved with COMZ-S1 and COMZ-S2 is precluded from being limited notified</u></p>
Investore Property Limited	405.76	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R9	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain COMZ-R9.1 (Construction of, or additions or alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.91	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R9	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.91	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R9	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.77	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R9	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend COMZ-R9.1 (Construction of, or additions or alterations to, buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.92	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R9	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.92	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R9	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R10	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain COMZ-R10.1 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities or visitor accommodation) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.93	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R10	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.93	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R10	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R10	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend COMZ-R10.1 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities or visitor accommodation) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.94	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R10	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.94	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-R10	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Prime Property Group	256.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes the 8m height limit in the Commercial Zone at 55-85 Curtis street.	Seeks amendment to the height limit in COMZ-S1 (Maximum Height)
Prime Property Group	256.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S1	Amend	Considers the Height Control Area over 55-85 Curtis St to be inconsistent with the NPS-UD and more restrictive than the residential area around. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that COMZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended as follows: Maximum height 1. A maximum height limit of 8 12m above ground level must be complied with.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.38	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S1	Support	Support as it allows for greater intensification and greater density in proximity to goods and services, allowing for walkable neighbourhoods.	Allow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.121	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S1	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.257	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S1	Oppose	Considers the 8m height standard is inconsistent with the objectives of the zone.	Opposes COMZ-S1 (Maximum height) and seeks amendment to provide for greater height in the Commercial Zone.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.122	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S2	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
McDonald's	274.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete COMZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.123	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S3	Oppose	Oppose Opposed to the minimum floor-to-floor ceiling heights for new development. The standard is overly prescriptive, does not provide for the specific requirements of drive-through facilities, and is unworkable from an operational perspective, and will only serve to increase the cost and/or regulatory processes of the development.	Delete COMZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.48	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S3	Oppose	Submission point 349.123 seeks to delete COMZ-S3 in its entirety. FSNi submission point 476.35 is supported by that.	Allow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S3	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete COMZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.

Commercial and Mixed use - Mixed Use Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.124	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S4	Support	Support	Retain COMZ-S4 (Verandah control) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.258	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial Zone / COMZ-S6	Oppose in part	Considers retirement villages should be excluded from this standard as in the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Opposes COMZ-S6 (Outdoor living space for residential units) and seeks amendment to exclude retirement villages.
Simon Ross	37.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	Considers that Mixed Use Zones are much too sparse and too small.	Seeks that mixed use be enabled wherever development over three storeys is allowed.
Simon Ross	37.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	Considers that Mixed Use Zones are much too sparse and too small.	Seeks that all corner sites in residential areas allow mixed use.
Simon Ross	37.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that mixed use is enabled around the Johnsonville Line stations.
Michael O'Rourke	194.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission.]	Seeks that some areas of Newtown, primarily those already zoned as Mixed Use, are also zoned High Density Residential Zone.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Support	Supports the idea of providing business activities spaces for mixed used areas of city centre.	Supports retention of Mixed Use Zone as notified
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Support	Considers that that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain the provisions applicable to "residential activities" in the Mixed Use Zone as notified.
Tawa Community Board	294.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Oppose	Opposes 10 Surrey Street (Tawa Junction) being Mixed Use Zone. Considers that land at 10 Surrey Street is one of the largest parcels of single-ownership land on the valley floor, very near the town centre and Tawa Station, and one of the most suitable sites for the highest height limit to encourage future development of centre-like mixed housing and business use.	Opposes the zoning of 10 Surrey Street, Tawa as Mixed Use Zone and seeks that this site is zoned Local Centre Zone, to match the Tawa Town Centre.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.259	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Mixed Use Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>
Z Energy Limited	361.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Support	Supports Mixed Use Zone in Tawa, Miramar and Kaiwharawhara. The purpose of the MUZ is to provide for a compatible mixture of residential, commercial, light industrial, recreational and/or community activities. It continues the long-standing approach of enabling a wide range of compatible activities in Wellington's suburban employment areas.	Retain the Mixed Use Zone chapter as notified.
Wellington Tenth's Trust	363.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	Considers appropriate amendment to introduction. The submitter has aspirations for future development at this site and the use of mixed zone opportunities applies. Appropriate considerations include mixed use development.	Seeks to amend the Mixed Use Zone to provide for potential future developments opportunities in relation to the submitter's site.
Waka Kotahi	370.403	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Support	Supports provision for active and public transport, consideration of function of the transport network, the discouragement of carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage and the quality design outcomes.	Retain the Mixed Use Zone chapter as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the height control area being amended to 27m appropriate, as it is the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent.</p> <p>Submitter seeks that that the planning framework as set out in the consented Shelly Bay Masterplan and Design Guide is adopted as the default planning settings for the landholdings within the scope of the granted consents. Notes that the granted resource consent is currently being implemented on site.</p>	Seeks that in addition to amending the extent of the zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru, that the height control area is amended to 27m.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.11	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.53	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.611	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Support in part	Supports the introduction and application of a Mixed Use Zone in the proposed District Plan. Some amendments are suggested to acknowledge that the context and activities in the vicinity of Mixed Use Zones may change in the future due to the proposed Plan provision and to acknowledge NPS-UD P6.	Retain introduction of the Mixed Use Zone chapter and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.612	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	Supports the introduction and application of a Mixed Use Zone in the proposed District Plan. Some amendments are suggested to acknowledge that the context and activities in the vicinity of Mixed Use Zones may change in the future due to the proposed Plan provision and to acknowledge NPS-UD P6.	Amend the second paragraph of the introduction of the Mixed Use Zone chapter as follows: The Mixed Use Zone is distributed across the city. A broad range of activities are enabled to occur alongside one another in the Mixed Use Zone. It needs to be noted that due to the wide range of non-residential activities provided for, and the potential for industrial activities to establish in this Zone, there may be moderate to high levels of noise, vehicle trip generation or other environmental effects. While such effects may be tolerable within the Mixed Use Zone, they could undermine the amenity of zones nearby if not appropriately managed. Effects from new activities and development within the Mixed Use Zone need to be compatible with the local context. Activities that generate adverse effects of a nature or scale that is potentially incompatible with the existing <u>and anticipated future</u> context will typically not be enabled in the Mixed Use Zone unless such activities can demonstrate they are able to co-exist with existing <u>and anticipated future</u> sensitive activities in the vicinity.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.
Miriam Moore	433.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Not specified	Considers that the MUZ land in Tawa is the best place for targeted intensification of residential development, it would be great to see this incentivised for that purpose.	Not specified.
Michelle Rush	436.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	Considers that the extent of mixed zones should be widened in neighbourhood and local centre zones, taking in part of the medium density and high density residential zones. This would ensure the ability for people to work, live, and seek services within a walkable, or micro-transport catchment while achieving carbon reduction, increasing liveability and amenity, contributing to public health and wellbeing, and community vibrancy. Increasing provision for mixed uses is part of this.	Seeks to extend Mixed Use Zones in and around Neighbourhood Centre Zones, Local Centre Zones, Medium Density Residential Zones and High Density Residential Zones.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / New MUZ	Amend	<p>Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and land use activity rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones are amended. The zone frameworks would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (MUZ-R13, CCZ-R16 and WFZ-R11).</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. The subject zones include suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the residential zones.</p>	<p>Amend the land use activity rule framework for the Mixed Use Zone to include a new permitted activity rule applying to "supported residential care activities" as follows, if the definition of "supported residential care activity" is retained:</p> <p><u>MUZ-RX Supported residential care activities</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. The activity is located above ground floor level; and</u> <u>b. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 residents.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with the requirements of MUZ-RX.1.a cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MUZ-P1, MUZ-P2 and MUZ-P5;</u> <u>2. The extent to which the activity is the most appropriate to meet Wellington's future growth needs;</u> <u>3. The compatibility with existing activities nearby and other activities provided for in the Mixed Use Zone;</u> <u>4. The effect on the visual quality of the streetscape and the extent to which the development contributes to or detracts from the pedestrian environment; and</u> <u>5. The extent to which the activity enables or limits adaptability for future non-residential activity at ground floor level.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MUZ-RX.2.a is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>3. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with the requirements of MUZ - RX.1 . b cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity may adversely impact on the amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MUZ - RX. 3.a is precluded from being publicly notified .</u></p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.279	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / New MUZ	Amend	<p>Seeks a new policy which focuses on Quality Design Outcomes within this Zone specifically, as per the other Commercial Zones within the PDP. In accordance with the relief sought for these policies in other commercial zones, a quality design outcome should include accessibility for emergency service vehicles.</p>	<p>Add new MUZ policy;</p> <p><u>MUZ-PX: Quality Design Outcomes</u></p> <p><u>Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of Mixed Use Zone by ensuring that it, where relevant:</u></p> <p><u>...</u></p> <p><u>x. it is accessible for emergency service vehicles.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.260	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / New MUZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Mixed Use Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.261	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / New MUZ	Amend	As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ-R10). Considers that the Local Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under MUZ-R16). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	<p>Add new 'Retirement villages' in the Mixed Use Zone chapter rule as follows: <u>MUZ-RX Retirement villages</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.613	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / New MUZ	Amend	Considers that a new rule should be added permitting industrial activities except heavy industrial activities which should require resource consent as a Non-Complying Activity to give effect to MUZ-P2 & MUZ-P4. Considers that as currently notified, industrial activities would always trip to Discretionary under MUZ-R13 which is inconsistent with MUZ-P2. A consequential amendment to the rule numbering will be required to accommodate this new rule.	<p>Seeks the addition of a new "industrial activities" rule in the Mixed Use Zone as follows:</p> <p><u>Industrial Activities</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>where:</u> <u>a. The activity is not a heavy industrial activity.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity Status: Non-complying</u> <u>where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with the requirements of MUZ- RX.1 cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MUZ-RX.2.a must be publicly notified.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.127	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / New MUZ	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial and mixed use zones that do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Add new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>MUZ-SX:</u> <u>Boundary setbacks.</u> <u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u></p> <p>AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.38	Part 3 / Commercial and Mixed Use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / New MUZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.125	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-01	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-01	Support	Supports the Objectives MUZ-01 to MUZ-05 as they provide a balanced approach to compatibility of activities with other zones, contributing to a well-functioning urban environment, the management of effects and accommodating and supporting for growth.	Retain MUZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.614	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-01	Support	Generally supports MUZ-01.	Retain MUZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-01	Support	Generally supports the intent of the Mixed Use Zone.	Retain MUZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.280	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-02	Support	Supports the policy as the objective seeks to ensure that residential and commercial growth needs are met through land specifically zoned for this purpose with the provision of adequate infrastructure for housing and business use	Retain MUZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.126	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-02	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-02	Support	Supports the Objectives MUZ-01 to MUZ-05 as they provide a balanced approach to compatibility of activities with other zones, contributing to a well-functioning urban environment, the management of effects and accommodating and supporting for growth.	Retain MUZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.615	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-02	Support	Generally supports MUZ-02.	Retain MUZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.134	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-02	Support in part	Supports MUZ-02 in part.	Retain MUZ-02 (Accommodating Growth) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.135	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-02	Amend	Seeks MUZ-02 be amended to explicitly recognise and provide for educational facilities in the MUZ as such facilities are interrelated with accommodating growth in this zone.	Amend MUZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Accommodating growth The Mixed Use Zone has an important role in accommodating growth and has sufficient serviced, resilient development capacity and <u>additional infrastructure</u> to meet business, and to a lesser extent residential growth needs.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-02	Support	Generally supports the intent of the Mixed Use Zone.	Retain MUZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.127	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-03	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-03 (Compatibility with other employment areas and the hierarchy of centres) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-03	Support	Supports the Objectives MUZ-01 to MUZ-05 as they provide a balanced approach to compatibility of activities with other zones, contributing to a well-functioning urban environment, the management of effects and accommodating and supporting for growth.	Retain MUZ-03 (Compatibility with other employment areas and the hierarchy of centres) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.616	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-03	Support	Generally supports MUZ-03.	Retain MUZ-03 (Compatibility with other employment areas and the hierarchy of centres) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-03	Support	Generally supports the intent of the Mixed Use Zone.	Retain MUZ-03 (Compatibility with other employment areas and the hierarchy of centres) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.128	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-04	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-04 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.262	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-04	Oppose in part	Considers that the current drafting of MUZ-04 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Opposes MUZ-04 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment as follows: Development in the Mixed Use Zone positively contributes to creating a well-functioning urban environment and a diverse local context
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.263	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-04	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of MUZ-04 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Retain MUZ-04 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment as follows: Development in the Mixed Use Zone positively contributes to creating a well-functioning urban environment and a diverse local context
Z Energy Limited	361.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-04	Support	Supports the Objectives MUZ-01 to MUZ-05 as they provide a balanced approach to compatibility of activities with other zones, contributing to a well-functioning urban environment, the management of effects and accommodating and supporting for growth.	Retain MUZ-04 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.617	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-04	Support	Generally supports MUZ-04.	Retain MUZ-04 (Amenity and design) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-04	Support	Generally supports the intent of the Mixed Use Zone.	Retain MUZ-04 (Amenity and Design) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.129	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-05	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-05 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-05	Support	Supports the Objectives MUZ-01 to MUZ-05 as they provide a balanced approach to compatibility of activities with other zones, contributing to a well-functioning urban environment, the management of effects and accommodating and supporting for growth.	Retain MUZ-05 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.618	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-05	Support	Generally supports MUZ-05.	Retain MUZ-05 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-05	Support	Generally supports the intent of the Mixed Use Zone.	Retain MUZ-05 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.130	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P1	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.265	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P1	Support	Supports MUZ-P1 and its accommodation for growth and choice of building types, sizes, affordability, density, and efficient use of available development sites.	Retain MUZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P1	Support	Supports the Policy as drafted.	Retain MUZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.619	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P1	Support in part	Supports MUZ-P1 in part but seeks amendments to recognise that the purpose of the Mixed Use zone is to allow for compatible activities to co-locate. Amendments are also sought to recognise that affordability and distribution cannot be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Mixed Use Zone. Amendment is also sought to add reference to public transport and remove the word 'convenient' which is subjective and inappropriate.	Retain MUZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.620	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P1	Amend	Supports MUZ-P1 in part but seeks amendments to recognise that the purpose of the Mixed Use zone is to allow for compatible activities to co-locate. Amendments are also sought to recognise that affordability and distribution cannot be managed through the District Plan. The focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Mixed Use Zone. Amendment is also sought to add reference to public transport and remove the word 'convenient' which is subjective and inappropriate.	Amend MUZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Provide for the use and development of the Mixed Use Zone to meet the City's needs for business activities and to a lesser extent housing residential activities co-located , including: 1. A choice variety of building type, size, affordability and distribution , including forms of medium and high density housing; 2. Efficient, well integrated and strategic use of available development sites; and 3. Convenient access to Access to state highways and key transport routes and public transport .
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.21	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P1	Support	Since the zone provides for residential activities, the other land uses will need to be compatible (noting the different character and amenity). Residential activities in the zone will provide for greater intensification in the zone, in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD), noting that residential activities may need acoustic insulation to provide a healthy indoor noise environment. Access to public transport for future residents is also supported.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P1	Support	Supports the need to provide for a choice of building, type, size, affordability and distribution, including forms of medium density housing.	Retain MUZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Support in part	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Supports MUZ-P2 (Enabled activities), with amendment.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Amend	Considers that there is a minor drafting error within the Mixed Use Zone Policy MUZ-P2.7 and Rule MUZ-R6, whereby "community corrections facilities" are referenced; this needs to be amended to reflect correct terminology in the PDP definition (i.e. "community corrections activities").	Amend MUZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as follows: 7. Community corrections facilities <u>activities</u> ;
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain MUZ-P2.10 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Amend	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and land use activity rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones are amended. The zone frameworks would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (MUZ-R13, CCZ-R16 and WFZ-R11). Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. The subject zones include suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the residential zones.	Amend MUZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as follows, if the definition of "supported residential care activity" is retained: MUZ-P2 Enabled Activities Enable a wide range of compatible activities in the Mixed Use Zone where they are of an appropriate nature, scale and intensity for the zone and the hierarchy of centres, including: 10. Residential activities <u>and supported residential care activities</u> above ground floor level; ...
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.281	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it makes provision for the provision of emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate stations anywhere within the urban and rural environment.	Retain MUZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.131	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Support	Supports the Policy as drafted.	Retain MUZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.621	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Support in part	Generally supports MUZ-P2 but seeks a technical amendment to correct 'community correction facility' which has no definition. An amendment is sought to provide for residential activities which are also located to the rear of buildings i.e., not on a road frontage. The use of active frontages in the Mixed Use Zone could be considered as a means to allow residential activities to be located to the rear of buildings.	Retain MUZ-P2 (Enabled activities) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.622	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Amend	Generally supports MUZ-P2 but seeks a technical amendment to correct 'community correction facility' which has no definition. An amendment is sought to provide for residential activities which are also located to the rear of buildings i.e., not on a road frontage. The use of active frontages in the Mixed Use Zone could be considered as a means to allow residential activities to be located to the rear of buildings.	Amend MUZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable a wide range of compatible activities in the Mixed Use Zone where they are of an appropriate nature, scale and intensity for the zone and the hierarchy of centres, including: ... 7. Community correction facilities <u>activity</u> ; ... 10. Residential activities above ground floor level <u>or not located on a road frontage</u> ; ...
Ministry of Education	400.136	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Support	Support MUZ-P2 as it is important to recognise and provide for educational facilities which will service the surrounding residential catchments and other community/commercial activities.	Retain MUZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.103	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P2	Support	Supports allowing a wide range of activities.	Retain MUZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Support in part	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain MUZ-P3 (Managing larger-scale retail activities), subject to amendments as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Amend	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Seeks addition of the following to MUZ-P3 (Managing larger-scale retail activities) as follows: <u>Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.132	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-P3 (Managing larger-scale retail activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.49	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Oppose	FSNI submission points 476.37 & 476.38 seek that this policy is amended. Submission point 349.132 seeks to retain MUZ-P3 as notified.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.70	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Amend	Considers that supermarkets that infringe MUZ-R12 should be able to be accommodated in the zone in MUZ-P3 if there is a functional and operational need and effects on the Centre are managed and this should be reflected in the zone policies. The proposed amendment offers a more appropriate wording relative to the restricted discretionary activity status for 'large' supermarkets within the Mixed-Use zone.	Amend MUZ-P3 (Managing larger-scale retail activities) as follows: Only Allow the establishment of integrated retail activities and large supermarkets in the Mixed Use Zone if it can be demonstrated that they will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not result in significant adverse impacts on the viability, vitality, role and function of the City Centre or any Metropolitan, Local or Neighbourhood Centres; 2. Not result in significant adverse impacts on the sustainability, safety or efficiency of the transport network and the hierarchy of roads from trip patterns, travel demand or vehicle use; and 3. Be compatible with adjoining land uses; 4. <u>Have an operational or functional need to locate in the zone.</u>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.14	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Support	Submission point 359.70 supports FSNI submission point 476.37.	Allow
Z Energy Limited	361.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Support	Supports the Policy as drafted.	Retain MUZ-P3 (Managing larger-scale retail activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.623	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Support	Supports MUZ-P3.	Retain MUZ-P3 (Managing larger-scale retail activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Support in part	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain MUZ-P3 (Managing larger-scale retail activities) with amendment.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P3	Amend	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Amend MUZ-P3 (Managing larger-scale retail activities) to include the following: Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.133	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P4	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-P4 (Heavy industrial activities as notified).
Z Energy Limited	361.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P4	Support	Supports the Policy as drafted.	Retain MUZ-P4 (Avoiding heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.624	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P4	Support	Supports MUZ-P4.	Retain MUZ-P4 (Avoiding heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.134	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P5	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-P5 (Residential activities) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.266	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P5	Oppose in part	Opposes restrictions on retirement villages being established at ground floor level.	Seeks to delete clause (1) of MUZ-P5 (Residential activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P5	Support	Supports the Policy as drafted.	Retain MUZ-P5 (Residential activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.625	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P5	Support in part	Supports MUZ-P5 but seeks amendments to enable ground floor residential at the rear of properties. An amendment is also sought to remove reference to 'reverse sensitivity'. As the purpose of the Mixed Use Zone is to enable compatible activities (including residential) to co-locate those living and working in the zone would anticipate a particular level of amenity which can be managed through other policies, rules and standards.	Retain MUZ-P5 (Residential activities) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.157	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P5	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the relief sought, however, The RVA seeks for residential development to be enabled at the ground floor without restriction.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.157	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P5	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the relief sought, however, Ryman seeks for residential development to be enabled at the ground floor without restriction.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.626	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P5	Amend	Supports MUZ-P5 but seeks amendments to enable ground floor residential at the rear of properties. An amendment is also sought to remove reference to 'reverse sensitivity'. As the purpose of the Mixed Use Zone is to enable compatible activities (including residential) to co-locate those living and working in the zone would anticipate a particular level of amenity which can be managed through other policies, rules and standards.	Amend MUZ-P5 (Residential activities) as follows: Ensure the ongoing functional use of the Mixed Use Zone for a range of business uses by: 1. Restricting residential activities being established at the ground floor level of buildings <u>except where they are not located on a road frontage</u> , and 2. Ensuring residential activities are designed and constructed to provide good on-site amenity and to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on non-residential activities within the zone.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.135	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P6	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-P6 (Design of new development) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P6	Support	Supports the Policy as drafted. In particular, Policy MUZ-P6 (Design of new development) which encourages a high standard of built form and amenity, while enabling innovation and choice in the design of new built development to reflect the diverse neighbourhood context of the MUZ. This is appropriate as it recognises that some activities may have an operational need for site design, such as service stations.	Retain MUZ-P6 (Design of new development) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.627	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P6	Support	Supports MUZ-P6.	Retain MUZ-P6 (Design of new development) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.136	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P7	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-P7 (Zone interfaces) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P7	Support	Supports the Policy as drafted.	Retain MUZ-P7 (Zone interfaces) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.628	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-P7	Support	Supports MUZ-P7.	Retain MUZ-P7 (Zone interfaces) as notified.
McDonald's	274.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R1	Support	Supports that commercial activities (McDonald's restaurants) are permitted activities in the COMZ, MUZ and GIZ	Retain COMZ-R1.1 (Commercial activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.137	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R1	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R1	Support in part	MUZ-R1 is supported as it provides for commercial activities, excluding integrated retail activities and supermarkets as a permitted activity.	Retain MUZ-R1 (Commercial activities) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R1	Amend	Considers that MUZ-R1 should be clarified to state whether a yard-based retail activity would sit within this rule framework, as yard-based retail activities do not have a specific rule in the MUZ.	Seeks to clarify MUZ-R1 (Commercial activities) and whether yard-based retail activities (i.e. service stations) would be a commercial activity in the MUZ under Rule MUZ-R1 given that there is no other rule for a more specific activity (such as a service station or yard-based retail activity), or whether they are caught as "All other Activities" under Rule MUZ-R13.
Ministry of Education	400.137	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R3	Support	Supports MUZ-R3 as it provides for educational facilities as a permitted activity.	Retain MUZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.282	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R5	Support	Supports rule as it permits the establishment of emergency service facilities in the MUZ	Retain MUZ-R5 (Residential activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R6	Support in part	Considers that there is a minor drafting error within the Mixed Use Zone Policy MUZ-P2.7 and Rule MUZ-R6, whereby "community corrections facilities" are referenced; this needs to be amended to reflect correct terminology in the PDP definition (i.e. "community corrections activities").	Supports MUZ-R6 (Community corrections facilities), with amendment.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R6	Amend	Considers that there is a minor drafting error within the Mixed Use Zone Policy MUZ-P2.7 and Rule MUZ-R6, whereby "community corrections facilities" are referenced; this needs to be amended to reflect correct terminology in the PDP definition (i.e. "community corrections activities").	Amend MUZ-R6 (Community corrections facilities) as follows: Community corrections facilities <u>activities</u>
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R10	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain MUZ-R10 (Residential Activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.629	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R10	Support in part	Generally supports residential activities being permitted in MUZ-R10 and supports activities being precluded from public notification but seeks amendments to: a. enable residential activities at ground floor where they are to the rear of a non-residential building.	Retain MUZ-R10 (Residential activities) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.630	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R10	Amend	Generally supports residential activities being permitted in MUZ-R10 and supports activities being precluded from public notification but seeks amendments to: a. enable residential activities at ground floor where they are to the rear of a non-residential building.	Amend MUZ-R10 (Residential activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted where: a. The activity is located above ground floor level <u>or located in a building that does not have a road frontage.</u> 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where: a. Compliance with the requirements of MUZ-R10.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The effect on the visual quality <u>character</u> of the streetscape and the extent to which the development contributes to or detracts from the pedestrian environment; and ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.158	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R10	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the relief sought, however, The RVA seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with its primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under MUZ-R16.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.158	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R10	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the relief sought, however, Ryman seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with its primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under MUZ-R16.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.71	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R12	Support in part	The provisions of the Mixed-Use Zone enable the establishment of a supermarket up to 1500m2 GFA under standard MUZ-R12 are supported (noting that the building proper would require consent for being greater than 500m2). To infringe this standard requires restricted discretionary activity consent with consideration required to be had to matters listed in MUZ-P3. This activity status to infringe the GFA standard is supported. However, the inclusion of a note underneath standard MUZ-R12 in the Mixed-Use Zone is opposed by Woolworths as it specifies that Council will not apply a permitted baseline assessment when considering the effects of supermarkets that cannot comply with the GFA standard. Woolworths considers that this is an unnecessary inclusion relative to the restricted discretionary activity status which otherwise conveys that larger supermarkets could be generally considered appropriate in the zone (noting the aforementioned issue that large supermarkets are not expressly provided for in any of the Centre Zones).	Retain MUZ-R12 (Supermarkets) with amendments.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.72	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R12	Amend	Considers that the purpose of the Mixed-Use Zone is to accommodate a variety of activities, and this is reflected in the zone objectives and policies. The exclusion of the permitted baseline is unnecessary relative to the restricted discretionary activity status which otherwise conveys that larger supermarkets could be generally considered appropriate in the zone.	Amend MUZ-R12.2 (Supermarkets) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of MUZ-R12.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MUZ-P3. The Council will not apply a permitted baseline assessment when considering the effects of supermarkets that cannot comply with MUZ-R12.1.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.15	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R12	Support	FSNI supports submission point 359.72 as the exclusion of the permitted baseline is unnecessary relative to the restricted discretionary activity status and could make it more difficult to consent supermarket activities. [Inferred reference to submission 359.72]	Allow
Z Energy Limited	361.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R13	Support in part	MUZ-R13 is supported on the principle of the 'catch-all' other activity rule. However, clarification is needed on yard-based retail activity.	Retain MUZ-R13 (All other activities) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R13	Amend	Clarification of MUZ-R13 is sought on whether a yard-based retail activity (i.e. service station) would sit within this rule framework.	Seeks to clarify MUZ-R13 (All other activities) and whether yard-based retail activities would be subject to this rule or rule MUZ-R1 (Commercial activities).
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.283	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R14	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the MUZ are a permitted activity.	Retain MUZ-R14 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.138	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R14	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-R14 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.284	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R15	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the MUZ are a permitted activity.	Retain MUZ-R15 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.139	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R15	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-R15 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.274	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R15	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain MUZ-R15 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.275	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R15	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend MUZ-R15 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.285	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Support	Supports the rule as the construction or, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures within the MUZ are a permitted activity	Retain MUZ-R16 (Construction of or additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.140	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Oppose	Oppose Opposed to the cross reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide within the matters of discretion. The cross reference to the policies of the MUZ is sufficient to ensure that development achieves a “good quality, well-functioning environment” as required by MUZ-O3.	Amend MUZ-16 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The extent of compliance with MUZ-S8, MUZ-S9 and MUZ-S10 for any part of the building used for residential activities; <u>and</u> 5. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide; and 6.5. The Residential Design Guides for any part of a building used for residential activities.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.267	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Amend	Supports the construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures being a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under MUZ-R16. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clauses 2, 3 and 4 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the requirements of MUZ-S1-S11. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 1, are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides, their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 5 and 6 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under MUZ-R16 should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under MUZ-R16 that complies with MUZ-S1, MUZ-S2, MUZ-S3 and LCZ-S5 should be precluded from being limited notified.	<p>Retain MUZ-R16.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of MUZ-R16.1 cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The matters in MUZ-P2, MUZ-P5, MUZ-P6 and MUZ-P7 (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>);</p> <p>2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with MUZ-S1, MUZ-S3, MUZ-S4, MUZ-S5, MUZ-S6, MUZ-S7 and MUZ-S11 as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards;</p> <p>3. The extent of compliance with MUZ-S2;</p> <p>4. The extent of compliance with MUZ-S8, MUZ-S9 and MUZ-S10 for any part of the building used for residential activities;</p> <p>5. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>);</p> <p>6. The Residential Design Guide (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>);</p> <p>7. For retirement villages:</p> <p>i. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>ii. <u>The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p>iii. <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>iv. <u>When assessing the matters in 2(a)(2), and 2(a)(4)(i) – (iii), consider:</u></p> <p>a. <u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p>b. <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>v. <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</p> <p>Notification status:</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MUZ-R16.2.a that results from non-compliance with MUZ-S4 or MUZ-S6 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified.</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MUZ-R16.2.a that results from non-compliance with MUZ-S1 but that complies with both MUZ-S2 and MUZ-S3 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified.</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule MUZ-R16.2.a is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule MUZ-R16.2.b where compliance is achieved with MUZ-S1, MUZ-S2, MUZ-S3 and NCZ-S5 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.73	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Amend	Considers that MUZ-R16.2 should be amended to establish matters of discretion specific to supermarket buildings that infringe MUZ-R16.1 standards. There are also concerns around the inclusion of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide within these matters of discretion on account of the unnecessary scope this introduces in a restricted discretionary consenting framework. As such, it is specifically sought that that this is excluded from the matters of discretion for new supermarket buildings. The proposed amendment directly correlates to the amendments proposed under standard MUZ-S6.	Amend MUZ-R16.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of MUZ-R16.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MUZ-P2, MUZ-P5, MUZ-P6 and MUZ-P7 <u>excluding for supermarkets exceeding MUZ-S6;</u> 2. <u>For supermarkets exceeding MUZ-S6 the matters in MUZ-PU2, MUZ-P3, MUZ-P6, and MUZ-P7;</u> 3. The extent and effect of non-compliance with MUZ-S1, MUZ-S3, MUZ-S4, MUZ-S5, MUZ-S6, MUZ-S7 and MUZ-S11 as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards; 4. The extent of compliance with MUZ-S2; 5. The extent of compliance with MUZ-S8, MUZ-S9 and MUZ-S10 for any part of the building used for residential activities; 6. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (<u>excluding supermarkets</u>); and 7. The Residential Design Guides for any part of a building used for residential activities.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.16	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Support	Submission point 359.73 supports FSNI submission points 476.1 and 476.102.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.631	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Support in part	Supports MUZ-R16 in part, particularly the preclusion public and limited notification. Seek amendments to this rule to remove direct reference to the design guide as design guides should be removed from the Plan and treated as a non-statutory tool outside of the District Plan. Amendments have been sought to articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD. If this is not accepted, seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to.	Retain MUZ-R16 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.632	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Amend	Supports MUZ-R16 in part, particularly the preclusion public and limited notification. Seek amendments to this rule to remove direct reference to the design guide as design guides should be removed from the Plan and treated as a non-statutory tool outside of the District Plan. Amendments have been sought to articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD. If this is not accepted, seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to.	Amend MUZ-R16.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of MUZ-R16.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are : ... 5. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, and 65. The Residential Design Guides for any part of a building used for residential activities. The extent to which the following centres and residential urban design outcomes are achieved where relevant: a. Provides an effective public private interface; b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood; c. Provides high quality buildings. d. Respond to the natural environment. <u>Note: Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u> ...
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.159	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the relief sought, however, The RVA seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with its primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under MUZ-R16.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.159	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the relief sought, however, Ryman seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with its primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under MUZ-R16.
Investore Property Limited	405.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain MUZ-R16.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.95	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.95	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend MUZ-R16.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.96	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.96	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Miriam Moore	433.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R16	Support in part	Considers that the 12 to 15m height limit should apply to Rule 16.1 if the development is for residential use.	Clarify with MUZ-R16 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) that all new residential development is subject to the heights specified in MUZ-S2.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.286	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Support in part	Supports this rule insofar as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure, including for the purposes of firefighting.	Supports MUZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.287	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Amend	Supports this rule insofar as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure, including for the purposes of firefighting.	Amend MUZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... 3. The Residential Design Guide; and 4. The extent to which the conversion enables the ground floor level to be used or adapted for future non-residential activities; <u>and</u> <u>5. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, including for firefighting purposes.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.40	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.40	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.633	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, and particularly supports the preclusion of public and limited notification. Considers amendments are required to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought.	Retain MUZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.634	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Amend	Considers amendments are required to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought.	Retain MUZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) and seeks amendment as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MUZ-P2 and MUZ-P5; 2. The extent of compliance with standards MUZ-S8, and MUZ-S9 and MUZ-S10; 3. The Residential Design Guide extent to which the following residential urban design outcomes are achieved; <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings;</u> <u>d. Responds to the natural environment; and</u> 4. The extent to which the conversion enables the ground floor level to be used or adapted for future non-residential activities.
Investore Property Limited	405.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain MUZ-R17.1 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.97	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.97	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.83	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend MUZ-R17.1 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.98	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.98	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Miriam Moore	433.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R17	Support in part	Considers that the 12 to 15m height limit should apply to Rule 17 if the development is for residential use.	Clarify with MUZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) that all new residential development is subject to the heights specified in MUZ-S2.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.288	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R18	Support in part	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Supports MUZ-R18 (Outdoor storage areas), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.289	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-R18	Amend	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Amend MUZ-R18 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site. b. Screening does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.
Tawa Residential Ventures Ltd	71.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Amend	Amend the height control at 4 William Earp Place in Tawa to 21m instead of 12m. This is to allow for multi-storey apartment development.	Amend the height control at MUZ-S1 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.1) for 4 William Earp Place from 12m to 21m.
Tawa Business Group	107.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the Tawa Junction site (10 Surrey Street) is unique to other MUZ areas in Wellington as it adjoins a HRZ which has a permitted building height of 21m. The Tawa Junction is also well separated from nearby residential properties and is within a walkable 'rapid transport' catchment.	Amend MUZ-S1 (Maximum height purposes of MUZ-R16.1) to increase the maximum permitted height within the Mixed Use Zone in relation to the Tawa Junction site to 22m (creating a new 'Height control area 5').
Wakefield Property Holdings Ltd	108.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the Tawa Junction site (10 Surrey Street) is unique to other MUZ areas in Wellington as it adjoins a HRZ which has a permitted building height of 21m. The Tawa Junction immediate area is within a walkable 'rapid transport' catchment and is also well separated from surrounding residential properties. Considers that given the separation distance from residential properties, a building of 22m in height will not result in any adverse streetscape, visual amenity, dominance, privacy or shading effects, and would enable the level of additional residential accommodation within the site to be increased. Considers that as the proposed and discretionary building height control of 18m for the Miramar (Ropa Lane, Maupuia Road) MUZ is interfacing a 14m residential heights MRZ this appropriately graduates from a denser 'mixed commercial and residential' form with greater heights, down to lower 'residential zone' heights. The scenario at Tawa Junction however suggests the opposite with the MUZ permitted height standard being 6m lesser than the adjoining residential properties. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend MUZ-S1 (Maximum height purposes of MUZ-R16.1) to increase the maximum permitted height within the Mixed Use Zone in relation to the Tawa Junction site to 22m (creating a new 'Height control area 5').
Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Amend	Opposes the height controls for 236 and 238 Middleton as considers this does not meet the National Policy Standard for housing as this is not a city centre or on a railway line and there are no neighbourhood shops. Considers that garden centre at 238 Middleton Road would no longer be able to exist if the 15m height control was implemented. The properties bound onto the adjacent public reserve which is a gazetted Historic Reserve, with a scheduled heritage building, (the Halfway House) and a heritage garden. Considers that the heights will impact on this reserve and garden, and does not meet documents such as Heritage Design Guide and Conservation Plan [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend MUZ-S1 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.1) so that Glenside has a maximum height limit of 15m. [Inferred decision requested]
Rongotai Investments Limited	269.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Amend	Considers the Rongotai South Mixed Use Zone Height Control limits to be inconsistent with the surrounding area [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks to increase Rongotai South Mixed Use Zone Height Control A,B,C and D to 20m

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.290	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports MUZ-S1 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.1), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.291	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend MUZ-S1 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.1) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... 3. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m; and 4. Lift overruns provided these do not exceed the height by more than 4m; and 5. <u>Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.141	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-S1 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.1) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.635	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Support in part	Considers that amendments are required to MUZ-S1 to provide for building heights of at least 22 m in all Mixed Use Zone Areas to provide for appropriate levels of density. Considers that the fence height should be enabled up to 2 m.	Retain MUZ-S1 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.1) and seeks amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.44	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZS1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.636	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to MUZ-S1 to provide for building heights of at least 22 m in all Mixed Use Zone Areas to provide for appropriate levels of density. Considers that the fence height should be enabled up to 2 m.	Amend MUZ-S1 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.1) as follows: 1. The following maximum height limits above ground level must be complied with:- <u>Buildings and structures must not exceed a maximum height of 22m above ground level.</u> Location Limit Height control area 1 Newtown South Greta Point Tawa South Takapu Island Tauhinu Road 12 metres Rongotai South Mixed Use Zone Height Control A- Rongotai South Mixed Use Zone Height Control B- Shelly Bay- Tawa: Tawa Street

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p>Height control area 2 Tawa Junction Kaiwharawhara 15 metres Kilbirnie North Miramar – Park Road and Weka Street</p> <p>Height control area 3 Rongotai South Mixed Use Zone Height Control B 16 metres Rongotai South Mixed Use Zone Height Control C</p> <p>Height control area 4 Miramar – Ropa Lane, Maupuia Road 18 metres Ngauranga</p> <p>2. Fences and standalone walls must not exceed a maximum height of 1.8 <u>2</u> metres (measured above ground level).</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.45	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZS1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Polish Association in New Zealand Incorporated	FS88.1	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Support	Support MUZ-S1 that Mixed Use Zones are classified with a maximum building height limit of 22m. Specifically, the Newtown south MUZ centered on Arney St, Newtown, is surrounded by local centre (22m) and high density residential (21m) zones, therefore it is blatantly unfair to current and future property owners within this MUZ to have a restriction of 12m when surrounded by 21m and 22m zones.	Allow / Seeks that the part of the submission to allow a maximum building height of 22m in mixed use zones be allowed (and specifically for the Newtown south MUZ centred on Arney St, Newtown).
Rongotai Investments Ltd	FS92.1	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZS1	Support	Considers that the amendments proposed by Kāinga Ora are similar to the submission proposed by Rongotai Investments.	Allow / Seeks that standard is deleted and replaced with the following: "Buildings and structures must not exceed a maximum height of 22m above ground Level" [Inferred decision requested]
Investore Property Limited	405.84	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that the height limit for the Tawa Site at 5 William Earp Place and surrounding Mixed Use zone should be increased to 18m. This height is appropriate having regard to the location of the site, and its boundaries with State highway 1, Main Road and the railway line.	Opposes MUZ-S1.1 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.1) and seeks amendment .
Investore Property Limited	405.85	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the height limit for the Tawa Site at 5 William Earp Place and surrounding Mixed Use zone should be increased to 18m. This height is appropriate having regard to the location of the site, and its boundaries with State highway 1, Main Road and the railway line.	Amend MUZ-S1.1 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.1) to provide for the Mixed Use zone applying to 5 William Earp Place to have a permitted height of 18m (height control area 4).
Tawa Business Group	107.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Support	Considers that the Tawa Junction site (10 Surrey Street) is unique to other MUZ areas in Wellington as it adjoins a HRZ which has a permitted building height of 21m. The Tawa Junction is also well separated from nearby residential properties and is within a walkable 'rapid transport' catchment.	Retain MUZ-S2 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.2) as notified (so that the Tawa Junction Height control remains 22m).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wakefield Property Holdings Ltd	108.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Support	<p>Considers that the Tawa Junction site (10 Surrey Street) is unique to other MUZ areas in Wellington as it adjoins a HRZ which has a permitted building height of 21m.</p> <p>The Tawa Junction immediate area is within a walkable 'rapid transport' catchment and is also well separated from surrounding residential properties.</p> <p>Considers that given the separation distance from residential properties, a building of 22m in height will not result in any adverse streetscape, visual amenity, dominance, privacy or shading effects, and would enable the level of additional residential accommodation within the site to be increased.</p> <p>Considers that as the proposed and discretionary building height control of 18m for the Miramar (Ropa Lane, Maupuia Road) MUZ is interfacing a 14m residential heights MRZ this appropriately graduates from a denser 'mixed commercial and residential' form with greater heights, down to lower 'residential zone' heights. The scenario at Tawa Junction however suggests the opposite with the MUZ permitted height standard being 6m lesser than the adjoining residential properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Retain MUZ-S2 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.2) as notified (so that the Tawa Junction Height control remains 22m).
Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that mention of Glenside in MUZ-R16.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) Height Control Area 5 (22.5m) appears to be a mistake.</p> <p>The height controls for 236 and 238 Middleton Road, Glenside are confusing as the interactive maps, property reports and Mixed Use zones do not match. There is no reference to Glenside in MUZ-S1.</p>	Opposes the inclusion of Glenside in MUZ-S2 (Height Control Area 5).
Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Amend	<p>Considers that mention of Glenside in MUZ-R16.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) Height Control Area 5 (22.5m) appears to be a mistake.</p> <p>The height controls for 236 and 238 Middleton Road, Glenside are confusing as the interactive maps, property reports and Mixed Use zones do not match.</p>	<p>Amend MUZ-S2 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.2) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Height Control Area 5</p> <p>Glenside</p> <p>Kaiwharawhara</p> <p>Sar Street</p> <p>Kilbirnie North</p> <p>Miramar: Park Road and Weka Street</p>
Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Amend	<p>Opposes the height controls for 236 and 238 Middleton as considers this does not meet the National Policy Standard for housing as this is not a city centre or on a railway line and there are no neighbourhood shops. Considers that garden centre at 238 Middleton Road would no longer be able to exist if the 15m height control was implemented.</p> <p>The properties bound onto the adjacent public reserve which is a gazetted Historic Reserve, with a scheduled heritage building, (the Halfway House) and a heritage garden. Considers that the heights will impact on this reserve and garden, and does not meet documents such as Heritage Design Guide and Conservation Plan.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend MUZ-S2 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.2) so that Glenside has a maximum height limit of 15m.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Rongotai Investments Limited	269.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Amend	Considers the Rongotai South Mixed Use Zone Height Control limits to be inconsistent with the surrounding area [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks to increase Rongotai South Mixed Use Zone Height Control A,B,C and D to 20m

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.142	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-S2 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.2) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.637	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes MUZ-S2 and for single maximum height standard to apply to the zone.	Delete MUZ-S2 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.2) in its entirety as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.86	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MUZ-S2 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.2) as notified.
Miriam Moore	433.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S2	Amend	Seeks clarification as to whether an existing building was converted to residential, with additions made to it, would fall under this rule. Proposes that MUZ-R16.1 and/or MUZR17 allow the height limits outlined in MUZ-S2 if the additions in height are for residential use. Notes that some buildings may have an appropriate base to add residential on.	Clarify that all new residential height is the heights specified in MUZ-S2 (Maximum height for the purposes of MUZ-R16.2).
Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the application of a recession plane standard to sites adjoining scheduled heritage will to some extent avoid the adverse effects of visual dominance which can arise when new buildings are out of scale with the existing environment. [Refer to original submission for full reason]. Considers council meeting sought to include recession planes for sites adjacent to Open Space B however these properties have been overlooked in Proposed District Plan.	Amend MUZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to 3 metres and 45 degrees for 236 Middleton Road and 238 Middleton Road.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.292	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S3	Support in part	Seeks the inclusion of an exemption for emergency facilities and associated hose drying towers for the reasons set out in the previous feedback point on MUZ-S1.	Supports MUZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.293	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S3	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of an exemption for emergency facilities and associated hose drying towers for the reasons set out in the previous feedback point on MUZ-S1.	Amend MUZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... d. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 3m measured vertically; and e. Lift overruns, provided these do not exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 1m measured vertically; <u>and</u> f. <u>Emergency facilities up to 9m in height and associated hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.143	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S3	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.638	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S3	Support	Considers that amendments to MUZ-S3 are required to achieve consistency with any changes sought to MUZ-S1 and MUZ-S2.	Retain MUZ-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.639	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S3	Amend	Considers that amendments to MUZ-S3 are required to achieve consistency with any changes sought to MUZ-S1 and MUZ-S2.	Seeks to amend MUZ-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) to align with changes sought to MUZ-S1 and MUZ-S2.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McDonald's	274.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete MUZ-S4 (Minimum ground floor height in its entirety).
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.144	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S4	Oppose	Opposed to the minimum floor-to-floor ceiling heights for new development. The standard is overly prescriptive, does not provide for the specific requirements of drive-through facilities, and is unworkable from an operational perspective, and will only serve to increase the cost and/or regulatory processes of the development.	Delete MUZ-S4 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.50	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed/ Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S4 use Zones	Support	Submission point 349.144 supports FSNI submission point 476.38.	Allow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S4	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete MUZ-S4 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.145	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S5	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-S5 (Windows adjacent to residential zones) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.640	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S5	Support in part	Generally supports MUZ-S5, however, considers that as the intent is to maintain privacy for residential units' amendments are sought to exclude the provisions from applying to windows in residential units in the MUZ as the effects are comparable to those experienced between residential units in residential zones.	Retain MUZ-S5 (Windows adjacent to Residential Zones) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.641	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S5	Amend	Generally supports MUZ-S5, however, considers that as the intent is to maintain privacy for residential units' amendments are sought to exclude the provisions from applying to windows in residential units in the MUZ as the effects are comparable to those experienced between residential units in residential zones.	Amend MUZ-S5 (Windows adjacent to Residential Zones) and seeks amendment as follows: 1. <u>Except for windows in a residential unit</u> opaque privacy glazing must be installed in windows where:
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.146	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S6	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-S6 (Maximum gross floor area of buildings) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.74	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S6	Amend	Considers that MUZ-S6 should be amended to establish a baseline for the development of supermarket buildings in the MUZ which is in line with the scale established under MUZ-R12. This is considered a commensurate response given the typical scale of supermarket buildings in this zone.	Amend MUZ-S6 (Maximum gross floor area of buildings) as follows: 1. Any building (<u>except for supermarkets</u>) must not exceed a maximum gross floor area of 500m2. 2. <u>Any supermarket building must not exceed a maximum gross floor area of 1500m2</u>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.17	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S6	Support	Submitter agrees with amendment in submission point 359.74.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.642	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S6	Oppose	Opposes MUZ-S6 as it constrains development and design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves. Considers that MUZ-R11 & MUZ-R12 provide limits for integrated retail activity and supermarket floor areas and so it is unclear what the purpose of this rule is as it would unnecessarily constrain those developments.	Delete MUZ-S6 (Maximum gross floor area of buildings) in its entirety as notified.
VicLabour	414.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S6	Amend	Considers the maximum permitted building gross floor area standard (MUZ-S6) of 500m2 may not be reasonable and should be extended or removed in order to support greater density and further development in these zones. Considers that cost efficiencies that may occur at larger scale developments and the ability this provides for a range of housing types to be catered for as well as more shared spaces and facilities.	Seeks that the permitted building activity standard of 500m2 in MUZ-S6 (Maximum gross floor area of buildings) be removed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S6	Oppose in part	Considers the maximum permitted building gross floor area standard (MUZ-S6) of 500m2 may not be reasonable and should be extended or removed in order to support greater density and further development in these zones. Considers that cost efficiencies that may occur at larger scale developments and the ability this provides for a range of housing types to be catered for as well as more shared spaces and facilities.	Seeks that the permitted building activity standard of 500m2 in MUZ-S6 (Maximum gross floor area of buildings) be removed.
VicLabour	414.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S6	Amend	Considers the maximum permitted building gross floor area standard (MUZ-S6) of 500m2 may not be reasonable and should be extended or removed in order to support greater density and further development in these zones. Considers that cost efficiencies that may occur at larger scale developments and the ability this provides for a range of housing types to be catered for as well as more shared spaces and facilities.	Seeks that the permitted building activity standard of 500m2 in MUZ-S6 (Maximum gross floor area of buildings) be increased.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.104	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S6	Oppose	Considers the gross floor area cap is overly restrictive and we do not consider there is good evidence for such a cap. 500m2 is a very low gross floor area and will hinder development.	Delete MUZ-S6 (Maximum gross floor area of buildings) in its entirety.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S6	Oppose	Considers the gross floor area cap is overly restrictive and we do not consider there is good evidence for such a cap. 500m2 is a very low gross floor area and will hinder development.	Amend MUZ-S6 (Maximum gross floor area of buildings) to significantly increase the cap.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.147	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S7	Support	Support	Retain MUZ-S7 (Verandah control) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S7	Support in part	MUZ-S7 is partially supported for its intent as it relates to specific sites identified on the Planning Maps with a 'verandah control'.	Retain MUZ-S7 (Verandah control) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S7	Amend	Considers that MUZ-S7 should be amended to provide an exception to MUZ-S7 where there is a functional requirement for a building not to contain a verandah. the performance standard would apply if Z Energy was seeking consent for a building or structure and requires a verandah to extend the full width of the building elevation. This is not practical in the context of a service station, where the buildings on the site are usually a canopy over the refuelling area and the ancillary retail building to one side or to the rear. (Option A)	Amend MUZ-S7 (Verandah control) as follows: 1. <u>Except where there is a functional requirement for a building to not contain a verandah</u> , any verandah constructed on any building frontage facing a public space, including roads, must:
Z Energy Limited	361.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S7	Amend	Considers that MUZ-S7 should be amended to provide an exception to MUZ-S7 where there is a functional requirement for a building not to contain a verandah. the performance standard would apply if Z Energy was seeking consent for a building or structure and requires a verandah to extend the full width of the building elevation. This is not practical in the context of a service station, where the buildings on the site are usually a canopy over the refuelling area and the ancillary retail building to one side or to the rear. This exception could also be specific to service stations. (Option B)	Amend MUZ-S7 (Verandah control) as follows: ... <u>This standard does not apply to:</u> a. <u>Service stations.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.643	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S8	Support in part	Supports MUZ-S8 in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility and a smaller studio unit.	Retain MUZ-S8 (Minimum residential unit size) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.644	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S8	Amend	Supports MUZ-S8 in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility and a smaller studio unit.	Amend MUZ-S8 (Minimum residential unit size) as follows: 1. Residential units, including dual key units, must meet the following minimum sizes: Residential unit type Minimum net floor area Studio unit 30m ² 1 or more bedroom unit 40m ² 2+ bedroom unit 55m ²

Commercial and Mixed use - Metropolitan Centre Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.106	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S8	Oppose	Opposes MUZ-S8 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in MUZ-P1 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure.	Delete MUZ-S8 (Minimum residential unit size) in its entirety.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.107	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S8	Amend	Opposes MUZ-S8 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in MUZ-P1 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure.	Seeks that if Council does decide to retain minimum residential unit sizes, it should be clearly defined that hotel accommodation, student accommodation and other similar accommodation types are distinct from residential unit sizes. The definition of residential units does not clearly exclude student accommodation and may render it subject to these minimum sizes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.268	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S9	Oppose in part	Considers retirement villages should be excluded from this standard as in the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Opposes MUZ-S9 (Outdoor living space for residential units) and seeks amendment to exclude retirement villages.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.645	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S9	Support in part	Generally supports MUZ-S9.	Retain MUZ-S9 (Outdoor living space for residential units) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.108	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S9	Oppose	Opposes MUZ-S9 as the submitter considers: - Minimum outdoor living space sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from lack of outdoor living space are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum outdoor living space sizes do not reflect the policy in MUZ-P1 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure.	Delete MUZ-S9 (Outdoor living space for residential units) in its entirety.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.109	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S10	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Delete MUZ-S10 (Minimum Outlook space for multi-unit housing). [Inferred decision requested].
Yvonne Weeber	340.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S11	Support	MUZ-S11 is supported. It is noted that over 50% of the frontage is now a blank façade under a verandah level.	Retain MUZ-S11 (Lyll Bay Parade frontage control) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.110	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZ-S11	Amend	Considers there should be more flexibility to breach the standard where the overall design has a positive effect on the streetscape.	Amend MUZ-S11 (Lyll Bay Parade frontage control) as follows: 1.New buildings built on a site adjoining the Open Space Zone and Recreation Zoned land fronting Lyall Parade must be built in alignment with the existing Lyall Parade street frontage <u>or otherwise enhances the streetscape</u> ; and ...
Oliver Sangster	112.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support	Considers that Johnsonville Centre has huge development potential as flat sunny land right next to the Johnsonville railway, numerous open space parks and Waitohi library.	Retain upzoning and intensification of the Johnsonville Mall area as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Bus Barn Limited	320.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support	MCZ provisions are generally supported with respect to the height increase, but some amendments are sought regarding height standards.	Retain the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter, with amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.269	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Metropolitan Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>
Z Energy Limited	361.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support	Supports MCZ zoning in Kilbirnie and Johnsonville. The purpose of the Metropolitan Centre Zone (MCZ) is to provide predominantly for a broad range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. The zone is a focal point for sub-regional urban catchments and provides significant support to the City Centre Zone by offering key services to the outer suburbs of Wellington City and the wider region. It seeks pleasant and interesting pedestrian environment.	Retain the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.404	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support	Supports provision for active and public transport, consideration of function of the transport network, the discouragement of carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage and the quality design outcomes.	Retain the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.646	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support in part	The use of standards to manage potential adverse effects across the PDP is generally supported, but changes are sought.	Retain the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.647	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that MCZ height controls should be amended to ensure the NPSUD and the Housing Supply Act are effectively and efficiently implemented, that intensification is enabled in areas of high accessibility to commercial amenity, community services and public transport, and that height controls enable a transition of height and density within the urban built form from higher heights and densities in centres.</p> <p>There may be a number of other consequential changes needed to standards to give effect to these height adjustments, such as increasing height in associated wind and daylight standards. These changes should be proportionate to the changes in building height sought to address any transition issues between zones and provide for increased levels of intensification.</p>	Amend the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter to add a height control of 29m within 400m walkable catchment of a Metropolitan Centre Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.107	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Oppose	Considers the proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the MCZ goes well beyond requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values of the neighbouring suburbs.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.46	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.648	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support in part	Supports the introduction and application of a Metropolitan Centre Zone in the Draft District Plan, but considers that amendments are required to better reflect density and design outcomes anticipated in the NPS-UD.	Retain the introduction text in the Metropolitan Centre Zone and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.649	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	Supports the introduction and application of a Metropolitan Centre Zone in the Draft District Plan, but considers that amendments are required to better reflect density and design outcomes anticipated in the NPS-UD.	Amend the introduction text in the Metropolitan Centre Zone as follows: ... The Johnsonville and Kilbirnie metropolitan centres will play a critical role in accommodating forecast population growth and have significant development/redevelopment potential. To support and encourage intensification, the Metropolitan Centre Zone provides substantial height limits <u>significant opportunity for building height</u> . Given the significant development potential in the Metropolitan Centre Zones, comprehensive development and the integrated and coordinated development of larger sites is required to act as a catalyst for positive change and demonstrate density done well. High quality building design <u>Achieving well designed buildings</u> is a focus for these centres and <u>criteria are included to deliver this outcome</u> . <u>The building typology and design is encouraged to be significantly different to the existing built form</u> transition to more intensive use in metropolitan centres will result in significant changes to existing amenity values and design in the centres and their surrounds . Redevelopment will be supported by a range of measures to promote good design and environmental outcomes and address amenity issues. Accordingly, most building activities will require a resource consent and an assessment against the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. There is an identified need for significant residential intensification within and around the Metropolitan Centres. These centres are subject to the intensification policies 3 (b) and (c) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) . Accordingly, residential activity is permitted above ground floor within the centres and the High Density Residential Zone has been applied within a walkable catchment of the edge of these centres. The cumulative risk from natural hazards in Kilbirnie is that the intensification of this area has been tempered as a qualifying matter under Subpart 6, clause 3.32 of the NPS-UD has been addressed by applying a natural hazards overlay.
Investore Property Limited	405.87	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support	Supports the recognition of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre of sub-regional importance.	Not specified.
Investore Property Limited	405.88	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support in part	Supports the introduction statement except for the statement that most building activities will require resource consent and an assessment against the Centres and Mixed Use design guide.	Retain the introductory text of the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.89	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	Supports the introduction statement except for the statement that most building activities will require resource consent and an assessment against the Centres and Mixed Use design guide.	Seeks to amend the fourth paragraph of the introductory text of the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter to: ... High quality building design is a focus for these centres. The transition to more intensive use in metropolitan centres will result in significant changes to existing amenity values and design in the centres and their surrounds. Redevelopment will be supported by a range of measures to promote good design and environmental outcomes and address amenity issues. Accordingly, most building activities will require a resource consent and an assessment against the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. ...
Investore Property Limited	405.90	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain Metropolitan Centre Zone's objectives and policies with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.111	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.112	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	Considers the medium density residential standards should apply across the Metropolitan Centre Zone in a similar way to the High Density Residential Zone. This would help encourage more development within Metropolitan Centre Zones. The active frontage controls in MCZ-S6 should still apply, as well as the rule in MCZ-R12 preventing residential at ground level.	Amend Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter to include the equivalent of HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards).
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.113	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	Considers the medium density residential standards should apply across the Metropolitan Centre Zone in a similar way to the High Density Residential Zone. This would help encourage more development within Metropolitan Centre Zones. The active frontage controls in MCZ-S6 should still apply, as well as the rule in MCZ-R12 preventing residential at ground level.	Amend Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter to incorporate the medium density residential standards (as incorporated in the High Density Residential Zone).
Johnsonville Community Association	429.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	Considers that the key purpose of the Johnsonville Shopping Centre is to provide the range or retail and services required to support surrounding residential areas. Submitter is concerned the WCC emphasis on building residential development within the Johnsonville Shopping Centre will compromise the focus of the centre and possibly further delay redevelopment of the Johnsonville Mall.	Seeks that the statement that residential development is to be a key focus of Metropolitan Centre is amended to be reduced to Residential Developments can also be supported as long as they do not compromise the core purpose of the centre as outlined by the current District Plan.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.2	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Oppose	Stride supports residential development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone as it is part of a well-functioning urban environment, and is opposed to the introduction of additional limitations to residential activity in this zone.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.2	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Oppose	Investore supports residential development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone as it is part of a well-functioning urban environment, and is opposed to the introduction of additional limitations to residential activity in this zone.	Disallow
John Wilson	453.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks clarification in relation to zoning around Metropolitan Centre Zones - why High Density Residential rules also apply to the Johnsonville centre compared to the Kilbirnie residential centre. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John Wilson	453.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Oppose	Opposes the provisions in the Plan applying to the "Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone". [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Delete all provisions related to "Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone". [Inferred decision requested]
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support	Supports the Metropolitan Centre Zoning of the Johnsonville Centre.	Retain as notified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support in part	Supports in part the introduction.	Retain the introduction as notified, with amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	Seeks to amend part of the introduction. Specifically the statement that most building activities will require resource consent and an assessment against the Centres and Mixed Use design guide. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend the introduction as follows: "...Redevelopment will be supported by a range of measures to promote good design and environmental outcomes and address amenity issues. Accordingly, most building activities will require a resource consent and an assessment against the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. "
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support in part	Supports the objectives and policies of the Metropolitan Centre Zone. Supports the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities.	Retain Metropolitan Centre Zone objectives and policies as notified, with amendments.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Support in part	Generally supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and specifically supports the recognition of medium and high-density development and the enablement of a wide range of activities.	Retain the Metropolitan Centre Zone objectives and policies, with amendments. [Inferred decision requested].
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.270	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / New MCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Metropolitan Centre Zone is required.	Add the following new policies in the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u> <u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.271	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / New MCZ	Amend	As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Local Centre Zone (LCZ-R10). Considers that the Local Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under LCZ-R18). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Add new 'Retirement villages' in the Local Centres Zone chapter rule as follows: <u>LCZ-RX Retirement villages</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.128	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / New MCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial and mixed use zones that do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Add new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>MCZ-SX:</u> <u>Boundary setbacks.</u> <u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u></p> <p>AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.39	Part 3 / Commercial and Mixed Use Zones / Metropolitan Zone / New MCZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.24	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / New MCZ	Oppose	Stride is opposed to identifying a setback area within 5m of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. This is not necessary for the safe or efficient operation of the railway line, which is already provided for through KiwiRail's designation. Imposing an additional setback as proposed would inappropriately constrain development outside of the rail designation, and inappropriately externalises the costs of the infrastructure on to private landowners. We note that KiwiRail is a Requiring Authority so has the ability to designate private land in order to acquire the interests required for their operations if the existing designation is insufficient.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.24	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / New MCZ	Oppose	Investore is opposed to identifying a setback area within 5m of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. This is not necessary for the safe or efficient operation of the railway line, which is already provided for through KiwiRail's designation. Imposing an additional setback as proposed would inappropriately constrain development outside of the rail designation, and inappropriately externalises the costs of the infrastructure on to private landowners. We note that KiwiRail is a Requiring Authority so has the ability to designate private land in order to acquire the interests required for their operations if the existing designation is insufficient.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.148	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-01	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-01	Support	Supports the objectives of the MCZ which seek to meet the sub-regional needs of communities, businesses and residents in a manner that supports the City's compact urban growth objectives.	Retain MCZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.650	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-01	Support	Generally supports MCZ-01.	Retain MCZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.91	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-01	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-01 (Purpose) with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.114	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-01	Support	Generally supports the intent of the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Retain MCZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.294	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O2	Support	Supports the objective as it seeks to ensure that residential and commercial growth needs are met through land specifically zoned for this purpose with the provision of adequate infrastructure for housing and business use.	Retain MCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.149	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O2	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.69	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O2	Support	Supports the objectives of the MCZ which seek to meet the sub-regional needs of communities, businesses and residents in a manner that supports the City's compact urban growth objectives.	Retain MCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.651	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O2	Support	Generally supports MCZ-O2.	Retain MCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.138	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O2	Support in part	Supports MCZ-O2 in part.	Retain MCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.139	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O2	Amend	Seeks MCZ-O2 is amended to explicitly recognise and provide for educational facilities in the MCZ.	Amend MCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Accommodating growth The Metropolitan Centre Zone plays a significant role in accommodating growth and has sufficient serviced, resilient development capacity <u>and additional infrastructure</u> to meet commercial and residential growth needs.
Investore Property Limited	405.92	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O2	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-O2 (Accommodating Growth) with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.115	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O2	Support	Generally supports the intent of the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Retain MCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.150	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O3	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.264	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O3	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of MUZ-O4 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Retain MCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment as follows: Medium and high density mixed-use development is achieved that positively contributes to a good quality, well-functioning urban environment that reflects the changing urban form and amenity values of the Metropolitan Centres Zone.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.272	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O3	Oppose in part	Considers that the current drafting of MCZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Opposes MCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment as follows: Medium and high density mixed-use development is achieved that positively contributes to a good quality, well-functioning urban environment that reflects the changing urban form and amenity values of the Metropolitan Centres Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.70	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O3	Support	Supports the objectives of the MCZ which seek to meet the sub-regional needs of communities, businesses and residents in a manner that supports the City's compact urban growth objectives.	Retain MCZ-O3 (Amenity ad design) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.652	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O3	Support	Generally supports MCZ-O3 but considers that amendments are required to better reflect the density and design outcomes necessary to reflect the centre's location in the Centres hierarchy and the NPS-UD outcomes.	Retain MCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment as follows: Medium and high density mixed-use development is achieved that positively contributes to a good quality, well-functioning urban environment <u>with a changing compact that reflects the changing urban form supporting high and</u> amenity values of <u>streets and public places</u> the Metropolitan Centres Zone.
Investore Property Limited	405.93	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O3	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.116	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O3	Support	Generally supports the intent of the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Retain MCZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.151	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O4	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-O4 (Activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.71	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O4	Support	Supports the objectives of the MCZ which seek to meet the sub-regional needs of communities, businesses and residents in a manner that supports the City's compact urban growth objectives.	Retain MCZ-O4 (Activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.653	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O4	Support	Generally supports MCZ-O4 but considers that amendments are required to better reflect the centre's location in the Centres hierarchy and the NPS ^{UD} outcomes.	Retain MCZ-O4 (Activities) and seeks amendment as follows: Activities will be of an appropriate scale and type to enhance the vibrancy and viability of <u>the sub-regional</u> Metropolitan Centres, and reflect their sub regional purpose.
Investore Property Limited	405.94	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O4	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-O4 (Activities) with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.117	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-O4	Support	Generally supports the intent of the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Retain MCZ-O4 (Activities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Support in part	Supports the objectives and policies for the Neighbourhood, Local and Metropolitan Centre zones, and specifically supports the recognition of medium and high-density development and the enablement of a wide range of activities.	Retain MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth), subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Amend	Submitter is opposed to the references on undermining the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the other Centre zones	Seek that MCZ-P1.1 (Accommodating growth) is amended as follows: 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Local Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centre Zone and primacy of the City Centre Zone <u>supports the purpose of the zone;</u>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.84	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the scale and primacy of Centres is critical in achieving a well-functioning urban environment and intensification outcomes.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.152	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.51	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Oppose	Submission point 349.152 seeks to retain MCZ-P1 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.40 seeks that this policy is amended.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.273	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Support	Supports MCZ-P1 and its accommodation for growth and a variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability, density, and efficient use of available development sites.	Retain MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.72	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Support in part	MCZ-P1 is supported as it provides for the use and development of the Metropolitan Centre Zone to meet the City's needs.	Retain MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.73	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Amend	Considers that MCZ-P1 should include additional emphasis to the provision of, or convenient access to, a range of commercial activities which is recognised in the MCZ objectives (MCZ-O2).	Amend MCZ-P2 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Provide for the use and development of the Metropolitan Centre Zone to meet the City's needs for housing, business activities and community facilities, including: 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the City Centre Zone; 2. A mix of medium and high-density housing; 3. Convenient access to active transport, public transport and rapid transit options; 4. Efficient, well integrated and strategic use of available development sites; and 5. Convenient access to a range of commercial services and open spaces.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.654	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Support in part	Generally supports MCZ-P1 but considers that an amendment is required to: (a) recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone, and to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. Considers that the focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Metropolitan Centre. And; (b) Clarify that intent of the metropolitan zone is to enable significant intensification and height, and therefore high-density housing is the appropriate scale of development to encourage within the Metropolitan Centre.	Retain MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) and seeks amendment as follows: Provide for the use and development of the Metropolitan Centre Zone to meet the City's needs for housing, business activities and community facilities, including: 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the City Centre Zone; 2. A mix of medium and high-density housing;
Investore Property Limited	405.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Oppose	Opposed to the reference to “undermining” the “ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy” of the City Centre Zone in Policy MCZ-P1. Considers that the Metropolitan Centres fulfil a different purpose, and are of an entirely different scale to the City Centre. The City Centre has a scale and centrality which means that activities in Johnsonville and Kilbirnie offer little threat to its long-term sustainability. As such any development in the Metropolitan Centres should be considered in its own right without the additional administrative burden of potentially requiring assessments of effects on the City Centre. The Metropolitan Centre zones are relatively confined, and it is also important to encourage efficient use of this land. It is considered that requiring a mix of medium and high density housing will not achieve this.	Opposes MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) and the reference to “undermining” the “ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy”. Seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Amend	<p>Opposed to the reference to “undermining” the “ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy” of the City Centre Zone in Policy MCZ-P1. The Metropolitan Centres fulfil a different purpose, and are of an entirely different scale to the City Centre. The City Centre has a scale and centrality which means that activities in Johnsonville and Kilbirnie offer little threat to its long-term sustainability. As such any development in the Metropolitan Centres should be considered in its own right without the additional administrative burden of potentially requiring assessments of effects on the City Centre.</p> <p>The Metropolitan Centre zones are relatively confined, and it is also important to encourage efficient use of this land. It is considered that requiring a mix of medium and high density housing will not achieve this.</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Provide for the use and development of the Metropolitan Centre Zone to meet the City’s needs for housing, business activities and community facilities, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the City Centre Zone; 2. A mix of medium and high-density housing; <p>...</p>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.118	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Support	Supports the need to provide for a variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability, etc.	Retain MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.89	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Oppose	Submission point 416.118 seeks to retain MCZ-P1 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.40 seeks to amend MCZ-P1.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Oppose	Opposes the reference to undermining the 'ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy' of the City Centre Zone. Any development in the Metropolitan Centre Zones is unlikely to have any impact on the City Centre Zone and any development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone should be considered in its own right.	Opposes MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth) as notified, seek amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-P1.1 (Accommodating Growth) as follows (or words to similar effect):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the City Centre Zone;
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to MCZ-P1 (Accommodating growth). Considers that requiring a max of medium and high density housing in the Metropolitan Centre Zones will not achieve efficient use of land.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-P1.2 (Accommodating Growth) as follows (or words to similar effect):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A mix of medium and high-density housing;
Foodstuffs North Island	476.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Amend	Opposes the references in MCZ-P1.1. to undermining the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the other Centre zones. The Centres each fulfil a different purpose as detailed in Objective 1, and are of different scales to one another. Any development within the lower order Centres should be considered in its own right without the additional administrative burden of potentially requiring assessments of effects on the higher order Centres.	<p>Amend MCZ-P1.1. (Accommodating growth) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A variety of building types, sizes, tenures, affordability and distribution of a scale and intensity that does not undermine the ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy of the City Centre Zone <u>supports the purpose of the zone;</u> <p>...</p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.59	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the scale and primacy of Centres is critical in achieving a well-functioning urban environment and intensification outcomes.	Disallow
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P2	Support	<p>Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification.</p> <p>The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.</p>	Retain MCZ-P2.7 (Enabled activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P2	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain MCZ-P2.2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.295	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P2	Support	Supports the policy as it makes provision for the provision of emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate stations anywhere within the urban and rural environment.	Retain MCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.153	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P2	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.74	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P2	Support	MCZ-P2 is supported as it enables a wide-range of activities, including commercial activities (as defined).	Retain MCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.655	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P2	Support	Generally supports MCZ-P2.	Retain MCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.140	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P2	Support	Supports MCZ-P2 as it is important to recognise and provide for educational facilities which will service the surrounding residential catchments and other community/commercial activities.	Retain MCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P2	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-P2 (Enabled activities) with amendments.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.154	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P3	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-P3 (Managed activities) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.274	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P3	Oppose in part	Opposes restrictions on retirement villages being established at ground floor level.	Seeks to delete clause (3) of MCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P3	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the reference to “undermining” the “ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy” of the City Centre Zone in Policy MCZ-P1. The Metropolitan Centres fulfil a different purpose, and are of an entirely different scale to the City Centre. The City Centre has a scale and centrality which means that activities in Johnsonville and Kilbirnie offer little threat to its long-term sustainability. As such any development in the Metropolitan Centres should be considered in its own right without the additional administrative burden of potentially requiring assessments of effects on the City Centre.</p> <p>The Metropolitan Centre zones are relatively confined, and it is also important to encourage efficient use of this land. It is considered that requiring a mix of medium and high density housing will not achieve this.</p>	Opposes MCZ-P3 (Managed activities) and the reference to “undermining” the “ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy”. Seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P3	Amend	<p>Opposed to the reference to “undermining” the “ongoing viability, vibrancy and primacy” of the City Centre Zone in Policy MCZ-P1. The Metropolitan Centres fulfil a different purpose, and are of an entirely different scale to the City Centre. The City Centre has a scale and centrality which means that activities in Johnsonville and Kilbirnie offer little threat to its long-term sustainability. As such any development in the Metropolitan Centres should be considered in its own right without the additional administrative burden of potentially requiring assessments of effects on the City Centre.</p> <p>The Metropolitan Centre zones are relatively confined, and it is also important to encourage efficient use of this land. It is considered that requiring a mix of medium and high density housing will not achieve this.</p>	Opposes MCZ-P3 (Managed activities) as follows: Manage the location and scale of commercial activities that could result in cumulative adverse effects on the viability and vibrancy of centres , the retention and establishment of a mix of activities within the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and the function of the transport network.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P3	Oppose	<p>Considers the matters in MCZ-P3 (Managed Activities) are for the market rather than District Plan regulation.</p> <p>Opposes the requirement to manage the location and scale of commercial activities that could result in cumulative adverse effects on the viability and vibrancy of centres, the retention and establishment of a mix of activities, and the function of the transport network.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete MCZ-P3 (Managed Activities) in its entirety.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P3	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes the reference to undermining the ‘viability and vibrancy of centres’.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes MCZ-P3 (Managed Activities) as notified, seeks amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P3	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to MCZ-P3 (Managed Activities). Considers that requiring a max of medium and high density housing in the Metropolitan Centre Zones will not achieve efficient use of land.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-P3 (Managed Activities) as follows:</p> <p>Manage the location and scale of commercial activities that could result in cumulative adverse effects on the viability and vibrancy of centres, the retention and establishment of a mix of activities within the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and the function of the transport network.</p>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.155	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P4	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.75	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P4	Amend	<p>Considers that MCZ-P4 as drafted differs to Policy P4 in the LCZ and NCZ and provides some clarity as to why matters 1-4 have been included within the policy (being that they are considered ‘potentially incompatible activities’). It is considered unnecessary to incorporate these clauses into Policy MCZ-P4. Potentially incompatible activities (being activities not contemplated by the zone, or ones that infringe the zone standards) should be able to be accommodated in the zone if there is a functional and operational need and effects on the Centre are managed.</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows:</p> <p>Only Allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the role and function of the Metropolitan Centre Zone, where they <u>demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone</u>; or will not have an <u>unacceptable</u> adverse effect on the vibrancy and amenity values of the centre. ±</p> <p>Potentially incompatible activities include:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage or non residential activity frontage; 2. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of vacant land; 3. Ground floor residential activities on street edges identified as having an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; and 4. Yard based retail activities.
Z Energy Limited	361.75	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P4	Support in part	<p>MCZ-P4 is supported for its intent in relation to new activities. Policy MCZ-P4 identifies potentially incompatible activities with the purpose of the MCZ, including yard-based retail, ground level carparking and residential activities, and vacant sites and seeks to only allow these activities where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity.</p>	Retain MCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.76	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P4	Amend	Considers that MCZ-P4 is too specific and should be amended. MCZ-P4 is too specific and it will impact on the continued operation, maintenance and upgrade of a range of existing activities. It is considered that some yard-based activities, like service stations, play a key role in providing essential services to enable a well-functioning urban environment.	Amend MCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow <u>new</u> activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the Metropolitan Centre zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: a. Carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; b. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of vacant land; c. Ground floor residential activities on street edges identified as having an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; and d. <u>Some</u> yard-based retail activities.
Investore Property Limited	405.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P4	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.119	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P4	Amend	Carparking at ground level should only be a "potentially incompatible activity" where it occurs along building frontages.	Amend MCZ-P4 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Potentially incompatible activities Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the City Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: 1. Industrial activities; 2. Yard-based retail activities; 3. Carparking at ground level <u>where it occurs along building frontages</u> ;
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.156	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P5	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.77	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P5	Support	MCZ-P5 is supported as it seeks to avoid heavy industrial activities in the MCZ as well as provide for a range of medium and high-density residential development.	Retain MCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activity) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.656	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P5	Support	Generally supports MCZ-P5.	Retain MCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P5	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-P5 (Heavy industrial activities)with amendments.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.157	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-P6 (Housing choice) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.275	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Amend	Generally supports MCZ-P6 and its enablement of medium density residential development that offers a range of housing price, type, size and tenure that caters to various ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that each individual development will not offer a range in those matters.	Retain MCZ-M6 (Housing choice) and seeks to amend to read "Offers Contributes to a range of housing price, type, size and tenure" ..

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.276	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Support	Generally supports MCZ-P6 and its enablement of medium density residential development that offers a range of housing price, type, size and tenure that caters to various ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that each individual development will not offer a range in those matters.	Retain MCZ-M6 (Housing choice) and seeks to amend to read "Offers Contributes to a range of housing price, type, size and tenure" ..
Z Energy Limited	361.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Support	MCZ-P6 is supported as it seeks to avoid heavy industrial activities in the MCZ as well as provide for a range of medium and high-density residential development.	Retain MCZ-P6 (Housing choice) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.657	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Support in part	Generally supports MCZ-P6 but considers that an amendment is required.	Retain MCZ-P6 (Housing choice) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.658	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Amend	Generally supports MCZ-P6 but considers that an amendment is required to: (a) recognise the range of housing densities potentially enabled in the zone, and to recognise that tenures and affordability cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan. Considers that the focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a Metropolitan Centre. And; (b) Clarify that intent of the metropolitan zone is to enable significant intensification and height, and therefore high-density housing is the appropriate scale of development to encourage within the Metropolitan Centre and high-density residential development can provide for a range of housing choices in itself. Considers that this position is consistent with MCZ-P7 and the intent of the MCZ.	Amend MCZ-P6 (Housing choice) as follows: Enable medium and high-density residential development that: 1. Contributes towards accommodating anticipated growth in the City; and 2. Offers a range of housing price, type, and size and tenure that is accessible to people of all ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities.
Investore Property Limited	405.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-P6 (Housing choice) with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.120	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Support	Support providing a range of housing choices.	Retain MCZ-P6 (Housing Choice) as notified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Oppose in part	Opposes reference to medium density residential development within the MCZ-P6 (Housing Choice).	Opposes MCZ-P6 (Housing Choice) as notified, seeks amendment.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P6	Amend	Considers that it is important that the plan recognises the role of Metropolitan Centres to enable high density housing, however medium density housing would not be an efficient use of this land. Considers that it is not appropriate for a policy to be directive on the price, type, size and tenure for development.	Amend MCZ-P6 (Housing Choice) as follows (or words to similar effect): Housing choice- Enable medium and high-density residential development that- 1. Contributes towards accommodating anticipated growth in the City; and 2. Offers a range of housing price, type, size and tenure that is accessible to people of all ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.296	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to achieve quality design outcomes for new development in the zone. In order to achieve good quality design outcomes, which includes the provision of a safe environment and resilient urban environment, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy.	Supports MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes - neighbourhood and townscape outcomes), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.297	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to achieve quality design outcomes for new development in the zone. In order to achieve good quality design outcomes, which includes the provision of a safe environment and resilient urban environment, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy.	Amend MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes - neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of Metropolitan Centre Zone by: 1. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive, development, including the extent to which the development: ... c. Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation enabled in this zone; and d. Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities; <u>and</u> e. <u>Is accessible for emergency service vehicles;</u>
McDonald's	274.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support in part	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain MCZ-P7 (Quality design -neighbourhood and townscape outcomes), subject to amendments as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Amend	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Seeks addition of the following to MCZ-P7 (Quality design -neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: <u>Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.158	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.52	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Oppose	Submission point 349.158 seeks to retain MCZ-P7 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.41 & 476.42 seeks that this policy is amended.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.277	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports the recognition in (1)(b) of optimising the development capacity of land and in (2)(e) of flexibility for ground floor space to be used for residential purposes	Retain MCZ-R7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support in part	MCZ-P7 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Amend	Considers that MCZ-P7 requires new development and additions and alterations, to positively contribute to the sense of space, quality and amenity of the MCZ. This includes, where relevant, providing continuous pedestrian shelter along streets requiring verandah coverage, requiring active frontages and ground floor glazing along identified street edges. The policy should also recognise that alternative design responses are necessary for functional and operational requirements of a range of activities, including existing service stations.	Amend MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Metropolitan Centre Zone by: ... 2. Ensuring that the development, where relevant: ... <u>f. Recognises that alternative design responses are necessary for functional requirements of a range of activities, including existing service stations.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.659	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support in part	Generally supports MCZ-P7, but considers that amendment is required.	Retain MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.660	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Amend	Considers that amendment is required to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy name to better reflect the intent of the policy and the subsequent wording, which seeks to manage new developments contribution to the centre and streetscape; and • The policy wording to better recognise the MCZ rule setting and the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect; and to simplify and clarify the neighbourhood and townscape outcomes that plan is seeking to manage. 	Amend MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as follows: <p>Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape Centres outcomes</p> <p>Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and planned urban built form <u>amenity and function</u> of the Metropolitan Centre Zone by:</p> <p>1. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive, development, including the extent to which the development:</p> <p>a. Acts as a positive catalyst for future change by reflecting <u>Reflects</u> the nature and scale of the development <u>proposed enabled</u> within the zone and in the vicinity, and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the centre;</p> <p>b. Optimises the development capacity of land, <u>particularly sites that are:</u></p> <p>i. Large; or</p> <p>ii. Narrow; or</p> <p>iii. Vacant; or</p> <p>iv. Ground level parking areas;</p> <p>...</p>
LIVE WELLington	FS96.37	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Oppose	Retain existing wording around quality outcomes and amenity. Removing words like amenity will result in poor liveability outcomes for residents and communities	Disallow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.22	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support	The amendment is considered an improvement enabling greater intensification while retaining good urban design.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.36	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Oppose	Retain existing wording around quality outcomes and amenity. Removing words like amenity will result in poor liveability outcomes for residents and communities.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	405.103	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) with amendments.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support	Supports this policy to ensure that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Retain MCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.121	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Amend	Considers that this is a long (and confusing) provision and should be reviewed against the earlier policies to ensure it is succinct, focused and does not cover the same ground as other policies.	Seeks that MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) be amended to ensure it is succinct, focused and does not cover the same ground as other policies.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.90	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support	Submission point 416.121 partly supports FSNi submission point 476.41.	Allow / Allow submission in part.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.122	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Amend	Considers that this is a long (and confusing) provision and should be reviewed against the earlier policies to ensure it is succinct, focused and does not cover the same ground as other policies. If the Design Guides are retained (which the submitter opposes), the submitter considers that this policy should be reviewed for overlap with the Design Guides.	Seeks that if the Design Guides are retained that MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) be reviewed for overlap with the Design Guides.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports MCZ-P7 in general. [Refer to original submission]	Retain MCZ-P7 (Quality design outcomes – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) as notified, seeks amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Amend	Supports MCZ-P7 in general, with the exception of 2(e) which requires flexibility for ground floor space to be converted for a range of activities “including residential”. Considers MCZ-P7.2.e. to be onerous to have to design commercial or retail buildings to be flexible for a change in use to residential.	Amend MCZ-P7.2.e. (Quality design outcomes...) as follows; “... c. Enhances the quality of the streetscape and public / private interface; d. Integrates with existing and planned active and public transport movement networks; and e. Allows sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be converted for a range of activities, including residential.” ”
Foodstuffs North Island	476.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Support in part	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain MCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) with amendment.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P7	Amend	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Amend MCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) to include the following: Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.159	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P8	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.661	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P8	Support in part	Supports MCZ-P8 in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Considers that amendments are required to remove communal outdoor space requirements are also sought as this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space.	Retain MCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.662	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P8	Amend	Supports MCZ-P8 in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Considers that amendments are required to remove communal outdoor space requirements are also sought as this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space.	Amend MCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as follows: Achieve a good standard of amenity for residential activities in the Metropolitan Centre Zone by: 1. Providing residents with access to adequate outlook; and 2. Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.
Investore Property Limited	405.104	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P8	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.123	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P8	Amend	<p>Considers that on-site residential amenity can be provided in a number of ways and should not be prescriptive, acknowledging that mandated types of amenity (such as outdoor space) can increase housing cost and prevent lower income residents living within the city centre. The submitter considers that the policy should acknowledge affordability constraints.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires district plans to “enable, in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible” (Policy 3). The submitter considers that this should not be restricted by prescriptive amenity requirements.</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-P8 (On-site residential amenity) as follows:</p> <p>Achieve a good standard of amenity for residential activities in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing residents with access to an adequate outlook; and 2. Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.160	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P9	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.278	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P9	Support in part	Agrees that shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects on adjacent sites require management. However, the level of management needs to be informed by the development expectations for the zone.	<p>Retain MCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks addition of new "role of density standards" policy in the Local Centre Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p>MCZ-PX Role of density standards</p> <p>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</p>
Z Energy Limited	361.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P9	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.663	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P9	Support in part	Considers that amendment is required to MCZ-P9 to specify “adjoining properties” for the minimisation of adverse effects and clarifying that effects are those beyond those anticipated in the plan in accordance with Policy 6 NPSUD.	Retain MCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.664	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P9	Amend	Considers that amendment is required to MCZ-P9 to specify “adjoining properties” for the minimisation of adverse effects and clarifying that effects are those beyond those anticipated in the plan in accordance with Policy 6 NPSUD.	<p>Amend MCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as follows:</p> <p>Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects <u>beyond those anticipated within the zone</u>, including:</p> <p>...</p>
Investore Property Limited	405.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P9	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Metropolitan Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the sub-regional role of these centres, the recognition of high-density development, and the enablement of a wide range of activities. Specific changes are sought to particular provisions.	Retain MCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) with amendments.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.124	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P9	Amend	Submitter considers that the impacts of construction activity on the transport network should not be relevant in the resource consenting process. The submitter considers that the densification proposed by the District Plan will inevitably result in impacts.	<p>Amend MCZ-P9 (Managing adverse effects) as follows:</p> <p>Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects on adjacent sites, and 2. The impact of construction on the transport network.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P9	Oppose in part	Opposes that part of MCZ-P9 (Managing Adverse Effects) which relates to managing the impact of construction activities on the transport network.	Opposes MCZ-P9 (Managing Adverse Effects) as notified, seeks amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P9	Amend	Considers that this is a matter that is better addressed in the transport chapter, while a focus of transport effects may constrain and lengthen construction periods.	<p>Amend MCZ-P9 (Managing Adverse Effects) to as follows;</p> <p>"1. Shading, privacy, bulk and dominance effects on adjacent sites; and</p> <p>2. The impact of construction on the transport network."</p>
McDonald's	274.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Seeks that MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Property Council New Zealand	338.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.207	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.207	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.161	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Oppose The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (and the associated policy and matters of discretion linkages), do not recognise or provide for the functional or operational requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide places unreasonable requirements on applicants on matters that are more appropriately dealt with at a national level (for example, reducing travel/shipping costs of materials to reduce carbon emissions, and installing insulation above minimum requirements). The imposition of "thresholds" for certain types of development result in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Amend MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: ... 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3.2. Incorporating 4-3. Incorporating 5-4. Enabling
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.53	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Submission point 349.161 seeks to amend MCZ-P10. FSNI submission point 476.43 seeks to delete this policy in its entirety, FSNI submission seeks that functional or operational requirements of activities and development are recognised in MCZ-P7 in submission point 476.42.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.279	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of MCZ-P10 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. Considers that the policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) in its entirety as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.76	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that MCZ-P10 is unclear and should be amended. The policy contains an incorrect reference to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide document (should be G97 as opposed to G107). A review of the guideline indicates that G97 City Outcomes Contribution is only triggered for City Centre zone developments (under or over height development comprising 50 or more units or any comprehensive development) and for over height development comprising 25 or more units or any comprehensive development in the Metropolitan Centre zone (MCZ), Neighbourhood Centre zone (NCZ), Local Centre zone (LCZ) and High Density Residential zone (HRZ). As such, the Policy as currently drafted implies that any non-residential development in the LCZ is subject to this policy which is incorrect. The above amendment seeks to align this Policy with the Guide document.	Amend MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height , large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development <u>that are over height</u> in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G97G107 , including through either: ...
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Submission point 359.76 seeks to amend MCZ-P10. FSNI submission point 476.43 seeks to delete MCZ-P10 in it's entirety.	Disallow / Disallow this submission in part.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.83	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Support in part	MCZ-P10 is supported, as it seeks to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107.	Retain MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.84	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	MCZ-P10 should also recognise the existing environment and the functional requirements of a range of activities.	Amend MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, <u>while recognising the existing environment</u> including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development; where this is provided, legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility. <u>6. Recognises that alternative design responses are necessary for functional requirements of a range of activities, including existing service stations.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.665	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Support in part	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' in MCZ-P10 for development for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; • Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and • all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. 	Retain MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.160	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with The RVA's primary submission to have these references removed.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.160	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with Ryman's primary submission to have these references removed.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.666	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' in MCZ-P10 for development for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; • Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and • all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. 	Amend MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive <u>Encourage</u> development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to <u>contribute to positive outcomes</u> deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development; where this is provided, legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.106	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks deletion of MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.107	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes MCZ-P10. Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Delete MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in it's entirety.
VicLabour	414.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.125	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	The submitter has requested removing the height limit in the CCZ, in which case the City Outcomes Contribution would not be relevant. The submitter considers that if that occurs, Council should consider whether it is still worth retaining the City Outcomes Contribution in other zones – it may be preferable removing the concept altogether.	Seeks that MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) be amended in accordance with any changes to CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution). Should height limits in the CCZ (City Centre Zone) be removed seeks that Council considers whether it is still worth retaining the City Outcomes Contribution in other zones (including MCZ (Metropolitcan Centre Zone)).
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.91	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Support	Submission point 416.125 seeks a similar outcome to FSNI submission point 476.43 but FSNI submission point 476.43 seeks to delete MCZ-P10 in it's entirety.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Fabric Property Limited	425.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide. Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.	Delete MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in it's entirety.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes due to the points raised in relation to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' [refer to original submission]	Delete MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	<p>Opposes MCZ-P10.</p> <p>While FSNI recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.</p>	Delete MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and consequential references in their entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.162	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R1	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.75	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R1	Support	Submission point 349.162 supports FSNI submission point 476.94.	Allow
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R1	Support	Supports commercial activities being permitted. Considers that these activities are clearly anticipated by the zone.	Retain MCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.94	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R1	Support	Supports supermarkets as a permitted activity in the MCZ.	Retain MCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
Ministry of Education	400.141	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R3	Support	Supports MCZ-R3 as it provides for educational facilities as a permitted activity.	Retain MCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.298	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R6	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the development of emergency service facilities within the zone as a permitted activity. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate stations anywhere within the urban and rural environment.	Retain MCZ-R6 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R7	Support	<p>Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification.</p> <p>The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.</p>	Retain MCZ-R7 (Community corrections activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R12	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain MCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.667	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R12	Support in part	Supports MCZ-R12 but consider amendment is required to delete reference to verandah control and natural hazards as these matters are not relevant to the location of residential activities or addressed in other rules such as the natural hazards rules.	Retain MCZ-R12 (Residential activities) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.668	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R12	Amend	Supports MCZ-R12 but consider amendment is required to delete reference to verandah control and natural hazards as these matters are not relevant to the location of residential activities or addressed in other rules such as the natural hazards rules.	Amend MCZ-R12.1 (Residential activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is located: i. Above ground floor level; ii. At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as an active frontage; iii. At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as a non-residential activity frontage; iv. At ground level along any street not identified as requiring verandah coverage; or v. At ground level on any site contained within a Natural Hazard Overlay.
Investore Property Limited	405.108	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R13	Oppose in part	Opposes the total gross floor area limit of 20,000m ² of MCZ-R13. Submitter seeks amendments to this rule in order to provide a 30,000m ² gross floor area threshold for triggering a Restricted Discretionary activity status in the land zoned Metropolitan Centre in Johnsonville. Submitter considers that a 30,000m ² threshold for this rule would be more appropriate given the scale of existing and consented development, large lot sizes, land in common ownership, and the anticipated level of development in the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes MCZ-R13.1 (Integrated retail activity) and seeks amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.109	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R13	Amend	Opposes the total gross floor area limit of 20,000m ² of MCZ-R13. Submitter seeks amendments to this rule in order to provide a 30,000m ² gross floor area threshold for triggering a Restricted Discretionary activity status in the land zoned Metropolitan Centre in Johnsonville. Submitter considers that a 30,000m ² threshold for this rule would be more appropriate given the scale of existing and consented development, large lot sizes, land in common ownership, and the anticipated level of development in the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend MCZ-R13.1 (Integrated retail activity) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The total gross floor area does not exceed 20,000m² <u>30,000m²</u> .
Investore Property Limited	405.110	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R13	Oppose in part	Considers that the restricted discretionary rule should provide a preclusion clause for public and limited notification. Retail activities are clearly anticipated by the zone, and the matters of discretion provided under MCZ-R13 enable appropriate consideration of effects for larger developments. Public and limited notification for these activities is therefore unnecessary and inappropriate. Also considers that the note stating the permitted baseline will not be applied is inappropriate and should be deleted. This should be a matter of discretion to be determined by the Council on the merits of the application. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes MCZ-R13.2 (Integrated retail activity) and seeks amendment

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.111	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that the restricted discretionary rule should provide a preclusion clause for public and limited notification. Retail activities are clearly anticipated by the zone, and the matters of discretion provided under MCZ-R13 enable appropriate consideration of effects for larger developments. Public and limited notification for these activities is therefore unnecessary and inappropriate.</p> <p>Also considers that the note stating the permitted baseline will not be applied is inappropriate and should be deleted. This should be a matter of discretion to be determined by the Council on the merits of the application.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-R13.2 (Integrated retail activity) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of MCZ-R13.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MCZ-P1, MCZ-P2, MCZ-P3, and MCZ-P4; 2. The cumulative effect of the development on: a. The ongoing viability and vibrancy of the City Centre Zone and Golden Mile; b. The safety and efficiency of the transport network, including providing for a range of transport modes; c. The hierarchy of roads, travel demand or vehicle use; and 3. The compatibility with other activities provided for in the Zone. Council will not apply a permitted baseline assessment when considering the effects of integrated retail activities that cannot comply with MCZ-R13.1.a. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MCZ-R13.2.a is <u>precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></p>
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R13	Oppose in part	Oppose in part MCZ-R13 (Integrated Retail Activity).	Opposes MCZ-R13 (Integrated Retail Activity) as notified, seeks amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers increase of permitted gross floor area would be more appropriate given the scale of existing and consented development, the large lot sizes, the land held in common ownership, and the anticipated level of development in Johnsonville.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-R13 (Integrated Retail Activity) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The total gross floor area does not exceed 20,000m² <u>30,000m²</u>.</p>
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers increase of permitted gross floor area would be more appropriate given the scale of existing and consented development, the large lot sizes, the land held in common ownership, and the anticipated level of development in Johnsonville.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend matters of discretion for MCZ-R13 (Integrated Retail Activity) as follows: 1. The matters in MCZ-P1, MCZ-P2, MCZ-P3, and MCZ-P4; 2. The cumulative effect of the development on: a. The ongoing viability and vibrancy of the City Centre Zone and Golden Mile; b. The safety and efficiency of the transport network, including providing for a range of transport modes; c. The hierarchy of roads, travel demand or vehicle use; and 3. The compatibility with other activities provided for in the Zone.</p>
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R13	Amend	<p>Seeks that a preclusion clause for public and limited notification is included, given retail activities are anticipated by the zone and the matters of discretion enable appropriate consideration of effects for larger developments.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-R13.2 (Integrated Retail Activity) as follows: "Council will not apply a permitted baseline assessment when considering the effects of integrated retail activities that cannot comply with MCZ-R13.1.a. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MCZ-R13.2.a is <u>precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u>"</p>
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R13	Amend	<p>Seeks deletion of note stating that council will not consider a permitted baseline assessment in relation to MCZ-R13.1.a. (Integrated Retail Activity).</p> <p>Considers that it is inappropriate to decline an assessment of the permitted baseline when considering the effects of an integrated retail development. This should be a matter of discretion to be determined by the Council on the merits of each consent application under s 104 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-R13.2 (Integrated Retail Activity) as follows: "..... 3. The compatibility with other activities provided for in the Zone. Council will not apply a permitted baseline assessment when considering the effects of integrated retail activities that cannot comply with MCZ-R13.1.a."</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McDonald's	274.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Oppose in part	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements.	Retain MCZ-R15.2 (Carparking activities), subject to amendment outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Amend	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements.	Amend MCZ-R15.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of MCZ-R15.1.a cannot be achieved.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.77	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Amend	Considers that MCZ-R15.2 should be amended so that the activity status of this standard infringement is changed to restricted discretionary. It is considered that this status, plus the suggested matters of discretion, will ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities are anticipated, such assessments will be rational and streamlined. Supermarkets often require car parking to be visible, both from commercial viability perspective but also given the requirements to separate loading and servicing activities from public interfaces. This site layout requires that loading is located to the rear of a store, with the building in front and the entrance accessible and legible from the car park and street frontage. The application of blanket urban design ideals in these standards is challenged such that the proposed amendment seeks to explicitly exclude supermarkets from complying with this standard.	Amend MCZ-R15.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: 2. Activity status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of MCZ-R15.1.a is not achieved. <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters in MCZ-P2, MCZ-P3, MCZ-P4, MCZ-P7, MCZ-P9 and MCZ-P10;</u> <u>2. The cumulative effect of the development on:</u> <u>a. The ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Zone ;</u> <u>b. The safety and efficiency of the transport network, including providing for a range of transport modes;</u> <u>c. The hierarchy of roads, travel demand or vehicle use; and</u> <u>3. The compatibility with other activities provided for in the zone.</u> <u>Note: Rule MCZ-R15 does not apply to new supermarkets or additions to existing supermarkets.</u>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Support	Submission point 359.77 partly supports submission points 476.44 and 476.45.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.108	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A "discretionary" activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9.	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.
Investore Property Limited	405.112	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Support in part	Supports the intent of MCZ-R15 but considers it would be appropriate to amend MCZ-R15 to enable any carparking at the ground level as a restricted discretionary activity, as this would provide appropriate discretion.	Retain MCZ-R15 (Carparking activities) with amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.113	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Amend	Supports the intent of MCZ-R15 but considers it would be appropriate to amend MCZ-R15 to enable any carparking at the ground level as a restricted discretionary activity, as this would provide appropriate discretion.	Amend MCZ-R15 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Support in part	Supports the intent of rule MCZ-R15 (Carparking activities).	Retain MCZ-R15 (Carparking activities) as notified, with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Amend	Considers that it would be appropriate to amend rule MCZ-R15 (Carparking Activities) to enable any carparking at the ground level as a restricted discretionary activity, as this would provide appropriate discretion.	Amend MCZ-R15 (Carparking Activities) as follows: 2. Activity status: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> .
Foodstuffs North Island	476.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Oppose	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in MCZ-R15 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend MCZ-R15 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.103	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A “discretionary” activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R15	Amend	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in MCZ-R15 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend MCZ-R15 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...
Z Energy Limited	361.85	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R16	Support in part	MCZ-R16 is supported in so much as it provides for yard-based retail activities (the definition of which includes service stations) as a discretionary activity. However, it is sought that changes to the notification status be made to exclude activities relating to the operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing activities and new activities adjoining specific zones and roads.	Retain MCZ-R16 (Yard-based retailing activities) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.86	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R16	Amend	Considers that MCZ-R16 should be amended to make changes to the notification status to exclude activities relating to the operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing activities and new activities adjoining specific zones and roads.	Amend MCZ-R16 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows: Activity status: Discretionary Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MCZ-R16.1 must be publicly notified <u>except:</u> <u>a. The activity relates to the maintenance, operation and upgrading of an existing activity;</u> <u>b. The new or existing activity adjoins another commercial zone, a residential zone or an arterial or collector Road.</u>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.151	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R16	Support in part	MCZ-R16 is supported in so much as the rule provides for yard-based retail activities as a discretionary activity. It is understood that an application for resource consent made in respect of this rule, however, must be publicly notified in accordance with the Notification Status.	Retain MCZ-R16 (Yard-based retailing activities) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.152	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R16	Amend	<p>Considers that MCZ-R16 should be amended as the notification requirement is not supported as it may have a range of unintended outcomes. For instance, without clarification, it may require public notification for any operational change, upgrading or maintenance to an existing yard-based activity where public notification would be more appropriately determined through standard notification tests. It may therefore also discourage existing activities from undertaking important maintenance and upgrades, for instance, to meet requirements of HSNO / HSWA legislation, better accord with good practise, introduce new technologies, or necessary changes to meet demand.</p> <p>Ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrades of existing service stations / yard-based retail activities should not be subject to this notification requirement, which is not appropriate for existing lawful activities.</p> <p>It is considered that an additional exclusion to the notification status is appropriate only where the existing or new activity is located on the edge of the zone or adjacent to an arterial or collector road. These locations and/or interfaces do not have, nor should they expect, the same urban design outcomes and levels of visual amenity compared to a centrally located site in the CCZ for example. A service station, for example, would not impact the function and vitality of a centre zone if it were located on the edge of the zone where it can appropriately transition to the adjoining zone.</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-R16 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows:</p> <p>Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MCZ-R16 must be publicly notified <u>except</u>:</p> <p><u>a. The activity relates to the maintenance, operation and upgrading of an existing activity;</u> <u>b. The new or existing activity adjoins another commercial zone, a residential zone or an arterial or collector Road.</u></p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.299	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R18	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the MCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain MCZ-R18 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.163	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R18	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-R18 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.669	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R18	Support	Supports MCZ-R18.	Retain MCZ-R18 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.300	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the MCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.164	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.276	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.277	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.15	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Oppose	Stride is opposed to this amendment as it is unnecessary to manage the effects of demolition and has the potential to add additional direct and administrative costs on to demolition and development.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	FS108.15	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Oppose	Investore is opposed to this amendment as it is unnecessary to manage the effects of demolition and has the potential to add additional direct and administrative costs on to demolition and development.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.670	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports this rule in part but seeks clarification, and any necessary amendments, to ensure that this rule will not have an unintended consequence of constraining staged developments.	Retain MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.671	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Amend	Supports this rule in part but seeks clarification, and any necessary amendments, to ensure that this rule will not have an unintended consequence of constraining staged developments.	Seeks to amend MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to avoid unintended consequence of constraining staged developments.
Investore Property Limited	405.114	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports the intention of this rule and supports the preclusion of public and limited notification but seeks amendments to provide for demolition as a Restricted Discretionary activity. Submitter has concerns that as notified it may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a larger site to enable development. Submitter considers that a restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.	Retain MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendments.
Investore Property Limited	405.115	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Amend	Supports the intention of this rule and supports the preclusion of public and limited notification but seeks amendments to provide for demolition as a Restricted Discretionary activity. Submitter has concerns that as notified it may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a larger site to enable development. Submitter considers that a restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.	Amend MCZ-R19.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of MCZ-R19.1 cannot be achieved The assessment of the activity must have regard to <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> 1. How the land will be utilised whilst it is vacant; and
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports the intent of rule MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures).	Retain MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified with amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R19	Amend	Seeks amendments to MCZ-R19, to provide for demolition as a Restricted Discretionary activity Considers that a restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend MCZ-R19 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures)as follows: 2. Activity status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of MCZ-R19.1 cannot be achieved The assessment of the activity must have regard to- <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> 1. How the land will be utilised whilst it is vacant; and 2. Creating a positive visual relationship between the site and streetscape whilst the site is vacant.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.156	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Considers a notification status statement is missing in relation to developments where all standards are met.	Amend MCZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: Notification status: <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MCZ-R20.2.a which complies with all standards is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. (...)</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.244	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point subject to the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.244	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.301	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Support	Supports the rule as the construction or, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures within the MCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain MCZ-R20 (Construction of or additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as notified.
McDonald's	274.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Oppose in part	Oppose the requirement for restricted discretionary consent where additions and alterations change the exterior to the building above veranda level and are visible from public spaces.	Retain MCZ-R20 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures), subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Considers where compliance can be achieved with the relevant standards, this should be a permitted activity otherwise McDonald's considered there to be a risk that this will result in the perverse outcome of parts of exterior facades not being updated.	Seeks the following amendment to MCZ-R20 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: 1. a. Any alterations or additions to a building or structure that: i. Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; or ii. Relate to a building frontage below veranda level, including entranceways and glazing and compliance with MCZ-S5 is achieved; or iii. Do not result in the creation of new residential units; and iv. Are not visible from public spaces; and v. i. Comply with standards MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, MCZ-S3, MCZS4, MCZ-S5 and MCZ-S6; and

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.165	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Oppose	Oppose Opposed to the cross reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide within the matters of discretion. The cross reference to the policies of the MCZ is sufficient to ensure that development achieves a "good quality, well-functioning environment" as required by MCZ-O3.	Amend MCZ-R20 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: ... 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 4-3. 5-4. 6-5. 7-6. ...
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.280	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Supports the construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures being a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under MCZ-R20. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the requirements of MCZ-S1 - MCZ-S10. However, considers that standard should not be applicable to retirement villages. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 1 are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes clause 3 matter of discretion relating to City Outcomes Contributions. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides, their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under MCZ-R20 should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under MCZ-R20 that complies with MCZ-S1 and MCZ-S4 should be precluded from being limited notified.	Retain MCZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amend as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of MCZ-R4920_1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MCZ-P6, MCZ-P7, MCZ-P8 and MCZ-P9 (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>); 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, MCZ-S3, MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5, MCZ-S6, MCZ-S7, MCZ-S8, MCZ-S9, MCZ-S10 and MCZ-S11; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height limit requirement at Ngaio, Berhampore and Aro Valley centres and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages) ; 4. The Residential Design Guide (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>); 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. Construction impacts on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure; <u>8. For retirement villages:</u> <u>i. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>ii. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> <u>iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>iv. When assessing the matters in 2(a)(2), and 2(a)(8)(i) – (iii), consider:</u> <u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> <u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>v. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
					<p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p>Notification status:</p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MCZ-R20.2 which complies with MCZ-S3, MCZ-S7, MCZ-S8, MCZ-S9, MCZ-S10 and MCZ-S11 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MCZ-R20.2 which results from non-compliance with MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5 and MCZ-S6 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule MCZ-R20.2 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule MCZ-R20.2 where compliance is achieved with MCZ-S1 and MCZ-S4 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>
Woolworths New Zealand	359.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that MCZ-R20.1 should be amended to establish a baseline for supermarket operations within the LCZ that is greater than the current threshold of 100m ² for new buildings on account of the general operational requirements of the stores. This proposed baseline of 2000m ² aligns with the Auckland Unitary Plan provisions in the Local Centre zone and is considered a commensurate response given the typical scale of supermarket buildings in this zone.	<p>Amend CZ-R20.1 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>b. The construction of any building or structure:</p> <p>i. Is not located on a site with an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; or</p> <p>ii. Is not visible from a public space; and</p> <p>iii. Will have a gross floor area of less than 100m² <u>except where specified in iv below;</u></p> <p><u>iv. Will have a gross floor area of less than 2000m² where it accommodates a supermarket;</u> and</p> <p>iv. Will result in a total coverage (together with other buildings) of no more than 20 percent of the site; and</p> <p>v. Comply with effects standards MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, MCZ-S3, MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5 and MCZ-S6 and</p> <p>vii. Does not involve the construction of a new building for residential activities</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that MCZ-R20.2 restricted discretionary activities should exclude new supermarket buildings. There are concerns around the inclusion of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide within these matters of discretion on account of the unnecessary scope this introduces in a restricted discretionary consenting framework. As such, it is specifically sought that that this is excluded from the matters of discretion for new supermarket buildings.	Amend CZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: 1. Compliance with any of the requirements of MCZ-R19.1 <u>MCZR20.1</u> cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MCZ-P6, MCZ-P7, MCZ-P8 and MCZ-P9 <u>excluding for supermarkets exceeding MCZ-R20(b)(iv);</u> <u>2. For supermarkets exceeding MCZ-R20(b)(iv), the matters in MCZ-P2, MCZ-P3, MCZ-P4, MCZ-P7, MCZ-P9;</u> 3. <u>3.</u> The extent and effect of non-compliance with MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, MCZ-S3, MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5, MCZ-S6, MCZ-S7, MCZ-S8, MCZ-S9, MCZ-S10 and MCZ-S11; 4. <u>4.</u> The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G10797 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (<u>excluding supermarkets</u>); 5. <u>5.</u> The Residential Design Guide; 6. <u>6.</u> The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 7. <u>7.</u> Construction impacts on the transport network; and 8. <u>8.</u> The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.672	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, and particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Considers that amendments are required to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought, and to remove reference to the "City Outcomes Contribution". Considers that reference to residential units should also be removed as this rule is focussed on the built form rather than activities and this would be a double up.	Retain MCZ-R20 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.673	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Supports this rule in part, and particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Considers that amendments are required to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought, and to remove reference to the “City Outcomes Contribution”. Considers that reference to residential units should also be removed as this rule is focussed on the built form rather than activities and this would be a double up.	Amend MCZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where: a. compliance with any of the requirements of MCZ-R19.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MCZ-P6, MCZ-P7, MCZ-P8 and MCZ-P9; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, MCZ-S3, MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5, MCZ-S6, MCZ-S7, MCZ-S8, MCZ-S9, MCZ-S10 and MCZ-S11; 3. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 4. The Residential Design Guide; <u>3. the following centres and residential urban design outcomes:</u> <u>a. provides an effective public private interface suitable for the location;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Appropriate response to neighbouring sites for the proposed activity.</u> <u>d. Provides high quality buildings.</u> 54. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 65. Construction impacts on the transport network; and 76. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. ...
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.161	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the relief sought, however, The RVA seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with The RVA’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA’s primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under MCZ-R20.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.161	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the relief sought, however, Ryman seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with Ryman’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman’s primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under MCZ-R20.
Investore Property Limited	405.116	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain MCZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.99	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.99	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.117	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend MCZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.100	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.100	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.118	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Support	Supports the preclusion of public and limited notification in MCZ-R20 and seeks that this rule is retained as notified but seeks that this be applied for all standards.	Seeks that the notification preclusion provision of MCZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) is retained as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.119	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Supports the preclusion of public and limited notification in MCZ-R20 and seeks that this rule is retained as notified but seeks that this be applied for all standards.	Seeks that MCZ-R20 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) be amended to provide provide that applications for which resource consent is required for non-compliance with MCZS[1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 or 11] is precluded from public or limited notification .
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.126	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Submitter considers that changes are required to MCZ-R20 for the following reasons: - The Design Guides should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - The City Outcomes Contribution will not be required if heightlimits are removed [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - "The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints" is vague and will be difficult to apply. It appears to refer to technical constraints which developers will necessarily take into account outside of the RM process. - "The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network" [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - "The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure" – This should be managed via development contributions / financial contributions.	Amend MCZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: ... 3. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 4. The Residential Design Guide; 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. Construction impacts on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. ...
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.257	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.275	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to "City Outcome Contributions" and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by The RVA.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.257	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.275	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to "City Outcome Contributions" and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by Ryman.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.127	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that changes are required to MCZ-R20 for the following reasons: - The Design Guides should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - The City Outcomes Contribution will not be required if heightlimits are removed [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - “The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints” is vague and will be difficult to apply. It appears to refer to technical constraints which developers will necessarily take into account outside of the RM process. - “The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network” [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - “The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure” – This should be managed via development contributions / financial contributions.	Seeks that MCZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) be amended (to clarify that applications that comply with all the relevant standards will not be notified) as follows: ... Notification status: ... <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of Rule 20.2.a which complies with MCZ-S1 to MCZ-S11 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u> ...
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.273	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.276	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to “City Outcome Contributions” and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by The RVA.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.273	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Allow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.276	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to “City Outcome Contributions” and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by Ryman.
Fabric Property Limited	425.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of “density done well” as stated in the Design Guide. Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.	Amend MCZ-R20.2.3 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows: ... 3. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107— City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building. ...
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Support	Supports the preclusion of public and limited notification and seeks that this is applied to all standards.	Retain MCZ-R20 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as notified, with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Considers appropriate that preclusion of public and limited notification seen in MCZ-R20 be applied to all standards. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend MCZ-R20 (construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MCZ-R20.2 which results from non-compliance with MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, <u>MCZ-S3</u> , MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5 and MCZ-S6, <u>MCZ-S7</u> , <u>MCZ-S8</u> , <u>MCZ-S9</u> , <u>MCZ-S10</u> , <u>MCZ-S11</u> is precluded from being publicly notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.302	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Support in part	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however included to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	Supports MCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.303	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Amend	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however included to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	Amend MCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... 3. The Residential Design Guide; and 4. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure; and <u>5. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, including for firefighting purposes.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.41	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.41	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.674	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, and particularly supports the preclusion public and limited notification. Considers that amendments are required to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought.	Retain MCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, to residential activities) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.675	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Amend	Supports this rule in part, and particularly supports the preclusion of public and limited notification. Considers that amendments are required to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought.	Amend MCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, to residential activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MCZ-P1, MCZ-P3, MCZ-S6 and MCZ-P8; 2. The extent of compliance with standards MCZ-S7, MCZ-S8 and MCZ-S9 and satisfaction of associated assessment criteria; 3. The Residential Design Guide <u>The following residential urban design outcomes:</u> <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings;</u> and 4. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.120	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain MCZ-R21.1 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, to residential activities) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.101	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.101	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.121	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend MCZ-R21.1 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, to residential activities) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.102	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.102	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R21	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.304	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R22	Support in part	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Supports MCZ-R22 (Outdoor storage areas), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.305	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R22	Amend	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Amend MCZ-R22 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site. b. Screening does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.306	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Support	Supports the standard as it provides a maximum height of between 15m and 25m for any building	Retain MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Bus Barn Limited	320.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that specific height control (MCZ-S1 - Height control 2) should be increased to 40m, rather than 27m. The demand for housing and business in Lyall Bay (and Wellington) is high. Policy 3b states 'in metropolitan centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to reflect demand for housing and business use in those locations, and in all cases building heights of at least 6 storeys'. To truly reflect the policy of the NPS-UD the height limit on this windfall site, the district plan should allow an increase to allow for more development to cater for high demand of housing in Lyall Bay, which in turn would support the local area.	Amend MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: ... Height control area 2 Kilbirnie (except as below) 27m <u>40m</u> ...
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.166	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.676	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that amendments are required to provide for building heights of 15 storeys (55 metres). Notes that no clarification is provided in the plan for why height limits are required. Considers that amendments are required to the Metropolitan Centre building height controls (MCZ-S1) to enable building heights of up to 15 storeys or 55 metres. This change will enable greater development capacity and is appropriate given the identification of the Metropolitan Centres as significant sub-regional centres second only to the City Centre in the city hierarchy. Considers that amendment is required to enable fence heights of up to 2 metres.	Retain MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and seeks amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.47	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / MUZS1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.677	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to provide for building heights of 15 storeys (55 metres). Notes that no clarification is provided in the plan for why height limits are required. Considers that amendments are required to the Metropolitan Centre building height controls (MCZ-S1) to enable building heights of up to 15 storeys or 55 metres. This change will enable greater development capacity and is appropriate given the identification of the Metropolitan Centres as significant sub-regional centres second only to the City Centre in the city hierarchy. Considers that amendment is required to enable fence heights of up to 2 metres.	Amend MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: 1. The following maximum height limits above ground level must be complied with: <u>Buildings and structures must not exceed a maximum height of 55m above ground level.</u> Location Limit Height control area 1 Johnsonville 25m Height control 2 Kilbirnie (except as below) 27m Height control area 3 Kilbirnie, north of Rongotai Road 15m 2. Fences and standalone walls must not exceed a maximum height of 1-82 metres (measured above ground level).
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.48	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.42	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Support	Stride supports the proposed 55m height limit within the Metropolitan Centre zone, for the reasons provided by the primary submitter and in Stride's primary submission.	Allow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.42	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Support	Investore supports the proposed 55m height limit within the Metropolitan Centre zone, for the reasons provided by the primary submitter and in Investore's primary submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.122	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Support in part	<p>Considers that the 35 m maximum height limit and extent is generally appropriate and supports it to the extent that it is more enabling than the height in the Operative District Plan; but seeks that it is amended to 50m for the central parts of the centre.</p> <p>It is important that the Metropolitan Centre zone provides appropriate building heights to enable sufficient development capacity to accommodate the population growth anticipated and the activities provided for. This will enable sufficient development needed in Johnsonville and is consistent with the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The area identified for this 50 m maximum height is shown in Appendix D of the submission.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>	Retain MCZ-S1 (maximum height) and seeks amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.123	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that the 35 m maximum height limit and extent is generally appropriate and supports it to the extent that it is more enabling than the height in the Operative District Plan; but seeks that it is amended to 50m for the central parts of the centre.</p> <p>It is important that the Metropolitan Centre zone provides appropriate building heights to enable sufficient development capacity to accommodate the population growth anticipated and the activities provided for. This will enable sufficient development needed in Johnsonville and is consistent with the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The area identified for this 50 m maximum height is shown in Appendix D of the submission.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>	Amend MCZ-S1 (maximum height) to provide for a 50m building height within an area identified between Moorfield Road and Johnsonville - Porirua Motorway. [Refer to original submission for map].
Investore Property Limited	405.124	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Support	Support the Height Control 2 (Kilbirnie) of 27 m within the standard.	Seek to retain Height Control 2 (Kilbirnie) of MCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.128	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Acknowledges that some form of bulk or height limitation is appropriate in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, but consider replacing with floor area ratios.</p> <p>As an alternative to maximum heights, floor area ratios relative to lot sizes could be used as a method to control bulk and calculated based on the heights currently allowed. This would enable more holistic design outcomes that prioritise performance outcomes as opposed to arguably arbitrary height limits.</p>	Seeks that Council consider replacing MCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) maximum height limits with floor area ratios.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.129	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Amend	<p>If height limits are retained, 35m should apply across both Metropolitan Centres. This is in line with the purpose of Metropolitan Centres and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD), Policy (3)(b).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Seeks that if height limits are retained, amend Kilbirnie to 35m.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.130	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Submitter considers that if height limits are retained, there should be further scope for development above the façade height, e.g. plant rooms, sloping roofs, etc.</p> <p>The submitter considers that it is the view from the street which is the greatest concern (i.e. the height of the parapet).</p> <p>The submitter considers that the way the current height limits are drafted encourages a 'flat haircut' style of building and limits potential roof designs.</p>	<p>Seeks that MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended as follows:</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <p>...</p> <p>d. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m; and</p> <p>e. Lift overruns provided these do not exceed the height by more than 4m;</p> <p>f. <u>Circumstances where up to 50% of a building's roof in elevation exceeds the maximum height where the entire roof slopes 15° or more; or</u></p> <p>g. <u>Circumstances where, in respect of flat roofs or roofs sloping less than 15°, non-habitable rooms (such as plant rooms) and other roof-top structures may exceed the height, provided those structures are set back from the leading edge of the parapet by at least 2 metres and do not exceed 50% of the overall roof area.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Rachel Underwood	458.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes the provision to allow six-storey buildings considering that it will result in cold, sunless, wind canyons.	Amend MCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) to retain existing low-rise or one-level buildings adjacent to the roadside with three-storey (or six-storey) buildings set back.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Support in part	<p>Supports in general the 35m height limit</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Retain MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified, with amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers appropriate that an amendment to MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to increase the height limit to 50m in the central parts of the centre.</p> <p>Considers that maximum height limit of 35 metres will not be sufficient to enable the development that is needed in Johnsonville, and the level that is appropriate for a Metropolitan Centre zoning in accordance with the strategic direction of the Proposed District Plan or the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Considers that a two-tiered approach to building height would be appropriate, and have seen this applied in the Kilbirnie Metropolitan Centre.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to provide for a 50m building height within the area shown on the map in Appendix C.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for attachment labelled Appendix C]</p>
McDonald's	274.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.167	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Oppose	<p>Oppose</p> <p>There are many buildings with a height less than the required minimum that will contribute positively to a well-functioning urban environment. The proposed standard will result in too many buildings requiring resource consent and is not an efficient or effective method to implement the policies of the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Delete MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.54	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Support	Submission point 349.167 supports FSNI submission point 476.46.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Oppose	MCZ-S2 is opposed in its entirety and should be deleted. The standard is overly onerous, when the PDP should be promoting development in the Centres. If this is to be retained in some degree ,it should be refined to be a building frontage height standard and limited to specified streets as identified on the planning maps to achieve centre vibrancy and amenity.	Delete MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Support	Submission point 359.80 supports submission point 476.46.	Allow
Z Energy Limited	361.87	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Support in part	MCZ-S2 is supported in so much as it seeks to enable a higher density of activities in the CC by enabling buildings of greater heights than other zones. This standard applies to every new 'building' or 'structure', which are both defined in the PDP and essentially includes any physical object that is fixed to the ground with no qualifying dimensions. [Submitter identified MCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) instead of MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height); submission points have been changed to refer to MCZ-S2]	Retain MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) with amendment. [Inferred decision requested]
Z Energy Limited	361.88	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Amend	Considers that MCZ-S2 should be amended to consider include exclusions for any building or structure that cannot be occupied by a person. [Submitter identified MCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) instead of MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height); submission points have been changed to refer to MCZ-S2]	Amend MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) as follows: 1. A minimum height of 7m is required for: a. New buildings or structures; and b. Additions to the frontages of existing buildings and structures. <u>This standard does not apply to:</u> <u>1. Any building or structure that is unable to be occupied by people.</u>
Investore Property Limited	405.125	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Support in part	Considers that the standard should only apply to identified active frontages. This is to recognise that smaller building types may be needed for practical reasons on larger development sites such as the Johnsonville centre alongside taller buildings. Restricting this standard to active frontages ensures that good urban design outcomes are still achieved.	Retain MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) with amendment.
Investore Property Limited	405.126	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the standard should only apply to identified active frontages. This is to recognise that smaller building types may be needed for practical reasons on larger development sites such as the Johnsonville centre alongside taller buildings. Restricting this standard to active frontages ensures that good urban design outcomes are still achieved.	Amend MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) as follows: 1. A minimum height of 7m is required for: a. New buildings or structures <u>on sites with active frontages</u> ; and b. Additions to the frontages of existing buildings and structures <u>on sites with active frontages</u> .
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.131	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Support in part	Supports MCZ-S2 in part. The submitter considers that the minimum building height (7m) is generally appropriate in the Metropolitan Centre Zones, however, the submitter suggests more flexibility to breach the standards where the new building will result in a quality urban design outcome.	Retain MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) with amendments.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.92	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Oppose	Submission point 416.131 seeks to amend MCZ-S2. FSNI submission point 476.46 seeks to delete MCZ-S2 in it's entirety.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.132	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Amend	Submitter considers that the minimum building height (7m) is generally appropriate in the Metropolitan Centre Zones, however, the submitter suggests more flexibility to breach the standards where the new building will result in a quality urban design outcome.	Seeks that MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) be amended, with the assessment criteria where the standard is infringed to include urban design outcomes.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Support in part	Supports in part MCZ-S2 (Minimum Building Height) .	Retain MCZ-S2 (Minimum Building Height) as notified, with amendments. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to MCZ-S2 (Minimum Building Height) so that the minimum building height standard only applies to identified active frontages.</p> <p>Considers that this would recognise that smaller building types may be needed for practical reasons on larger development sites such as the Johnsonville centre alongside taller buildings.</p> <p>Considers that restricting this standard to active frontages would ensure that good urban design outcomes are still achieved.</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-S2 (Minimum Building Height) as follows:</p> <p>1. A minimum height of 7m is required for:</p> <p>a. New buildings or structures <u>on sites with active frontages</u>; and</p> <p>b. Additions to the frontages of existing buildings and structures <u>on sites with active frontages</u>.</p>
Foodstuffs North Island	476.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S2	Oppose	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	Delete MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.307	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S3	Support	Supports the standard as it provides a maximum height of between 15m and 25m for any building	Retain MCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) as notified.
McDonald's	274.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S3	Oppose	<p>Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	Delete MCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.168	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S3	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the minimum floor-to-floor ceiling heights for new development.</p> <p>The standard is overly prescriptive, does not provide for the specific requirements of drive-through facilities, and is unworkable from an operational perspective, and will only serve to increase the cost and/or regulatory processes of the development.</p>	Delete MCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.55	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S3	Support	Submission point 349.168 supports FSNI submission point 476.47.	Allow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S3	Oppose	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	Delete MCZ-S3 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.169	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S4	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.678	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S4	Support in part	<p>Considers amendments to MCZ-S4 are required to achieve consistency with any recommended changes to the height in relation to boundary rules and height for the residential zones.</p>	Retain MCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.679	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S4	Amend	<p>Considers amendments to MCZ-S4 are required to achieve consistency with any recommended changes to the height in relation to boundary rules and height for the residential zones.</p>	Amend MCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary) to align with changes sought to MCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and MCZ-S2 (Minimum building height).
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.170	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S5	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-S5 (Verandah control) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.89	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S5	Support in part	MCZ-S5 is partially supported as relates to specific sites identified on the Planning Maps with a 'verandah control'. However, the performance standard would apply if Z Energy was seeking consent for a building or structure and requires a verandah to extend the full width of the building elevation. This is not practical in the context of a service station, where the buildings on the site are usually a canopy over the refuelling area and the ancillary retail building to one side or to the rear.	Retain MCZ-S5 (Minimum building height) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.90	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S5	Amend	Considers that MCZ-S5 should be amended to have greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. It is sought that this standard not apply to buildings where there is functional requirement to not include a verandah. (Option A)	Amend MCZ-S5 (Minimum building height) as follows: 1. Verandahs must be provided on building elevations on identified street frontages <u>except where there is a functional requirement for a building to not contain a verandah.</u> ...
Z Energy Limited	361.91	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S5	Amend	Considers that MCZ-S5 should be amended to have greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. It is sought that this standard not apply to service stations. (Option B)	Amend MCZ-S5 (Minimum building height) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Any scheduled building identified in SCHED1-Heritage buildings. However, if for any reason these buildings received Council approval (resource consent or other approval) to be demolished, then a verandah would be required for any replacement buildings on these sites; and b. Any building where compliance with the standard results in an encroachment into the dripline of an existing street tree. <u>c. Service stations</u>
Z Energy Limited	361.92	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S5	Amend	Considers that MCZ-S5 should be amended to have greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. It is sought that this standard recognise functional requirement in the assessment criteria. (Option C)	Amend MCZ-S5 (Minimum building height) as follows: ... Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. The extent to which any non-compliance: a. Will adversely affect the comfort and convenience of pedestrians; b. Will result in further street trees being added to public space as part the development; and <u>c. Is required for on-site functional or operational needs</u> 2. The continuity of verandah coverage along the identified street, informal access route or public space
McDonald's	274.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Oppose in part	Considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls in Centres and Mixed Use Zones are overly prescriptive.	Retain MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls), subject to amendment outlined other submission points.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McDonald's	274.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity. It would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Amend MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows: 1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage or a non-residential activity frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building, must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; b. Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and c. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; 2. Any new building or ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: a. Is more than 4 3 metres wide; and b. Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; and c. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent. 3. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent; and 4. Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a non-residential activity frontage control must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and b. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.180	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. The RVA considers that residential activities, including retirement villages, should be permitted at ground floor.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.180	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages, should be permitted at ground floor.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.171	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.56	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Oppose	Submission point 349.171 seeks to retain MCZ-S6 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.48 seeks that the provision is amended.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Support in part	The restricted discretionary activity status to infringe the active frontage standards of MCZ-S6, NCZ-S6, and LCZ-S6 is supported. Notwithstanding, it is noted that supermarkets are unlikely to comply with these standards in any circumstance (being built up to the street edge on all street boundaries; a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; 50% visually transparent shutter doors), owing to genuine operational reasons. Whilst Woolworths acknowledges that the assessment criteria associated with the standard enable the consideration of those operational and functional needs, the standard represents another circumstance whereby consents would always be required for supermarkets, despite supposedly being encouraged with the relevant CMUZ.	Retain MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Amend	<p>Considers that supermarkets are unlikely to comply with the restricted discretionary standards of MCZ-S6 in any circumstance, owing to genuine operational reasons.</p> <p>While the assessment criteria associated with the standard enable the consideration of those operational and functional needs, the standard represents another circumstance whereby consents would always be required for supermarkets, despite supposedly being encouraged with the relevant CMUZ. This standard should be amended to not apply to new or extended supermarkets. The restricted discretionary activity status to infringe this standard is supported.</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any new building or addition to an existing building (<u>excluding new supermarkets or additions to an existing supermarket</u>) on an identified street with an active frontage must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; Any ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is more than 3 metres wide; and Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building <u>on a site located on an identified street with an active frontage</u> must be at least 50% visually transparent; and Any new building or addition to an existing building (<u>excluding new supermarkets or additions to an existing supermarket</u>) on a site with a non-residential activity frontage control must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Support	Submission point 359.82 partly supports FSNI submission point 376.48.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Z Energy Limited	361.93	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Support in part	MCZ-S6 is partially supported as it requires that buildings are built up to the street edge along the full width of the site, that glazing is provided and that the principal entrance is located on the front road boundary.	Retain MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.94	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that MCZ-S6 should be amended to recognise the operational and functional requirements of existing service stations and should be amended.	<p>Amend MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any new building or addition to an existing building adjoining an identified street with an active frontage control must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for that building to be set back from the street edge. In this case, 1b would not apply;</u> Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for the principal entrance to not front the street.</u> ... Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a non-residential activity frontage control must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for that building to be set back from the street edge.</u> Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for the principal entrance to not front the street.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.680	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that MCZ-S6 should be amended so that active frontage controls only apply where necessary, such as along principal roads/arterials not necessary along connecting streets. Only buildings that are located along any street edge should be controlled, rather than buildings on the whole site where an active frontage applies. Active frontage controls on streets and buildings where these matters do not apply should be deleted. These amendments recognise that active frontage controls are useful to achieve well-functioning urban environments where they are specifically applied on key roads where character and amenity values anticipated by underlying zoning are present.	Amend MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) to only apply for buildings that are located along principal roads/arterials and along any street edge.
Investore Property Limited	405.127	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Support in part	Supports this control and associated provisions in part, and agrees with the intent around urban design, but considers that it provides insufficient exceptions for functional requirements such as vehicle entrances. Considers the requirement should be amended so that so that only 70% of an active frontage must be built up to the street edge, in order to allow for functional requirements on the remaining 30% of the street frontage.	Retain MCZ-S6.1.a (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) with amendments.
Investore Property Limited	405.128	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Amend	Supports this control and associated provisions in part, and agrees with the intent around urban design, but considers that it provides insufficient exceptions for functional requirements such as vehicle entrances. Considers the requirement should be amended so that so that only 70% of an active frontage must be built up to the street edge, in order to allow for functional requirements on the remaining 30% of the street frontage.	Amend MCZ-S6.1.a (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows: 1. Any new building or addition to an existing building adjoining an identified street with an active frontage must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full 70% of the width of the site <u>boundary</u> bordering any street boundary, <u>subject to functional requirements.</u>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.133	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Amend	Submitter considers that there should be more flexibility to breach the standard where the overall design has a positive effect on the streetscape.	Amend MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: The extent to which: ... b. The building frontage is designed and located to create a strong visual alignment with adjoining buildings <u>or otherwise enhances the streetscape;</u> and ...
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.93	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Support	Submission point 416.133 seeks to amend MCZ-S6. FSNI submission point 476.48 also seeks to amend MCZ-S6.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Support in part	Supports MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) and associated provisions in part, and agrees with the intent around urban design.	Retain MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as notified, with amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that the active frontage controls provide insufficient exceptions for functional requirements such as vehicle entrances. Seeks amendments to the active frontage controls and all associated provisions so that only 70% of an active frontage must be built up to the street edge, in order to allow for functional requirements on the remaining 30% of the street frontage.	Amend MCZ-S6.1.a. (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows: 1. ... a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full 70% of the width of the site <u>boundary</u> bordering any street boundary, <u>subject to functional requirements.</u> ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Oppose in part	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.</p> <p>Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage or a non-residential activity frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building, must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; Any new building or ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is more than 4 metres wide; and Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; and Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent; and Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a nonresidential activity frontage control must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.47	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.47	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested										
Foodstuffs North Island	476.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Amend	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.</p> <p>Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend MCZ-S6 (Active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls) as follows:</p> <p>1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage or a non-residential activity frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building. must-</p> <p>a) Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary;</p> <p>b) Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and</p> <p>c) Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary;</p> <p>2. Any <u>new building or</u> ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that:</p> <p>a) Is more than 4 <u>3</u> metres wide; and</p> <p>b) Extends from a height of 1m above ground level to a maximum height of 2.5m; and</p> <p><u>c) Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u></p> <p>a. Any roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building must be at least 50% visually transparent; and</p> <p>4. Any new building or addition to an existing building on a site with a nonresidential activity frontage control must-</p> <p>a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; and</p> <p>b. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.</p>										
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.48	Part 4 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow										
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.48	Part 4 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S6	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow										
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.681	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S7	Support in part	Supports this standard in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility.	Retain MCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) and seeks amendment.										
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.682	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S7	Amend	Supports this standard in part but considers that amendments are required to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility.	<p>Amend MCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Residential unit type</th> <th>Minimum net floor area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Studio unit</td> <td>30m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>1 or more</u> bedroom unit</td> <td>40m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2+ bedroom unit</td> <td>55m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>...</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Residential unit type	Minimum net floor area	Studio unit	30m ²	<u>1 or more</u> bedroom unit	40m ²	2+ bedroom unit	55m²	...	
Residential unit type	Minimum net floor area														
Studio unit	30m ²														
<u>1 or more</u> bedroom unit	40m ²														
2+ bedroom unit	55m²														
...															
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.134	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S7	Oppose	<p>Opposes MCZ-S7 as the submitter considers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in MCZ-P1 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure. 	Delete MCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) in its entirety.										

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.135	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S7	Amend	Opposes MCZ-S7 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in MCZ-P1 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure.	Seeks that if Council does decide to retain MCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) minimum residential unit sizes, it should be clearly defined that hotel accommodation, student accommodation and other similar accommodation types are distinct from residential unit sizes. The definition of residential units does not clearly exclude student accommodation and may render it subject to these minimum sizes.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S7	Support in part	Supports in part MCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size).	Retain MCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) as notified, with amendments.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S7	Amend	Seeks that MCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) is amended to ensure that well designed smaller apartments are provided for to in order ensure housing affordability, consistency with the NPS-UD, and to acknowledge diverse housing needs.	Amend MCZ-S7 (Minimum residential unit size) as follows: ... a. Studio unit 35 25m ² b. 1 bedroom unit 40 30m ² c. 2+ bedroom unit 55 m ²
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.281	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S8	Oppose in part	Considers retirement villages should be excluded from this standard as in the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Opposes MCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) and seeks to amend.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.282	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S8	Amend	Considers retirement villages should be excluded from this standard as in the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Amend MCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) to exclude retirement villages.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.683	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S8	Support in part	Supports this standard in part but is opposed to requiring communal outdoor living space in addition to private outdoor living space. Considers that it is not clear whether communal outdoor living space is required in addition to, or as an alternative to private outdoor living space. Considers that amendments are required to either: - clarify that communal outdoor living space is not required but can be provided as an alternative to private outdoor living space, or - to remove the requirement to provide communal outdoor living space. Also considers that amendment to the minimum dimension is required.	Retain MCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.684	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S8	Amend	Supports this standard in part but is opposed to requiring communal outdoor living space in addition to private outdoor living space. Considers that it is not clear whether communal outdoor living space is required in addition to, or as an alternative to private outdoor living space. Considers that amendments are required to either: - clarify that communal outdoor living space is not required but can be provided as an alternative to private outdoor living space, or - to remove the requirement to provide communal outdoor living space. Also considers that amendment to the minimum dimension is required..	Amend MCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) as follows: Living space type a. Private i. Studio unit and 1- bedroom unit 5m ² 1.8m ii. 2+ bedroom unit 8m ² 1.8m b. Communal i. For every 5 units 10m² 8m

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.136	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S8	Oppose	Opposes MCZ-S8 as the submitter considers: - Minimum outdoor living space sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from lack of outdoor living space are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum outdoor living space sizes do not reflect the policy in MCZ-P1 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure.	Delete MCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) in its entirety.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	FS14.3	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S8	Oppose	Fire and Emergency consider the NZBC needs to be updated to catch up with the changing urban environment, and that there is a lack of clarity / consistency in the interpretation / application of the NZBC and the RMA with respect to operational firefighting requirements. As such, Fire and Emergency disagree that fire egress issues that arise from lack of outdoor living spaces are best dealt with by other legislation. Fire and Emergency consider that district plan provisions ought to address these matters up front in order to manage the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, and for their health and safety in accordance with Section 5 of the RMA.	Disallow / Retain MCZ-S8 as notified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S8	Support	Supports MCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) as it enables the ability to provide communal outdoor living space as an alternative to private outdoor living space.	Retain MCZ-S8 (Residential – outdoor living space) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.685	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S9	Oppose	Opposes MCZ-S9 as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living.	Delete MCZ-S9 (Minimum outlook space for multi-unit housing) in its entirety as notified.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.283	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S10	Oppose in part	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 10 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for retirement villages are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes MCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) and seeks amendment as follows: 1..... [figure] <u>This standard does not apply to retirement villages.</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.686	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S10	Oppose	Opposes MCZ-S10 as it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.	Delete MCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) in its entirety as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.129	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S10	Oppose	Considers that this standard will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves. It is also impractical as it provides a more restrictive standard for the placement of two residential buildings on the same site, than it does for residential buildings on two separate adjoining sites.	Delete MCZ-10 (Minimum building separation distance) in its entirety.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S10	Oppose	Considers standard MCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design. Considers MCZ-S10 is impractical as it provides a more restrictive standard for the placement of two residential buildings on the same site, than it does for residential buildings on two separate adjoining sites.	Delete MCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.172	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S11	Support	Support	Retain MCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.76	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S11	Oppose	Submission point 349.172 seeks to retain MCZ-S11 as notified. FSNi submission 476.95 point seeks to delete MCZ-S11 in its entirety.	Disallow

Commercial and Mixed use - City Centre Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.284	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S11	Amend	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for LCZ-R18 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend MCZ-S10 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows: 1..... [figure] <u>This standard does not apply to retirement villages.</u>
Woolworths New Zealand	359.83	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S11	Amend	Considers that MCZ-S11 should be amended to introduce operational and functional requirements to infringements to maximum building depth since continuous external wall depth greater than 25m may be difficult to avoid in some larger scale proposals. Development of that scale may warrant consent and assessment, so long as that assessment is commensurate to the scale of the proposal, its context and those operational and functional requirements.	Amend MCZ-S11 (Maximum building height) as follows: 1. The extent to which the design mitigates the effect of a long featureless building elevation; and 2. Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites. 3. <u>The extent to which any non-compliance is necessary to provide for the functional needs or operational needs of a proposed activity</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.687	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S11	Oppose	Opposes MCZ-S11 as it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.	Delete MCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.130	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S11	Oppose	Considers that this standard will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.	Delete MCZ-11 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.137	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S11	Oppose	Submitter considers that the maximum building depth is too restrictive and the submitter does not consider that it meets the section 32 Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Delete MCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S11	Oppose	Considers MCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design.	Delete MCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-S11	Oppose	Opposes the Centre standards which sets a maximum 25m continuous depth of any external side wall. The word “continuous” is defined as forming an unbroken whole, without being interrupted. It is unclear whether the standard would still apply if the side wall was modulated. It would appear that the intent of these standards relates to privacy and dominance effects on neighbours and preventing a long featureless building façade. Privacy and dominance effects are more appropriately dealt with via the height, height in relation to boundary and outlook space standards. Furthermore, any new building in a Centre zone that is visible from the public realm requires consent and consideration of objectives and policies that also address amenity and design. Considers that the standards on maximum building depth are unnecessary and will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design.	Delete MCZ-S11 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.
Andrew Haddleton	23.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that allowing buildings up to 28.5m will remove some of the character of the city and there are other areas where high-rise buildings could go. Instead buildings up to 18m (like the existing Embassy Theatre) will maintain the balanced aesthetic appearance of the street.	Seeks that the allowable building height in the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is sympathetic to the surrounding heritage buildings and character of the city. [Inferred decision requested]
Mark Tanner	24.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	The CCZ (City Centre Zone) is supported because densification of CBD, Te Aro, and Adelaide Road will accommodate projected population increases.	Retain CCZ (City Centre Zone) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tim Bright	75.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes the edge of the Mount Victoria suburb being zoned CCZ.	[Not specified]
Judith Graykowski	80.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Oppose the Western edge of Mount Victoria being zoned City Centre.	Seeks that the Western edge of Mount Victoria is rezoned
Joanna Newman	85.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes the western edge of the legal suburb of Mt Victoria being included in the CCZ (City Centre Zone). Considers that Cambridge Terrace forms the logical eastern boundary of the CCZ. CCZ is incompatible with the current, historical, Wellington City Council and Geographic Board definition of Mount Victoria as a suburb. Mount Victoria distinctive and strong identity to its residents and the city, dating back to its origins in 1840. Its main streets were laid out according to the 1840 plan by William Mein-Smith, surveyor for the New Zealand Company. The current low-rise but historically dense residential area extends well into the area currently designated City Centre Zone and intended for building at least 10 storeys high. Boundaries of the suburb of Mount Victoria are defined, and the suburb named, by The New Zealand Geographic Board and gazetted by Land Information New Zealand. Wellington City Council documents also show the western boundary of Mount Victoria along Cambridge Terrace, putting the islands between the two Terraces in Mount Victoria. Throughout WCC planning documents, including the Draft Spatial Plan, Mount Victoria is references are to the "suburb" of Mount Victoria, which must be understood to mean both the New Zealand Geographic Board and the Wellington City Council defined suburb. When WCC issues resource consents, it classifies consents applied for or granted in the part of Mount Victoria proposed to be zoned City Centre as Mount Victoria. Supports evidence submitted by Mt Victoria Historical Society.	Seeks that the CCZ (City Centre Zone) east of Cambridge Terrace in Mount Victoria be rezoned to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone). [Inferred decision requested]
Aro Valley Community Council	87.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Considers that it would be inappropriate and dangerous to classify 290 Willis Street as a City Centre Zone. The site is adjacent to the dangerous Karo Drive and Willis Street intersection.	Seeks that 290 Willis Street is rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.47	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>
Aro Valley Community Council	87.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that the sites at 290, 292 , 294, 296, 298, 300, 302, 304 and 306 Willis Street were never built to be part of the Central City - and have never operated as part of the Central City. A historical mapping error that gives this impression has been repeatedly acknowledged by the WCC but left unaddressed.</p>	<p>Seeks that 290, 292 , 294, 296, 298, 300, 302, 304 and 306 Willis Street are rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero	FS54.48	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Considers that the western edge of Mt Victoria should not be CCZ (City Centre Zone) Considers that CCZ is incompatible with various definitions of Mt Victoria as a suburb. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the area of Mount Victoria that is CCZ (City Centre Zone) is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Area. [Inferred decision requested]
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports all moves towards higher density housing in the CCZ. Supports a focus on high density rather than all housing supply as this is a more sustainable, affordable, resource efficient approach, and promotes connectivity within the city.	Seeks that all moves towards higher density housing in the City Centre Zone are supported. [Inferred decision requested].
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Considers that further steps can be taken to ensure housing quality, affordability and accessibility.	Not specified.
Vivienne Morrell	155.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Oppose the Western edge of Mount Victoria being zoned City Centre.	Seeks that the Western edge of Mount Victoria is rezoned.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dr Briar E R Gordon and Dr Lyndsay G M Gordon	156.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposal to zone much of the area of Thorndon east of the motorway as CCZ, with the implication of high/medium density intensification in the residential and educational area of Selwyn and Guildford Terraces.</p> <p>Considers that the area is surrounded by buildings of high public value and interest, and Selwyn Terrace has a community of heritage houses. The area affords heritage and amenity values to the whole city and is too precious to be subject to the pressures of high density development.</p> <p>Enabling buildings of the proposed heights would be detrimental to the views and also interfere with the important listed viewshafts referred to in Sir Douglas White's submission.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Reject zone change of the area of Thorndon east of the motorway to City Centre Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.68	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	These submissions align with the Association's submissions for the Hobson precinct, the Portland/Hawkestone precinct, and the Selwyn precinct.	Allow
James and Karen Fairhall	160.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	Seeks that good quality intensification of the CCZ should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.
James and Karen Fairhall	160.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Michael O'Rourke	194.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes the strip south of the Basin Reserve up Adelaide Road to John Street being zoned as CCZ. Notes that by various measures, including the Wellington Regional Council City Zone for public transport ending at the Basin, this area is not the CBD. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that the Adelaide Road spine is made High Density Residential Zone.
Angus Hodgson	200.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Support a dense urban centre for Wellington, drawing together our homes, work places, entertainment and leisure spaces, and green spaces.	Seeks that the densification within the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is retained as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Angus Hodgson	200.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the introduction of minimum height requirements, which will assist in creating more attractive streetscapes generating a coherent rhythm, and more importantly allow for greater density by precluding underdevelopment of City Centre Zone sites.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) as notified.
Angus Hodgson	200.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Opposes the effective removal of setback requirements in the CCZ (City Centre Zone). Considers that sense of human scale is important within the urban centre. Considers that setback requirements assist in mitigating negative wind effects, allow for greater natural light on street sides, connections to natural landscape, and reduce the risk of knocking effect in seismic and high wind events.	Seeks the addition of setback requirements that take into account width of the streets and height of a proposed building into the CCZ (City Centre Zone).
Wellington City Youth Council	201.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the PDP's emphasis on promoting productive use of City Centre spaces, including requiring accommodation sites to have non-residential use of the ground floor such as cafes, restaurants, dairies, etc.	Retain the City Centre Zone chapter as notified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the City Centre should be a people-centric place to live, work, and enjoy.	Seeks that the PDP facilitates pedestrianisation of areas such as Cuba street to stimulate business activity and make better use of limited space.
Avryl Bramley	202.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that Rules currently allow multi story buildings in the Central city to have multiple car parks. Typically these are then used for non-residential dedicated single user park where the vehicle is not used at all during the day. In short the company car loafing in the company car park after a peak hour journey to transport an individual from home to work and return. These cars are expensive in terms of green and require expensive peak hour traffic schemes paid for by the community but benefit only a few. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks addition of rules to limit number of non residential on site in building car parks permitted to those necessary for the service and maintenance of the building plus a small margin over and above.
Avryl Bramley	202.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that Rules currently allow multi story buildings in the Central city to have multiple car parks. Typically these are then used for non-residential dedicated single user park where the vehicle is not used at all during the day. In short the company car loafing in the company car park after a peak hour journey to transport an individual from home to work and return. These cars are expensive in terms of green and require expensive peak hour traffic schemes paid for by the community but benefit only a few. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks addition of rules to create a sinking lid policy on existing car parks used for those same purposes and to reregister their use into the same categories and newly created parks.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dougal and Libby List	207.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City. Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.
Dougal and Libby List	207.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design. Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.
Craig Forrester	210.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City. Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.
Craig Forrester	210.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes the western edge of the legal suburb of Mt Victoria being included in the CCZ (City Centre Zone). Considers that Cambridge Terrace forms the logical eastern boundary of the CCZ. Considers that CCZ is incompatible with the current, historical, Wellington City Council and Geographic Board definition of Mount Victoria as a suburb. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the CCZ (City Centre Zone) east of Cambridge Terrace in Mount Victoria be rezoned to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone). [Inferred decision requested]
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.73	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the operative District Plan strikes an appropriate balance with CCZ encroachment on residential zones by containing central area activities within the central area and a range of non-residential activities in residential zones, provided character and amenity standards are maintained and adverse effects are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>The purpose of those provisions in the ODP have been diluted in the PDP.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that policies are added that address encroachment of city centre activities into adjoining residential zones.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.95	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	<p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>10min walkable catchment</p> <p>Specific heritage identification and assessment</p> <p>Views contributing to sense of place and identity</p> <p>Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell</p> <p>Boffa Miskell streetscapes</p> <p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>CCZ encroachment on residential zones</p> <p>Old St Pauls height controls</p> <p>Preserve viewshalfs</p>	Allow
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Considers that that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain the provisions applicable to "residential activities" in the City Centre Zone as notified.
Generation Zero Inc	254.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the introduction of the chapter should be amended for consistency.	<p>Amend introduction of the City Centre Zone as follows;</p> <p>In locations where rapid transit investment has been signalled measures have been included to enable opportunities for more intensive, comprehensive development to occur, particularly in areas within a walkable distance <u>catchment</u> of planned rapid transit stops.</p>
Wheeler Grace Trust	261.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that the opportunity for residential intensification would be better reflected with HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).</p> <p>Changing from Inner Residential to City Centre Zone would drastically change Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>Opposes the element of the NPS-UD application regarding commercial activities.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace does not have a mix of land uses - it is all residential except the British High Commission, which has it's frontage on Hill Street.</p> <p>For Selwyn Terrace to be CCZ it would need better road access.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace is unique and has character, making CCZ inappropriate.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Selwyn Terrace, Thorndon is rezoned as High Density Residential Zone.
Steve Dunn	288.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that intensification in Newtown should be focussed along Adelaide Road</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that intensification in Newtown should be focussed along Adelaide Road.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers the need for a Design Review Panels for all inner city developments where developments are over 3 levels. The wholesale adoption of the MDRS standards could well result in a drastic lowering of design standards of housing, given that there are no quality control standards applied at the same time.</p> <p>A solution would be a mandatory Design Panel Review, as it would encourage high quality design outcomes in the city.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that a mandatory Design Panel Review be adopted for all inner city developments.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.16	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports the need for Design Review Panels.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.224	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.224	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	Considers that the Council needs to work harder to create good quality meaningful living conditions for residents in Te Aro to ensure that this area will flourish and not become a slum.	Not specified.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that Adelaide Road should not be classified as CCZ. The street is likely unsuitable for the creation of further high-rise areas due to it being the former boggy route of a wetland stream. Medium-rise development to the level of 5-6 storeys and the occasional nine storey tower should be continued.	Remove Adelaide Road from City Centre Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone is undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Murcott	322.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace residential enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace residential enclave not be classified as City Centre Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.58	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the residential area of Portland Crescent should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the residential area of Portland Crescent not be classified as City Centre Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.59	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the residential area of Hawkestone Street should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the residential area of Hawkestone Street not be classified as City Centre Zone.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.60	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Richard Murcott	322.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that high density City Centre areas should have incentives to build and densify, potentially through rates. This would take the focus away from densifying Wellington's inner city residential areas that are full of character, green spaces and oftentimes significant heritage. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that incentives be placed to encourage densification in City Centre Zones.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.61	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone , and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission. [Refer to original submission]
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone , and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission. [Refer to original submission]
Property Council New Zealand	338.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the Proposed District Plan's proposal to encourage more inner city living, greater density of urban form, and more efficient use of sites within the City Centre.	Retain the 'City Centre Zone' chapter as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Carolyn Stephens	344.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to more comprehensively provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that enhanced sunlight access be provided to outdoor and indoor living areas.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.17	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	This submission recognises the importance of sunlight for people in central Wellington. Wellington Civic Trust supports this submission, which is also in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space.	Allow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.285	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Metropolitan Centre Zone is required.	Add the following new policies in the City Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> 1. <u>Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> 2. <u>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> a. <u>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> b. <u>Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u> <u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>
Z Energy Limited	361.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	The CCZ is generally supported, as it enables and reinforces the continued primacy of the Wellington central city area as the principal commercial and employment centre servicing the city and metropolitan region. It is also a major employment hub for the region and contains a mix of inner city living, entertainment, educational, government and commercial activity.	Retain the City Centre Zone chapter as notified.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to more comprehensively provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that enhanced sunlight access be provided to outdoor and indoor living areas.
Waka Kotahi	370.405	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports providing for access to active and public transport activity options, discouraging carparking at ground level and the quality design outcomes.	Retain the City Centre Zone chapter as notified.
Parliamentary Service	375.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	Submitter notes that in the City Centre Zone, the provisions of the Proposed Plan need to recognise the unique role that the Parliamentary Precinct plays in NZ and that the planning framework provides for the safe, effective and efficient functioning of parliament.	Not specified.
Parliamentary Service	375.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	As it is currently drafted, the permitted activities in the City Centre Zone do not provide for Parliamentary activities, and therefore resource consent would be required for such activities under CCZ-R16. The Parliamentary Service does not anticipate this to be the intended outcome of this chapter, and suggests that CCZP1 includes a specific reference to Parliamentary activities, and a permitted activity rule is introduced for Parliamentary activities.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jane Szentivanyi	376.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose in part	Considers that, as currently drafted, the current provisions of the District Plan will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design. Negative effects would include public and private amenity, reverse sensitivity effects, including along the boundary with adjoining residentially zoned areas, and impacts on character and heritage.	Not specified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	The Introduction to the CCZ chapter is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain the Introduction of the City Centre Zone chapter, with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the CCZ chapter should be amended to clarify the scarcity of available public open space in the City Centre Zone, and how this shortfall is going to be corrected through the Plan and other methods available to the Council. It is noted that provisions that would provide additional public spaces are lacking. A statement recognising the need for additional public spaces in areas that currently fall short of existing needs should be added in the Introduction. The wording should also explain how the shortfall is going to be made up before further residential development is provided for.	Amend the Introduction of the City Centre Zone chapter to state the need for more available public open space in the City Centre Zone and how this shortfall is going to be corrected through the Plan and other methods available to the Council.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that Taranaki Whānui should be engaged as partners in any development as a matter of first priority, as Taranaki Whānui are the hold ahi kā in regard to the city centre zone and development at Te Ngakau Civic Centre. [see original submission]	Seek to amend in chapter, to include <u>Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in the City Centre Zone.</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.55	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.688	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	The use of standards to manage potential adverse effects across the PDP is generally supported, but changes are sought.	Retain the City Centre Zone chapter with amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.689	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that CCZ height controls should be amended to ensure the NPSUD and the Housing Supply Act are effectively and efficiently implemented, that intensification is enabled in areas of high accessibility to commercial amenity, community services and public transport, and that height controls enable a transition of height and density within the urban built form from higher heights and densities in centres. There may be a number of other consequential changes needed to standards to give effect to these height adjustments as noted in this submission such as increasing height in associated wind and daylight standards. These changes should be proportionate to the changes in building height sought to address any transition issues between zones and provide for increased levels of intensification.	Amend the City Centre Zone chapter to add a height control of: i. 43m within a 400m walkable catchment of a City Centre Zone ii. 36m within a 400-1500m walkable catchment of a City Centre Zone.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.33	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone (43m within a 400m walkable catchment of the CCZ and 36m within a 400-1500m walkable catchment of the CCZ) go well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.8	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone goes well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity and other values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.10	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone go well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity and other values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.8	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone (43m within a 400m walkable catchment of the CCZ and 36m within a 400–1500m walkable catchment of the CCZ) go well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow
Jenny Gyles	FS53.8	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Considers that the proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone goes well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity and other values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow
Helen Foot	FS62.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone goes well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of exposed weather conditions in Oriental Bay.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.108	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Considers the increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone goes well beyond requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.49	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.38	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	We oppose the submission to introduce new height limits around the CCZ. These are not required and will have significant impact on residential areas.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.37	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposes the submission to introduce new height limits around the CCZ. These are not required and will have significant impact on residential areas.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.690	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Generally supports the introduction and application of a City Centre Zone in the Proposed District Plan. Considers that an amendment is needed to delete Comprehensive development from the Introduction as there are no rules to implement this approach.	Retain introduction of the City Centre Zone as notified and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.691	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Generally supports the introduction and application of a City Centre Zone in the Proposed District Plan. Considers that an amendment is needed to delete Comprehensive development from the Introduction as there are no rules to implement this approach.	Amend the eighth paragraph of the introduction of the City Centre Zone as follows: In locations where rapid transit investment has been signalled measures have been included to enable opportunities for more intensive, comprehensive development to occur, particularly in areas within a walkable distance of planned rapid transit stops.
Oyster Management Limited	404.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks amendment to the City Centre Zone to enable well-functioning urban environments in the City Centre zone.
Oyster Management Limited	404.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the recognition of the City Centre as the primary centre serving the wider Wellington region. Supports the creation of well-functioning urban environments, which is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Retain CCZ (City Centre Zone) - Introduction as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.77	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Submission point 404.44 supports FSNI submission points 476.96 - 476.99	Allow
Oyster Management Limited	404.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the 90m Height Control Overlay should extend over 141 The Terrace, 294 and 298 Lambton Quay so it is contiguous with the height control applying to 312 Lambton Quay and other sites to the south.	Amend 90m Height Control Overlay to extend over 141 The Terrace, 294 and 298 Lambton Quay. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].
Guy Marriage	407.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that if Te Aro is to flourish, and not to become a slum, then the WCC need to work far harder to create good quality meaningful living conditions for Te Aro residents. One of the key aspects of this will be the adoption of equally good measures for access to sunlight and daylight to the residents of the far more dense streets of Te Aro and the rest of Central. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of the set-back provisions from the Draft District Plan (required developments on narrow streets to have step back as the yrose higher, so as to stop the obliteration of daylight and sunlight to the residents on lower levels).
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.160	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Considers that set backs in narrow streets will enhance liveability and wellbeing for residents in high density residential areas and is a longstanding technique for achieving good quality density.	Allow
Guy Marriage	407.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the increases in height limits in the CCZ leaves all existing home owners in buildings 6-9 storeys tall now facing the prospect of being surrounded by towers 14-20 storeys tall, casting long deep shadows for entire blocks southwards. The effect on the existing buildings will be massive, severe, and will have a catastrophic effect on property values. The strategy of creating Te Aro as an area suitable for the continued clustering of tall towers is badly flawed. Geologically the Te Aro Basin is crisscrossed with the remains of several small creeks, leading down to what was formerly a swamp filled with eels, and a channel from Newtown, through the Basin Reserve, down to the sea near the present Waitangi Park. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that building heights in Te Aro are restricted to 5 - 6 storeys, with the occasional 9 storey towers. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.162	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow
Guy Marriage	407.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the extension of the CCZ down Adelaide Road is flawed, as this is the lowers point on the path from Newtown to the Basis and is also the former boggy route of a wetland stream, so will be unsuitable for the creation of high rises.	Seeks that the City Centre Zone chapter is not extended along Adelaide Road.
Guy Marriage	407.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers the addition of a setbackstandard important to ensure daylight into living spaces. Considers that the Sydney Design is a appropriate method. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of a setback standard to narrow streets in the City Centre Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.161	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Considers that set backs in narrow streets will enhance liveability and wellbeing for residents in high density residential areas and is a longstanding technique for achieving good quality density.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.138	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter is seeking fewer prescriptive standards.</p> <p>Submitter considers that Wellington needs to ensure that we are not unnecessarily preventing innovation by prescribing housing standards, such as minimum unit sizes and outdoor living space requirements (in particular, within the City Centre Zone). While the standards currently drafted will be appropriate for many uses, they may not suit everyone and they do not respond to emerging trends in apartment design.</p> <p>The standards also risk stifling affordable housing within the City Centre Zone by preventing more affordable building typologies.</p>	<p>Seeks to remove the extent of prescriptive standards, such as minimum unit sizes and outdoor living spaces (in particular, within the City Centre Zone).</p> <p>[inferred decision requested].</p>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.139	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.</p>
Fabric Property Limited	425.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the objectives and policies for the City Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the City Centre as the primary commercial and employment centre for the wider region (CCZ-O1), the recognition of the role of the City Centre in accommodating growth (CCZ-O2), the enablement of the most intensive form of development concentrated in the zone (CCZ-O3), and the recognition of the benefits of intensification (CCZ-P5).</p>	<p>Seeks that the City Centre Zone chapter is retained as notified, with amendments.</p>
Chrissie Potter	446.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	<p>Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p>
Chrissie Potter	446.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Considers that Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria.</p> <p>Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Not specified.</p>
Dorothy Thompson	449.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	<p>Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dorothy Thompson	449.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Considers that Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria.</p> <p>Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.
David Lee	454.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes City Centre Zoning for the Western edge of Mt Victoria.	Seeks to rezone Western edge of Mt Victoria from being City Centre Zone.
Catherine Penetito	474.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced.</p> <p>The Hall of Memories, the Carillon and the old museum building are too important to be overshadowed by residential or other buildings.</p>	Seeks that the building height zones adjacent to Item 40 (National War Memorial and Carillon) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is reconsidered to ensure it is not overshadowed.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.18	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these submissions, which are in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space in Central Wellington.	Allow
Catherine Penetito	474.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced.</p> <p>The Hall of Memories, the Carillon and the old museum building are too important to be overshadowed by residential or other buildings.</p>	Seeks that the building height zones adjacent to Item 41 (National/Dominion Museum and National Art Gallery (former)) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is reconsidered to ensure it is not overshadowed.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.19	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these submissions, which are in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space in Central Wellington.	Allow
Catherine Penetito	474.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced.	Seeks that the building height zones adjacent to Item 42 (Home of Compassion Crèche (former)) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is reconsidered to ensure it is not overshadowed.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.20	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these submissions, which are in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space in Central Wellington.	Allow
Catherine Penetito	474.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced.	Seeks that the building height zones adjacent to Item 424 (Army Headquarters (former)) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is reconsidered to ensure it is not overshadowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.21	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these submissions, which are in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space in Central Wellington.	Allow
Foodstuffs North Island	476.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Railway Metro (2 Bunny Street, Pipitea).	Retain City Centre Zoning of New World Railway Metro (2 Bunny Street, Pipitea) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Willis Street Metro (70 Willis Street, Wellington Central).	Retain City Centre Zoning of New World Willis Street Metro (70 Willis Street, Wellington Central) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Wellington City (279 Wakefield Street, Te Aro).	Retain City Centre Zoning New World Wellington City (279 Wakefield Street, Te Aro) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Thorndon (150 Molesworth Street).	Retain City Centre Zoning of New World Thorndon (150 Molesworth Street) as notified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that tall buildings around spaces are creating shade and wind problems. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that in any future developments, the effect on adjacent public spaces is addressed.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.100	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Provision of medium density housing zones Provision of Character Precincts. Tall buildings create wind and shade problems	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports mention of active engagement with mana whenua in the development of the Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct in the chapter introduction.	Retain introduction of the City Centre zone with amendment.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the introduction to the chapter statement could be improved by requiring partnership with mana whenua in the development of the Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Amend the introduction of the City Centre zone to require partnership with mana whenua in the development of the Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ- PREC01	Support	Supports in its entirety CCZ-PREC01 (Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) and considers that they adequately address the unique range of factors, including heritage, which need to be considered in any (re)development of this area.	Retain CCZ-PREC01 in its entirety as notified.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ- PREC01	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.24	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ- PREC01	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision or development in accordance with s.6 of the RMA.	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ- PREC01	Support in part	The recognition of Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct within the Central City Zone (CCZ-PREC01), and the specific introductory statement and aims that apply to the Precinct are supported. However, an amendment to the wording is sought.	Retain CCZ-PREC01 (Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that wording in CCZ-PREC01 should be clarified. Wording in the introductory sentence portrays the precinct as redevelopment area. The findings of a seminar run by the Civic Trust in 2021 were that people seek to retain as much as possible of the existing buildings, structures and spaces for reuse, rather than demolition and replacement buildings. It is sought that this is reflected in the introductory statement.	Amend wording in CCZ-PREC01 (Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: The purpose of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct is to provide for civic activities, functions, <u>public use and</u> areas of open space and redevelopment . <u>Any future change in the precinct must ensure that development of change while ensuring that any future development</u> respects the special qualities of the area, including the concentration of listed heritage buildings.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.1	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PREC01	Oppose	Willis Bond and Company Limited consider references to new development and redevelopment within Te Ngākau in CCZ-PREC01 should be retained as they are relevant to certain parts of Te Ngākau such as the Michael Fowler carpark site and they reflect Te Ngākau Civic Precinct Framework adopted by Council.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.165	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PREC01	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.140	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PREC01	Amend	Submitter agrees that the Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct (TNCSP) needs to be a vibrant and welcoming space. It also needs to be able to adapt in years to come to Wellington's changing needs. Given the intention to demolish CAB (and possibly MOB) is it appropriate to refer to them in this Policy?	Amend CCZ-PREC01 (Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: CCZ-PREC01Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct ... The Precinct is Wellington's unique civic place. It is located in the heart of the City Centre and is a destination in itself. It is also an anchor point and gateway that connects the city centre's entertainment area, the waterfront and the Central Business District. Wellington's major civic and entertainment venues are located within the precinct, including the Wellington Town Hall, City Gallery Wellington (Te Whare Toi), Wellington City Library (Te Matapihi), Michael Fowler Centre, Civic Administration Building, Municipal Office Building, and Capital E. ...
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.22	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PREC01	Oppose	The two buildings that are sought to be removed from mention in the introduction to the Te Ngākau Precinct are part of the existing precinct. The Wellington Civic Trust opposes their removal from the description. It is inappropriate to presume that they do not form part of the existing character and quality of the Precinct.	Disallow
Paul Burnaby	44.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Draft provision CCZ-R21 (Comprehensive development of land 2000sqm in area or greater) should be 'reinstated' in the now notified City Centre Zone provisions.	Seeks that Draft District Plan CCZ-R21 is reinstated.
Jill Wilson	218.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that the minimum requirements for apartments in new apartment buildings may not suffice for emergency supplies storage. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks amendment to require new apartment buildings to incorporate adequate storage of emergency supplies for residents.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and land use activity rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones are amended. The zone frameworks would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (MUZ-R13, CCZ-R16 and WFZ-R11).</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. The subject zones include suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the residential zones.</p>	<p>Amend the land use activity rule framework for the City Centre Zone to include a new permitted activity rule applying to "supported residential care activities" as follows, if the definition of "supported residential care activity" is retained:</p> <p><u>CCZ-RX Supported residential care activities</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 residents : and</u> <u>b. The activity is located:</u> <u>i. Above ground floor level; or</u> <u>ii. At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as an active frontage; or</u> <u>iii. At ground level along any street not identified as requiring veranda coverage; or</u> <u>iv. At ground level on any site contained within a Natural Hazard Overlay.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with the requirements of CCZ-RX.1.a cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity may adversely impact on the amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-RX.2.a is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>3. Activity status: Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-RX.1.b cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-RX.3.a is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p>
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that there should be a set-back standard for narrow streets and lanes to ensure daylight to living spaces in the CCZ. The Sydney Design Standard is considered an appropriate method to use.</p>	<p>Seeks a setback standard is added in the City Centre Zone.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.286	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Metropolitan Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the City Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.287	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that as currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the City Centre Zone (CCZ—R12). Considers that the City Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under CCZ-R20), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	<p>Add the following "retirement villages" rule into the City Centre Zone chapter:</p> <p><u>CCZ-RX Retirement villages</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>
Parliamentary Service	375.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that a new Precinct should be recognised in the CCZ chapter. The Parliamentary Precinct and the activities that occur on that Precinct should be recognised in at least as enabling a way as the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct has been in the City Centre Zone. The Parliamentary Precinct is distinct from any other area in the Wellington district, and the district plan provisions should ensure that the uniqueness is acknowledged, as well as ensuring that the Precinct can continue to be used for its Parliamentary purpose.</p> <p>It is submitted that the Parliamentary Precinct is of at least as much significance as the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, and should therefore be recognised in the planning provisions in a similar way. It is essential that the Parliamentary Precinct can continue to be fit for its Parliamentary purpose. The planning framework should therefore enable the use of the land to continue to be able to respond to the changing needs of Parliament.</p> <p>These Parliamentary Precinct provisions could be analogous to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objectives: CCZ-PREC-01, CCZ-PREC-02, CCZ-PREC-03 - Policies: CCZ-PREC01-P1, CCZ-PREC01-P2, CCZPREC01- P3, CCZ-PREC01-P4 - Rules: CCZ-PREC01-R1, CCZ-PREC01-R2, CCZ-PREC01- R3, CCZ-PREC01-R4, CCZ-PREC01-R5, CCZ-PREC01-R6, CCZ-PREC01-R7, and CCZ-PREC01-R7 - Standard: CCZ-PREC01-S1. 	<p>Seeks that the Parliamentary Precinct be recognised in planning provisions in a similar way to the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct.</p> <p>These Parliamentary Precinct provisions could be analogous to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objectives: CCZ-PREC-01, CCZ-PREC-02, CCZ-PREC-03 - Policies: CCZ-PREC01-P1, CCZ-PREC01-P2, CCZPREC01- P3, CCZ-PREC01-P4 - Rules: CCZ-PREC01-R1, CCZ-PREC01-R2, CCZ-PREC01- R3, CCZ-PREC01-R4, CCZ-PREC01-R5,
Parliamentary Service	375.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that CCZ rules need to be clarified to make clear that Parliamentary activities are permitted in the City Centre Zone – because such activities do not clearly fall within any of the activities listed at CCZ-P1. It is submitted that a new permitted activity rule is therefore required to ensure that parliamentary activities are provided for in this zone.	<p>Add new Rule in the City Centre Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>CCC-R13 Parliamentary activities</u> <u>1. Permitted</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the City Centre Zone chapter should have an additional Rule immediately before or after CCZ-PREC01-R7. Demolition of buildings should be made a separate category of activity within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, separate from the City Centre applicable rule. All demolitions relating to the Precinct should be carefully considered and publicly notified.</p> <p>At present it appears that there is no ability for the acceptability of demolition of an existing building or structure to be considered as a separate matter from the development of a consented new building or creation of public space. It is noted that the current rule for demolition of buildings does not refer to the rule by which a new building in the Precinct may seek consent, CCZR18, which may be a lacuna in the plan or a deliberate omission.</p>	<p>Add new Rule in the City Centre Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>CCZPRE-RXX: Demolition or removal of buildings and structures in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The demolition or removal of a building is required to avoid an imminent threat to life and/or property.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Discretionary</u> <u>Where the demolition or removal of a building or structure:</u> <u>i. Enables the creation of public space; or</u> <u>ii. Is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building.</u></p> <p><u>3. Activity status: Non-complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZPRE-RXX1 or 2 cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PRE-RXX 2. or 3. must be publicly notified.</u></p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.166	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that the City Centre Zone chapter should have an additional Rule for the Precinct that relates to the modification of existing open space or the development of new open space. An additional rule similar to that in the Waterfront Zone is sought.	<p>Add new Rule in the City Centre Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>CCZPRE-RXXX: Development of new public space, or modification of existing public open space in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Discretionary</u> <u>The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022].</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PRE-RXXX must be publicly notified.</u></p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.167	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.129	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial and mixed use zones that do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Add new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>CCZ-SX:</u> <u>Boundary setbacks.</u> <u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u></p> <p>AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.40	Part 3 / Commercial and Mixed Use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.141	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities.</p> <p>Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.</p>	Seeks that at minimum, add a new rule as CCZ-PREC01-R7 for Educational Facilities as a Permitted activity status and re-number CCZ-PREC01-R7 (all other land use activities) (currently CCZ-PREC01-R7) to CCZ-PREC01-R8.
Catharine Underwood	481.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that all new buildings in the inner city should have a minimum set back of at least 1.5 (2m is better) to give room for a green corridor. Side yards are a good place for rubbish bins, compost bins or sheds to store bikes and other toys. A good example of why larger set backs are needed in The Paddington on Taranaki Street, which was meant to have several street trees lining the pavement and softening the development, as part of the consent but ended up with no trees due to underground services like pipes, telecommunications, electricity and sewerage. If there had been a setback, a green front would have been possible. The residents of The Paddington and Wellington are the poorer because of this.	<p>Add a new Standard in the City Centre Zone chapter setting boundary setbacks of at least 1.5m for all new buildings.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O1	Support	No specific reason provided.	Retain CCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.173	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O1	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O1	Support	CCZ-O1 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to, a range of residential, commercial and community activities.	Retain Objective CCZ-O1 (Purpose) a notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.92	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O1	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.692	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O1	Support	Supports CCZ-O1.	Retain CCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O1	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Paul Burnaby	44.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes d, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support	No specific reason provided.	Retain CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.308	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support	Supports the objective a the zone has sufficient serviced development capacity meet its short, medium and long term residential and business growth needs.	Retain CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.174	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support	CCZ-O2 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.93	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.693	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support in part	Supports CCZ-O2, but considers amendment is required that clarifies that the Central City Zone contains high density residential living rather than medium density housing.	Retain CCZ-O1 (Accommodating growth) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.694	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Amend	Supports CCZ-O2, but considers amendment is required that clarifies that the Central City Zone contains high density residential living rather than medium density housing	Amend CCZ-O1 (Accommodating growth) as follows: The City Centre Zone plays a significant role in accommodating residential, business and supporting community service growth, and has sufficient serviced development capacity to meet its short, medium and long term residential and business growth needs, including: 1. A choice of building type, size, affordability and distribution, including forms of medium and high-density residential living housing ,
Ministry of Education	400.142	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support in part	Supports CCZ-O2 in part.	Retain CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ministry of Education	400.143	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Amend	Seeks CCZ-O2 be amended to explicitly recognise and provide for educational activities to in the CCZ.	Amend CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Accommodating growth The City Centre Zone plays a significant role in accommodating residential, business and supporting community service growth, and has sufficient serviced development capacity <u>and additional infrastructure</u> to meet its short, medium and long term residential and business growth needs, including: ... 4. Convenient access to a range of open space, including green space, and supporting commercial activity, and community facility options <u>and educational facilities</u> .
Oyster Management Limited	404.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.142	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O2	Support	Supports the direction of CCZ-O2 to provide for a choice of building type, size, affordability and distribution, including forms of medium and high-density housing.	Retain CCZ-O2 (Accommodating growth) as notified.
Paul Burnaby	44.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O3	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes d, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-O3 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O3	Support	No specific reason provided.	Retain CCZ-O3 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.175	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O3	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-O3 (Urban Form and scale) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O3	Support	CCZ-O3 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-O3 (Urban Form and Scale) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.94	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O3	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-O3 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.695	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O3	Support	Supports CCZ-O3.	Retain CCZ-O3 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O3	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-O3 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.143	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-O3	Support	Supports the scale and form of development within the city centre being the highest and most intensive form of development within the city.	Retain CCZ-O3 (Urban form and scale) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.176	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	CCZ-04 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support in part	Supports CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) in principle.	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.696	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Supports CCZ-04.	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified.
VicLabour	414.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Supportive of ahi ka provisions	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Amend	Considers that the objective should require partnership with mana whenua rather than engagement.	Seeks that CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) be amended to provide for partnership with mana whenua in terms of development.
Paul Burnaby	44.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.309	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Supports the objective as it seeks to produce a resilient urban environment that effectively adapts and responds to natural hazard risks, such as fire.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.177	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	CCZ-05 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-05 (Amenity and Design) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.476	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	The submitter strongly support this objective due to its emphasis on the need for climate change resilience and green space within the CBD. It does this alongside successfully balancing the maintenance and improvement of Wellington's important modern and heritage cultural sites demonstrating that ensuring Wellington's long term resilience and sustainability need not involve any loss of what makes Wellington, Wellington.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.29	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	This submission is in line with the general submission of Wellington Civic Trust (388.20) which seeks recognition of the need for more open space for a growing central city population.	Allow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support in part	Supports CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) in principle.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.697	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support in part	Supports CCZ-05, but considers that an amendment is required to balances the need to contribute to the amenity of neighbouring residential areas while achieving anticipated built form in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.698	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Amend	Supports CCZ-05, but considers that an amendment is required to balances the need to contribute to the amenity of neighbouring residential areas while achieving anticipated built form in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Amend CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as follows: Development in the City Centre Zone positively contributes to creating a high quality, well-functioning urban environment, including: ... 4. Contributing to the general amenity of neighbouring residential areas <u>while achieving the anticipated urban form of each zone</u> ;
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.23	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	It is appropriate that the policy direction acknowledge the anticipated built form each zone and not unintentionally prevent that from being realised.	Allow
Oyster Management Limited	404.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre. In particular, supports CCZ-05's direction regarding producing a resilient urban environment that effectively adapts and responds to natural hazard risks and the effects of climate change.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Supports this objective including 'Acknowledging and sensitively responding to adjoining heritage buildings, heritage areas and areas and sites of significance to Māori.'	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and Design) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.144	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Amend	Submitter considers that the requirement to acknowledge and respond to heritage buildings and areas should only apply where those heritage areas immediately adjoin the relevant development.	Amend CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as follows: Development in the City Centre Zone positively contributes to creating a high quality, well-functioning urban environment, including: ... 7. Acknowledging and sensitively responding to <u>immediately</u> adjoining heritage buildings, heritage areas and areas and sites of significance to Māori.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Burnaby	44.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.178	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	CCZ-06 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.699	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	Supports CCZ-06	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.179	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support	CCZ-07 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support in part	Supports CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) in principle.	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.700	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support in part	Supports CCZ-07, but considers that an amendment is required to recognise that adverse effects do not include significant changes to an area anticipated by the planned urban built form in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.701	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Amend	Supports CCZ-07, but considers that an amendment is required to recognise that adverse effects do not include significant changes to an area anticipated by the planned urban built form in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Amend CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Adverse effects of activities and development <u>beyond the planned urban built form anticipated</u> in the City Centre Zone are managed effectively both:
Oyster Management Limited	404.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.147	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-02	Amend	Submitter considers that item 3 of CCZ-PREC-02: "Frames the square" implies that all development in the precinct is adjacent to the square.	Amend CCZ-PREC-02 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: Built form The scale, form and positioning of development within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct: ... 3. Frames the square <u>where situated adjacent to the square</u> ;
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.24	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-02	Oppose	The Civic Trust does not agree with this submission. Buildings can still "frame the square" even when they are set back or behind another building (if they are taller).	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.148	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-02	Amend	Submitter considers that item 4 of CCZ-PREC-02: "sunlight access within the precinct" should be focused on public spaces, rather than buildings.	Amend CCZ-PREC-02 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: Built form The scale, form and positioning of development within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct: ... 4. <u>Ensures a high degree of sunlight access is achieved within the precinct Ensures a high degree of sunlight access is achieved within public spaces in the precinct</u> ;
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-02	Oppose	The Civic Trust does not agree with this submission. Buildings can be part of the public realm – and in this situation the civic function would imply that they are likely to be. In such circumstances sunlight access within a building may be a desirable consideration.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.478	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-03	Support	Considers that Wellington has long prided itself on its walkability, however as of current much of casual navigation around the city centre relies on a harmful culture of jaywalking. It is important that the council is recognising the importance of maintaining current pedestrian linkages whilst acknowledging the need for enhancement.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-03 (Integration with the City Centre, Waterfront and wider transport network) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-03	Support	CCZ-PREC01-03 is generally supported.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-03 (Integration with the City Centre, Waterfront and wider transport network) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.149	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-03	Support	Agrees that Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct is an important pedestrian thoroughfare and pedestrian linkages from surrounding streets and spaces should be retained and improved if possible.	Retain CCZ-PREC-03 (Integration with the City Centre, Waterfront and wider transport network) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Supports the wide range of activities provided for under this policy.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain CCZ-P1.8 (Enabled activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain CCZ-P1.2 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Amend	<p>Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and land use activity rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones are amended. The zone frameworks would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (MUZ-R13, CCZ-R16 and WFZ-R11).</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. The subject zones include suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the residential zones.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows, if the definition of "supported residential care activity" is retained:</p> <p>CCZ-P1 Enabled Activities</p> <p>Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the purpose and ongoing viability of the City Centre Zone and enhances its vibrancy and amenity, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commercial activities; 2. Residential activities <u>and supported residential care activities</u>, except; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Along any street subject to active frontage and/or veranda coverage requirements; b. On any site subject to an identified natural hazard risk; ...
Stratum Management Limited	249.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Amend	Considers that this policy should include residential at ground level to match subsequent provisions, including for example CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) and CCZ-R12 (Residential activities).	<p>Amend CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Residential activities, except: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>At ground level</u> along any street... b. <u>At ground level</u> on any site...
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.310	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Supports the policy as it promotes the provision of emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate stations anywhere within the urban and rural environment.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support in part	Generally supports the objectives and policies of the City Centre Zone and the enablement of commercial activities	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities), subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.180	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.103	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	CCZ-P1 is supported as it enables a wide-range of activities including commercial activities (as defined).	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Parliamentary Service	375.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Parliamentary Service	375.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P1 does not provide for the use of the Parliamentary Precinct for parliamentary purpose, as it is not clear which (if any) of the listed activities “parliamentary activities” would fall within. It is therefore submitted that this policy needs to specifically provide for parliamentary activities to occur within the City Centre Zone. It is submitted that a corresponding permitted activity land use rule will also be required, otherwise such activities will be considered Discretionary under CCZ-R16, which is unlikely to have been the intention.	Amend CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the purpose and ongoing viability of the City Centre Zone and enhances its vibrancy and amenity, including: 1. Commercial activities; ... 11. Repair and maintenance service activities; and 12. Recreation activities; <u>and</u> 13. Parliamentary activities.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) in principle.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.702	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P1 but considers an amendment is required to recognise that residential activities are generally enabled. Considers that Policy CCZ-P2 provides the specifics about activities that should be restricted, noting that this is residential activities at ground floor in areas of identified natural hazard risk. Furthermore, Natural Hazard Area provisions control the location of hazard sensitive activities, such as residential units, within these areas (e.g. NH-R11).	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.703	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Amend	Supports CCZ-P1 but considers an amendment is required to recognise that residential activities are generally enabled. Considers that Policy CCZ-P2 provides the specifics about activities that should be restricted, noting that this is residential activities at ground floor in areas of identified natural hazard risk. Furthermore, Natural Hazard Area provisions control the location of hazard sensitive activities, such as residential units, within these areas (e.g. NH-R11).	Amend CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the purpose and ongoing viability of the City Centre Zone and enhances its vibrancy and amenity, including: 1. Commercial activities; 2. Residential activities; except: a. Along any street subject to active frontage and/or verandah coverage requirements; b. On any site subject to an identified natural hazard risk; ...
Oyster Management Limited	404.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Supports the discouragement of ground-level car parks in the city centre.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
McDonald's	274.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Opposed to all ground level car parking being considered as a potentially incompatible activity in the City Centre zone. The policy seeks to protect adverse effects on amenity therefore if the car parking is not visible then this policy should not apply. This would be consistent with the other centre zones which do provide such an exclusion.	Seeks that CCZ-P2.3 (Potentially incompatible activities) is amended as follows: ... 3. Carparking at ground level <u>visible at the street edge or public space</u> ;
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.181	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.57	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Oppose	Submission point 349.181 seeks to retain CCZ-P2 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.49 seeks to amend CCZ-P2.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.288	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Oppose in part	Opposes restrictions on retirement villages being established at ground floor level.	Opposes CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.289	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Opposes restrictions on retirement villages being established at ground floor level.	Seeks to delete clause (5) of CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.84	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P2 should be amended. The provision as drafted differs to Policy P4 of the LCZ and NCZ and provides some clarity as to why matters 1-5 have been included within the policy (being that they are considered 'potentially incompatible activities'). It is considered unnecessary to incorporate these clauses into Policy CCZ-2. Potentially incompatible activities (being activities not contemplated by the zone, or ones that infringe the zone standards) should be able to be accommodated in the zone if there is a functional and operational need and effects on the Centre are managed.	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the role and function of the City Centre Zone, where they demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone; or will not have an unacceptable adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: 1. Industrial activities; 2. Yard-based retail activities; 3. Carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; 4. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of vacant land; 5. Ground floor residential activities on street edges identified as having an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; and 6. Yard-based retail activities.
Z Energy Limited	361.104	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P1 for its intent in relation to new activities but considers it is too specific and it will impact on the continued operation, maintenance and upgrade of a range of existing activities. Some yard-based activities, like service stations, play a key role in providing essential services to enable a well-functioning urban environment.	Retain CZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P2 is too specific and should be amended. CCZ-P2 will impact on the continued operation, maintenance and upgrade of a range of existing activities. Some yard-based activities, like service stations, play a key role in providing essential services to enable a well-functioning urban environment.	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow <u>new</u> activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the City Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: 1. Industrial activities; 2. <u>Some</u> yard-based retail activities; 3. Carparking at ground level; 4. Demolition of buildings that result in the creation of vacant land; and 5. Ground floor residential activities on streets identified as having either an active frontage or verandah coverage and in any identified hazard risk areas.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.479	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	The submitter considers that the policy as it currently stands seeks to ensure that abnormal activities performed within the City Centre Zone would not have adverse effect on " Vitality, Vibrancy and amenity". However, the submitter considers that this does not place emphasis on the need to consistently maintain the Wellington City Centres walkability and sustainability in accordance with objectives 3 and 5. The submitter also considers that the policy leaves itself open for activities that could hinder the City Centres public transport network or climate change and Earthquake resilience	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the City Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy, and amenity, <u>walkability, climate change and earthquake resilience or ease of public transport access and use.</u> Potentially incompatible activities include: 1. Industrial activities; 2. Yard-based retail activities; 3. Carparking at ground level; 4. Demolition of buildings that result in the creation of vacant land; and 5. Ground floor residential activities on streets identified as requiring either an active frontage or verandah coverage and sites subject to an identified hazard risk.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.24	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	The listed values are all considered important for the vitality and resilience of the city centre. It is therefore considered appropriate to assess the adverse effects of potentially incompatible activities on these important values.	Allow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.59	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Oppose	Submission point 383.100 seeks to retain CCZ-P2 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.49 seeks to amend CCZ-P2.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.704	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support in part	Supports this policy but considers that amendments are required to provide for ground floor residential activities that are not visible from streets and notes that identified hazard risk is addressed in the natural hazards chapter so does not need to be referenced here.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.705	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Supports this policy but considers that amendments are required to provide for ground floor residential activities that are not visible from streets and notes that identified hazard risk is addressed in the natural hazards chapter so does not need to be referenced here.	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the City Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: ... 5. Ground floor residential activities <u>that are visible</u> on streets identified as requiring either an active frontage or verandah coverage and sites subject to an identified hazard risk.
Ministry of Education	400.144	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Supports CCZ-P2 as it is important to recognise and provide for educational facilities which will service the surrounding residential catchments and other community/commercial activities.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.58	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Oppose	Submission point 404.54 seeks to retain CCZ-P2 as notified. Submission point 476.49 seeks to amend CCZ-P2.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.150	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Submitter considers that carparking at ground level should only be a “potentially incompatible activity” where it occurs along building frontages.	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the City Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: 1. Industrial activities; 2. Yard-based retail activities; 3. Carparking at ground level <u>where it occurs along building frontages</u> ;
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.94	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Submission point 416.150 seeks a similar outcome to FSNI submission point 476.49.	Allow / Allow submission in part.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Oppose in part	Opposes all ground level car parking being considered as a potentially incompatible activity in the City Centre zone. The policy seeks to protect adverse effects on amenity therefore if the car parking is not visible then this policy should not apply. This would be consistent with the other centre zones which do provide such an exclusion. Retail activities such as supermarkets generally seek to provide on-site customer car parking. This policy, together with the public notification requirement under CCZ-R14.2.a, will act as a significant deterrent to development in City Centre zone.	Amend CCZ-P2.3 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: 3. Carparking at ground level <u>visible at the street edge or public space</u> ;
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.101	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A "discretionary" activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.182	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.106	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.706	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	Supports CCZ-P3.	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Paul Burnaby	44.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	Considers that the policy appropriately seeks to enable high density residential development in the zone.	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Amend	Considers that replacing the term 'abilities' with 'impairments' in CCZ-P4 is more appropriate. Notes that using the term 'abilities' to refer to disabled people is regarded as euphemistic by many within the disabled community.	Amend CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as follows: Enable high density, good quality residential development that: 1. Contributes towards accommodating anticipated growth in the city; and 2. Offers a range of housing price, type, size and tenure that is accessible to people of all ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities <u>impairments</u> . [Inferred decision requested]
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.183	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.292	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Supports CCZ-P5 and its recognition of the benefits of intensification by enabling greater height and scale of development, and the efficient optimisation of the development capacity of land.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.108	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.103	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.709	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.152	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Support allowing greater overall height and scale within the city centre.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.185	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.109	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.104	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.710	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support in part	Supports adaptive use within the CCZ but seeks amendments that recognise that ground floor residential activities may be appropriate where they are located at ground floor level but not fronting active streets. Considers not all hazards would restrict residential activities from locating at ground floor. For example - earthquake risk is likely to be just as high at ground floor as it is on other floors. In addition, considers the Natural Hazards chapter manages this issue.	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.711	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Amend	Supports adaptive use within the CCZ but seeks amendments that recognise that ground floor residential activities may be appropriate where they are located at ground floor level but not fronting active streets. Considers not all hazards would restrict residential activities from locating at ground floor. For example - earthquake risk is likely to be just as high at ground floor as it is on other floors. In addition, considers the Natural Hazards chapter manages this issue.	Amend CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as follows: Adaptive use Encourage new development and redevelopment in the City Centre Zone that is sustainable, resilient and adaptable to change in use over time, including enabling: 1. Sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be used and converted for a range of activities; and 2. Residential activities at ground floor level along fronting streets that are not subject to active frontage and/or verandah coverage requirements and sites free of any identified natural hazard risk.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.153	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Oppose	Submitter considers that while adaptive reuse is generally encouraged, it is already effectively controlled through: - market mechanisms (developers and property owners naturally wish to increase flexibility of their buildings); and - sustainability requirements and rating tools, which reward reuse.	Delete CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.186	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.110	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Ka) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) in principle.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.712	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified
Oyster Management Limited	404.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Ka) as notified.
VicLabour	414.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	Supportive of ahi ka provisions, particularly papakainga housing and consider that mana whenua should lead this.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports reference to papakainga.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified.
Paul Burnaby	44.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Supports policy CCZ-P8, particularly requirement to encourage diversity of accessible, well designed civic and public space as this will enable greater accessibility and mobilisation by everyone, including disabled people.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.187	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.111	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.106	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.103	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) in principle.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.713	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.154	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Support reinforcing the city centre's diversified and vibrant mix of activities and visually prominent buildings and variety of architectural styles. The District Plan should not shy away from permitting quality development at scale.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.
Paul Burnaby	44.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Supports the recognition of the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, as well as the providing for increased levels of residential accommodation anticipated.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.311	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to achieve quality design outcomes for new development in the zone. In order to achieve good quality design outcomes, which includes the provision of a safe environment and resilient urban environment, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy.	Supports CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) with amendment.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.62	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Oppose	Submission point 383.107 seeks to retain CCZ-P9 as notified. FSNI submission points 476.50 & 476.51 seek to amend CCZ-P9.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.104	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) in principle.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.714	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Generally supports this policy, but seeks amendment to: (a) The policy name to better reflect the intent of the policy and the subsequent wording, which seeks to manage new developments contribution to the city centre and streetscape; and (b) The policy wording to better recognise the CCZ rule setting and the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect; and to simplify and clarify the neighbourhood and townscape outcomes that plan is seeking to manage.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) and seeks amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.715	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	Generally supports this policy, but seeks amendment to: (a) The policy name to better reflect the intent of the policy and the subsequent wording, which seeks to manage new developments contribution to the city centre and streetscape; and (b) The policy wording to better recognise the CCZ rule setting and the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect; and to simplify and clarify the neighbourhood and townscape outcomes that plan is seeking to manage.	Amend CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: Quality design <u>City Centre</u> outcomes Require significant new development, and alterations and additions to existing development, at a site scale to positively contribute to the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity <u>planned urban built form and function</u> of the City Centre Zone by: 1. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive intensive development, including the extent to which the development: a. Acts as a catalyst for future change by reflecting <u>Reflects</u> the nature and scale of the development proposed <u>enabled</u> within the zone and in the vicinity and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood <u>City Centre</u> ; b. Optimises the development capacity of the land, particularly sites that are- i. Large; or ii. Narrow; or iii. Vacant; or iv. Ground level parking areas; ... 2. Ensuring that development, where relevant : a. Responds to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to: i. A scheduled site of significance to Māori; ii. A heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area; iii. An identified character overlay <u>precinct</u> ; ... g. Allows sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be converted to a range of activities, including residential along streets that are not subject to active frontage and/or verandah coverage requirements and sites free of any identified natural hazard risk.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.129	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Oppose	Considers the intended policy direction of listing sites with development capacity is helpful and appropriate.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.39	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Oppose	We oppose the amendment to CCZ-P9 to remove references in (1)(b) to large, narrow, vacant or ground level parking sites. The intended policy direction by listing sites with development capacity is helpful and appropriate.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	The recommended amendment is considered to provide clearer guidance regarding expectations around built form of larger projects.	Allow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.38	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposes the amendment to CCZ-P9 to remove references in (1)(b) to large, narrow, vacant or ground level parking sites. The intended policy direction by listing sites with development capacity is helpful and appropriate.	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.61	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Oppose	Submission point 404.61 seeks to retain CCZ-P9 as notified. FSNI submission points 476.50 & 476.51 seek to amend CCZ-P9.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Supports this policy to ensure that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.155	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) in part.	Not specified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.156	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	The submitter considers that this is a long (and confusing) provision and should be reviewed against the earlier policies to ensure it is succinct, focused and does not cover the same ground as other policies. If the Design Guides are retained (which the submitter opposes), the submitter considers that this policy should be reviewed for overlap with the Design Guides.	Seeks that CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) be amended to ensure it is succinct, focused and does not cover the same ground as other policies.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Submission point 416.156 seeks a similar outcome to FSNI submission points 476.50 & 476.51.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.157	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	The submitter considers that this is a long (and confusing) provision and should be reviewed against the earlier policies to ensure it is succinct, focused and does not cover the same ground as other policies. If the Design Guides are retained (which the submitter opposes), the submitter considers that this policy should be reviewed for overlap with the Design Guides.	Seeks that if the Design Guides are retained that CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) be reviewed for overlap with the Design Guides.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Submission point 416.157 seeks a similar outcome to FSNI submission points 476.50 & 476.51.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) with amendment.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Amend CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) to include the following: Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Burnaby	44.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Amend	Opposes CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space) relating to outdoor living spaces. As a result, Stratum seeks and amendment to CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) by deleting point (2) of CCZ-P10.	Amend CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as follows: Achieve a high standard of amenity for residential activities that reflects and responds to the evolving, higher density scale of development anticipated in the City Centre Zone, including: 1. Providing residents with access to an adequate outlook, and 2. Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.189	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.114	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.108	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.716	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support in part	Supports this policy in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Amendments to remove communal outdoor space requirements are also sought as it is considered this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space.	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.717	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Amend	Supports this policy in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Amendments to remove communal outdoor space requirements are also sought as it is considered this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space.	Amend CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as follows: Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.
Oyster Management Limited	404.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.168	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	Considers reference in CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) to "adequate outlook" and "convenient outdoor space" is necessary and important for residential wellbeing in high density environments.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.158	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Amend	Submitter considers that on-site residential amenity can be provided in a number of ways and should not be prescriptive, acknowledging that mandated types of amenity (such as outdoor space) can increase housing cost and prevent lower income residents living within the city centre. Submitter considers that the policy should acknowledge affordability constraints. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires district plans to "enable, in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible" (Policy 3). Submitter considers that this should not be restricted by prescriptive amenity requirements.	Amend CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as follows: Achieve a high standard of amenity for residential activities that reflects and responds to the evolving, higher density scale of development anticipated in the City Centre Zone <u>and the need to provide for a choice of building type, size, affordability and distribution</u> , including: 1. Providing residents with access to an adequate outlook; and 2. Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Burnaby	44.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-P11 as this refers to the City Outcomes Contribution.	Delete CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contributions)
Wellington City Youth Council	201.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	Supports the introduction of the 'City Outcomes Contribution' mechanism, ensuring larger commercial, residential and mixed use developments will become more publicly beneficial for everyone.	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that the introductory text to this policy requires clarification that it applies to over height and under height buildings and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building. As currently worded, the policy application is unclear. Equivalent changes may be required elsewhere within the chapter or in other chapters to ensure consistency of wording.	Seeks to amend CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) to clarify its intent in accordance with the third matter of discretion under Rule CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures)
McDonald's	274.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Seeks that CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.
Property Council New Zealand	338.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.208	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.208	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P11 should also make reference to disabled people by adding the term 'disability'.	Amend CCZ-P11(5) (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over and under height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the City Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: ... 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility/ <u>disability</u> . [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.190	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (and the associated policy and matters of discretion linkages), do not recognise or provide for the functional or operational requirements of activities.</p> <p>The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p> <p>The Design Guide places unreasonable requirements on applicants on matters that are more appropriately dealt with at a national level (for example, reducing travel/shipping costs of materials to reduce carbon emissions, and installing insulation above minimum requirements). The imposition of “thresholds” for certain types of development result in a “pass/fail” assessment being applied and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as follows:</p> <p>Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the City Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3.2. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4.3. Incorporating assisted housing into the development; where this is provided, legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5.4. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.63	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 349.190 seeks to amend CCZ-P11. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11 in its entirety.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.294	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of CCZ-P11 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. The policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) in its entirety as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.85	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P11 is unclear and should be amended. The provision contains an incorrect reference to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide document (should be G97 as opposed to G107). A review of the guideline indicates that G97 City Outcomes Contribution is only triggered for City Centre zone developments where they are under or over height development comprising 50 or more units or any comprehensive development). As such, the Policy as currently drafted implies that any non-residential development in the CCZ is subject to this policy which is incorrect. The above amendment seeks to align this Policy with the Guide document.	<p>Amend CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as follows:</p> <p>Require over and under height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development under or over height development comprising 50 or more units or any under or over height comprehensive development in the City Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G97G107, including through either:</p>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 359.85 seeks to amend CCZ-P11. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11 in it's entirety.	Disallow / Disallow this submission in part.
Z Energy Limited	361.115	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) which seeks to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107.	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.116	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P11 should also recognise the existing environment and the functional requirements of a range of existing activities.	<p>Amend CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as follows:</p> <p>Require over and under height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the City Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, <u>while recognising the existing environment</u>, including through either:</p> <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.109	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Opposes this policy which requires some developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions in accordance with the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. This is because: - This provision elevates what is normally a design guide into a rule. A design guide should be separate to a plan. The Design Guide should be an external document to the District Plan and be referenced as a guide only. - Further, this provision, provides a mechanism for the Council to require these aspects as part of a development. This is inappropriate. A development should be assessed on its merits.	Delete Policy CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution).
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.65	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	Submission point 404.63 supports FSNI submission point 476.52.	Allow
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.6	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports these submissions seeking deletion of the City Outcomes Contributions. While MRNZL recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.718	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose in part	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' for development for the following reasons: a. Considers it is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; b. Considers over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and c. Considers all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. Seeks amendments to the policy to instead encourage positive outcomes for development in the HRZ	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) and seeks amendment
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.162	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with The RVA's primary submission to have these references removed, however, The RVA seeks for this provision to be deleted in full.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.162	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with Ryman's primary submission to have these references removed, however, Ryman seeks for this provision to be deleted in full.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.719	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	<p>Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' for development for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. Considers it is inconsistent with the current legislative framework;</p> <p>b. Considers over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and</p> <p>c. Considers all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to the policy to instead encourage positive outcomes for development in the HRZ</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as follows:</p> <p>City Outcomes Contribution</p> <p>Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive Encourage development in the City Centre Zone to contribute to positive outcomes deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guideline G107, including through either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development, and where this is provided legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.
Oyster Management Limited	404.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.64	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 404.63 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11 in its entirety.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.
Investore Property Limited	405.131	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	<p>Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>	Seeks that CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) is deleted in its entirety as notified.
VicLabour	414.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.159	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support in part	<p>Supports CCZ-P11 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that CCZ-P11 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p>	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution), with amendments.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 416.159 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.160	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	<p>Supports CCZ-P11 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains “subject to” numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that CCZ-P11 is also phrased to “require” City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Delete CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) if height limits are also deleted.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 416.160 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.161	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	<p>Supports CCZ-P11 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains “subject to” numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that CCZ-P11 is also phrased to “require” City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Seeks that CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) be amended if floor area ratios are used instead of height standards. Amend to allow greater additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required) if the relevant outcomes are achieved.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 416.161 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.162	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	<p>Supports CCZ-P11 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains “subject to” numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that CCZ-P11 is also phrased to “require” City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Seeks that if CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) is retained, it should be re-phrased so that, rather than “Require over and under height” developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions, the height limit for developments is varied where City Outcomes Contributions are achieved. The change of phrasing reflects the possibility that, as currently proposed, over and under height developments still have a theoretical pathway to obtain a restricted discretionary consent without achieving City Outcomes Contributions. It would also make it clearer that the developer providing the outcome is entitled to the increase in height (or floor area).
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 416.162 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	Delete CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety.
Fabric Property Limited	425.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	[See original submission for further detail, outlined in previous submission point]	Delete CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety.
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	Considers that CCZ-P11 provides appropriate guidance on what buildings heights that are outside of the permitted parameters need to achieve.	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	<p>Opposes CCZ-P11</p> <p>Specifically opposes requiring contributions for development in the City Centre zone that is below the minimum height limit.</p> <p>While FSNI recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.</p>	Delete CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) and consequential references in their entirety.
Stratum Management Limited	249.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	<p>Considers that the policy seeks to recognise the "evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone..." which is supported.</p> <p>It then seeks to manage any associated adverse effects including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impacts of building dominance and the height and scale relationship; • Building mass effects, including the amount of light and outlook around buildings. <p>Considers that the policy can be read as being potentially inconsistent with Policy CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale).</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows:</p> <p>Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The impacts of building dominance and the height and scale relationship <u>where a building does not meet relevant standards; and</u> 2. Building mass effects, including the amount of light and outlook around buildings <u>where a building does not meet relevant standards; and</u> 3. The impacts on sunlight access to identified public space; and 4. The impacts of related construction activity on the transport network.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.313	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to manage any adverse effects associated with higher density development anticipated in this zone. In order to manage the full range of adverse effects, which includes consideration of fire safety in high density urban environments, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new high density developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy	Supports CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.314	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to manage any adverse effects associated with higher density development anticipated in this zone. In order to manage the full range of adverse effects, which includes consideration of fire safety in high density urban environments, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new high density developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy Note: Submitter refers to CCZ-P13, which is an error.	Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects including: 1. The impacts of building dominance and the height and scale relationship; 2. Building mass effects, including the amount of light and outlook around buildings; and 3. The impacts on sunlight access to identified public space; and 4. The impacts of related construction activity on the transport network; and <u>5. Accessibility for emergency service vehicles.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.191	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.117	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.480	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	The submitter considers that the policy fails to mention the impact of the development process on any of the Wellington Central City Zones sustainability goals. Whilst the submitter notes that the protection of the public transport network is important, The submitter suggests the addition of 1 new and amendment of 1 point in order to ensure the policy correctly upholds the ideals and vision held within the preamble and Objectives 3 and 5.	Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects including: 1. The impacts of building dominance and the height and scale relationship <u>2. The emission of greenhouse gases and waste water runoff from construction.</u> 3. Building mass effects, including the amount of light and outlook around buildings; and 4. The impacts on sunlight access to identified public space; and 5. The impacts of related construction activity on the transport network <u>and pedestrian linkages.</u>
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.110	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.720	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support in part	Supports policy subject to amendments that reflect NPSUD Policy 6.	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.721	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	Supports policy subject to amendments that reflect NPSUD Policy 6.	Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects <u>beyond those anticipated within the zone</u> including: ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.163	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	Submitter considers that the impacts of construction activity on the transport network should not be relevant in the resource consenting process. Submitter considers densification proposed by the District Plan will inevitably result in impacts.	Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects including: ... 4. The impacts of related construction activity on the transport network.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.26	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Oppose	As proposed, the impact on the transport network is an effect to be managed. Given the role and function of the zone, high traffic volumes are expected but works within the road corridor can cause serious delays on a network where there are high traffic volumes. The policy as drafted (appropriately) allows for the careful consideration of how construction could be provided for in a manner than reduces the impact on road users in the zone. Retain as drafted.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P1	Support	CCZ-PREC01-P1 is generally supported.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P1 (Activities) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.164	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P1	Support	Submitter agrees a range of activities should be supported within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P1 (Activities) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P2	Support in part	CCZ-PREC01-P2 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P2 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	Considers that CCZ-PREC01-P2 should be amended to clarify wording. Wording in portrays the precinct as redevelopment area. The findings of a seminar run by the Civic Trust in 2021 were that people seek to retain as much as possible of the existing buildings, structures and spaces for reuse, rather than demolition and replacement buildings. It is sought that this is reflected in the provision.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-P2 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: Provide for the staged redevelopment of managed change in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, and its connections with the transport network, wider City Centre Zone and Waterfront Zone, including: 1. Enhancing the public function, pedestrian network and public spaces within the precinct; 2. Maintaining its special character by managing the form, scale and intensity of development; 3. Ensuring land use activities and <u>any new</u> development are planned and designed in a co-ordinated, site-responsive, comprehensive and integrated manner; and 4. Enabling new development and a range of activities that are integrated and compatible with existing buildings and land uses in the precinct.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.165	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	Submitter considers that item 3 may result in a perverse situation where development is delayed while other potential development areas of Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct are being considered.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-P2 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: Provide for the staged redevelopment of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, and its connections with the transport network, wider City Centre Zone and Waterfront Zone, including: 1. Enhancing the public function, pedestrian network and public spaces within the precinct; 2. Maintaining its special character by managing the form, scale and intensity of development; 3. Ensuring land use activities and development are planned and designed in a co-ordinated, site-responsive, comprehensive and integrated manner <u>to the extent reasonable while allowing for development to progress in a natural manner</u> ; and 4. Enabling new development and a range of activities that are integrated and compatible with existing buildings and land uses in the precinct.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P2	Oppose	This submission cuts across a submission of the Civic Trust. The Trust does not see the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct as a giant redevelopment site. Our request is for policy recognition of the need for careful management of any change in the precinct. There is nothing "natural" in redevelopment although that is how the submission suggests it should be portrayed. The Civic Trust seek that its submission is allowed, and this one disallowed.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P3	Support in part	CCZ-PREC01-P3 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P3 (Access, connections and open space) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-PREC01-P3 should be amended to clearly state that the Precinct must be kept free of vehicular traffic.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-P3 (Access, connections and open space) as follows: Require that the use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct: ... 3. Provides well-designed, safe and accessible public and green open space, within the precinct. 4. <u>Avoids vehicle access at surface level with the precinct.</u>
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.166	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P3	Support	Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct provides an important central connection hub.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P3 (Access, connections and open space) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P4	Support	CCZ-PREC01-P4 is generally supported.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P4	Support in part	Supports CCZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) in principle.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.167	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P4	Support	The requirements stated reflect the importance of quality development within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Century Group Limited	238.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.192	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.78	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Submission point 349.192 supports FSNI submission point 476.100.	Allow
Z Energy Limited	361.118	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports Rule CCZ-R1 (Commercial Activities) which provides for commercial activities (as defined) as a permitted activity with no limitation as to the land use activity. It is understood that any new building or structure to be erected on would still need to comply with the applicable permitted activity performance standards under Standards CCZ-S1 - S13, or require consent as a restricted discretionary activity where those standards cannot be met.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.111	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports commercial activities, including offices and retail activities, being permitted in the City Centre zone. This is appropriate to enable the continued vibrancy of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.80	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Submission point 383.111 supports FSNI submission point 476.100.	Allow
Oyster Management Limited	404.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports commercial activities being Permitted in the City Centre Zone to ensure continued vibrancy of the city.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.79	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Submission point 404.65 supports FSNI submission point 476.100.	Allow
Fabric Property Limited	425.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports the commercial activities being permitted in the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial Activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports supermarkets as a permitted activity in the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R2	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R2 (Community facilities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R2	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R2 (Community facilities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R3	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Century Group Limited	238.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R3	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.145	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R3	Support	Supports CCZ-R3 as it provides for educational facilities as a permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R4	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R4 (Recreation activities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R4	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R4 (Recreation activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R5	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R5 (Arts, culture, and entertainment activities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R5	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R5 (Arts, culture and entertainment activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R6	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R6 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R6	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R6 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.315	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R6	Support	Supports the rule as it makes provision for new emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate stations anywhere within the urban and rural environment.	Retain CCZ-R6 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R7	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R7 (Marae activities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R7	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R7 (Marae activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R8	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R8 (Community corrections activities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R8	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R8 (Community corrections activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R8	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain CCZ-R8 (Community corrections activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R9	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R9 (Public transport activities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R9	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R9 (Public transport activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R10	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R10 (Visitor accommodation activities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R10	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R10 (Visitor accommodation activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R11	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R11 (Repair and maintenance service activities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R11	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R11 (Repair and maintenance service activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Amend point (iv) of the rule to ensure consistency.	Amend CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as follows: iv. At ground level on any site <u>not</u> contained within a Natural Hazard Overlay.
Stratum Management Limited	249.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Considers that the establishment of a residential activity is provided for as a permitted activity with four conditions. None of those conditions would lead to a requirement for limited notification.	Seeks that the notification status under CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) is amended to preclude both limited notification and public notification.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.112	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support	Supports residential activities being permitted in the City Centre zone.	Retain CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.722	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support in part	Supports this rule in part as residential activities should be enabled in the City Centres, but seeks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active frontages are only applied to key roads Considers it is unclear why verandah coverage is an issue for residential development particularly when ground floor development is controlled on active frontages and non-residential activity frontages in accordance with LCZ-P4 Reference to natural hazards is removed as it is considered these matters are controlled by Natural Hazard rules and the proposed wording is inconsistent with this approach as this encourages residential development in hazard overlay areas. Considers this is unnecessary duplication 	Retain CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.723	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Supports this rule in part as residential activities should be enabled in the City Centres, but seeks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active frontages are only applied to key roads Considers it is unclear why verandah coverage is an issue for residential development particularly when ground floor development is controlled on active frontages and non-residential activity frontages in accordance with LCZ-P4 Reference to natural hazards is removed as it is considered these matters are controlled by Natural Hazard rules and the proposed wording is inconsistent with this approach as this encourages residential development in hazard overlay areas. Considers this is unnecessary duplication 	Amend CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) to only apply active frontages where necessary such as along principal roads/arterials not necessary along connecting streets as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Activity status: Permitted where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The activity is located: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Above ground floor level; or At ground floor level along any street edge not identified as an active frontage; or <ol style="list-style-type: none"> At ground level along any street not identified as requiring verandah coverage; or At ground level on any site contained within a Natural Hazard Overlay.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.724	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Supports this rule in part as residential activities should be enabled in the City Centres, but seeks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the activity status for non-compliance is amended to Restricted Discretionary and appropriate matters of discretion are restricted to Policy 7 and 8 matters. 	Amend CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Activity status: Discretionary Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with the requirements of CCZ-R12.1.a cannot be achieved. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R12.2.a is precluded from being publicly notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.725	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Supports this rule in part as residential activities should be enabled in the City Centres, but seeks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the activity status for non-compliance is amended to Restricted Discretionary and appropriate matters of discretion are restricted to Policy 7 and 8 matters 	Seeks to add matters of discretion to CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) that are limited to simple design limitations.
Oyster Management Limited	404.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support	Supports residential activities being permitted in the City Centre Zone.	Retain CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R13	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R13 (Industrial activities, excluding repair and maintenance service activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Support	Supports the discouragement of ground-level car parks in the city centre.	Retain CCZ-R14 (Car-parking activities) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose in part	Considers there may be circumstances where there are functional needs to provide car parking at ground level. It is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis in these circumstances and for the effects of this activity to be considered as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) to remove mandatory notification for at grade car parks.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose in part	Considers there may be circumstances where there are functional needs to provide car parking at ground level. It is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis in these circumstances and for the effects of this activity to be considered as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) activity status from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary for non-compliance with the permitted activity conditions.
Century Group Limited	238.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements. Furthermore, if the car parking is not visible then this should be a should be a permitted activity as per the other centre zones.	Retain CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities), subject to amendments outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements. Furthermore, if the car parking is not visible then this should be a should be a permitted activity as per the other centre zones.	Amend CCZ-R14.1 (Carparking activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity involves: i. <u>i.</u> Provision of carparks not visible at the street edge or public space; or ii. <u>ii.</u> Provision of carparks above ground floor level; or iii. <u>iii.</u> Provision of carparks below ground floor level; or iv. <u>iv.</u> Provision of parking spaces for people with disabilities; or v. <u>v.</u> Provision of ground floor level carparks that form part of a building specifically constructed and used for carparking purposes.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.27	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Space in the centres is valuable, but the use of that space can have a wide range of effects (negative and positive), including on the character, perceptions of safety, road user behaviour, walkability and choice of transport mode. It is considered appropriate that non-compliant car parking provision consider a wide range of effects.	Disallow
McDonald's	274.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements. Furthermore, if the car parking is not visible then this should be a should be a permitted activity as per the other centre zones.	Amend CCZ-R14.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of CCZ-R14.1.a cannot be achieved.
McDonald's	274.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the requirement for public notification of any carparks at ground level in the City Centre Zone	Delete the notification clause under CCZ-R14.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R14.2.a must be publicly notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.86	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Considers that CCZ-R14.2 should be amended so that the activity status of this standard infringement is changed to restricted discretionary. It is considered that this status, plus the suggested matters of discretion, will ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities are anticipated, such assessments will be rational and streamlined. The mandatory public notification status for infringing is proposed to be deleted as this is unnecessarily onerous in the context of the infringement.	Amend CCZ-R14.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: 2. Activity status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of CCZ-R14.1.a is not achieved. <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> 1. <u>The matters in CCZ-P2, CCZ-P3, CCZ-P4, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P9 and CCZ-P10;</u> 2. <u>The cumulative effect of the development on:</u> <u>a. The ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Zone ;</u> <u>b. The safety and efficiency of the transport network, including providing for a range of transport modes;</u> <u>c. The hierarchy of roads, travel demand or vehicle use; and</u> 3. <u>The compatibility with other activities provided for in the zone.</u> Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R14.2.a must be publicly notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Support	Submission point 359.86 supports FSNI submission 476.53 and 476.54.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the requirement for full public notification of any resource consents sought under Rule CCZ-R14.2. Reading Wellington Properties Limited hold resource consents for ground level car parking on two of our sites (200 Wakefield Street and 24 Tory Street). Both were granted on a non-notified basis, on the fact that adverse effects were appropriately mitigated. The mitigation meant neither full or limited notification was necessary. The notification clause is opposed and should be removed, as it prevents applications for such an activity from being assessed on their merits. Decisions on notification should be made on the basis of effect, not on the basis of a rule.	Amend CCZ-R14.2. (Carparking activities) by removing the notification clause.
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Opposes the requirement for full public notification of any resource consents sought under Rule CCZ-R14.2. Reading Wellington Properties Limited hold resource consents for ground level car parking on two of our sites (200 Wakefield Street and 24 Tory Street). Both were granted on a non-notified basis, on the fact that adverse effects were appropriately mitigated. The mitigation meant neither full or limited notification was necessary. The notification clause is opposed and should be removed, as it prevents applications for such an activity from being assessed on their merits. Decisions on notification should be made on the basis of effect, not on the basis of a rule.	Amend CCZ-R14.2. (Carparking activities) by removing the notification clause.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in CCZ-R14 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.102	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A “discretionary” activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in CCZ-R14 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...
Foodstuffs North Island	476.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Considers that if the carparking is not visible then this should be a permitted activity in CCZ-R14 as per the other centre zones.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity involves: i. <u>Provision of carparks not visible at the street edge or public space; or</u> ii. Provision of carparks above ground floor level; or ...
Foodstuffs North Island	476.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the requirement in CCZ-R14 for public notification of any carparks at ground level in the City Centre Zone.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R14.2.a. must be publicly notified.
Century Group Limited	238.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.119	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Support in part	CCZ-R15 (yard-based retail activities) is supported in so much as it provides for yard-based retail activities (the definition of which includes service stations) as a discretionary activity.	Retain CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.120	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-R15 should be amended to not require public notification, as it may have a range of unintended outcomes. For instance, the requirement for public notification for any operational change, upgrading or maintenance to an existing yard-based activity where public notification would be more appropriately determined through standard notification tests. It may also discourage existing activities from undertaking important maintenance and upgrades, for instance, to better accord with good practise, introduce new technologies, or change to meet demand.</p> <p>CCZ-R15 should be clarified to address operation, maintenance, and upgrade of existing service station / yard-based retail activity are not subject to this requirement, which is not considered appropriate for existing activities.</p> <p>An additional exclusion to the notification status is appropriate only where the existing or new activity is located on the edge of the zone or adjacent to an arterial or collector road. These locations and/or interfaces do not have nor should they expect the same urban design outcomes and levels of visual amenity compared to a centrally located site in the CCZ for example.</p> <p>A service station, for example, would not impact the function and vitality of a centre zone if it were located on the edge of the zone where it can appropriately transition to an adjoining zone.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p>Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R15 must be publicly notified <u>except:</u></p> <p><u>a. The activity relates to the maintenance, operation and upgrading of an existing activity;</u> <u>b. The new or existing activity adjoins another commercial zone, a residential zone or an arterial or collector Road.</u></p>
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.153	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Support in part	CCZ-R15 is supported in so much as the rule provides for yard-based retail activities as a discretionary activity. It is understood that an application for resource consent made in respect of this rule, however, must be publicly notified in accordance with the Notification Status.	Retain CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.154	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-R15 should be amended as the notification requirement is not supported as it may have a range of unintended outcomes. For instance, without clarification, it may require public notification for any operational change, upgrading or maintenance to an existing yard-based activity where public notification would be more appropriately determined through standard notification tests. It may therefore also discourage existing activities from undertaking important maintenance and upgrades, for instance, to meet requirements of HSNO / HSWA legislation, better accord with good practise, introduce new technologies, or necessary changes to meet demand.</p> <p>Ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrades of existing service stations / yard-based retail activities should not be subject to this notification requirement, which is not appropriate for existing lawful activities.</p> <p>It is considered that an additional exclusion to the notification status is appropriate only where the existing or new activity is located on the edge of the zone or adjacent to an arterial or collector road. These locations and/or interfaces do not have, nor should they expect, the same urban design outcomes and levels of visual amenity compared to a centrally located site in the CCZ for example. A service station, for example, would not impact the function and vitality of a centre zone if it were located on the edge of the zone where it can appropriately transition to the adjoining zone.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows:</p> <p>Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R15 must be publicly notified <u>except</u>:</p> <p><u>a. The activity relates to the maintenance, operation and upgrading of an existing activity;</u> <u>b. The new or existing activity adjoins another commercial zone, a residential zone or an arterial or collector Road.</u></p>
Century Group Limited	238.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R16	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R16 (All other land use activities) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Supports the permitted status for maintenance and repair of buildings under CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures)	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.316	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the CCZ is a permitted activity	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.193	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.113	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of existing buildings and structures being permitted.	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures_ as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Supports repair and maintenance of existing buildings being a Permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.317	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the CCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.194	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.278	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.279	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.114	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Amend	Supports demolition or removal of a building being permitted where it is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building. However, Argosy opposes that demolition or removal of a building that cannot comply with CCZ-R18.1.a or b would require resource consent as a non-complying activity. There may be practical reasons why a building might need to be demolished or removed before a resource consent is sought for a new building, for example if a staged development is being undertaken. It would be more appropriate for this rule to be a restricted discretionary activity. The notification status for rule CCZ-R18.2.a is supported.	Amend CCZ-R18.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures): 2. Activity status: Non-complying <u>Restricted discretionary</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.726	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support in part	Supports this rule in part but seeks clarification, and any necessary amendments, to ensure that this rule will not have an unintended consequence of constraining staged developments.	Seeks to amend CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as necessary to avoid potential unintended consequence of constraining staged development.
Oyster Management Limited	404.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support in part	Supports demolition or removal of a building being permitted where it is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building.	Retain CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.69	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Amend	Opposes demolition that cannot comply with CCZ-R18.1.a or CCZ-R18.1.b being a non-complying activity. Considers there are practical reasons for demolition being required before consent is granted for a new building, e.g. in the case of staged developments. Considers an RD activity status would be appropriate.	Amend CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Non-complying <u>Restricted discretionary</u> ...
Oyster Management Limited	404.70	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support	Supports notification status for rule CCZ-R18.2.a.	Retain notification status of CCZ-R18.2.a (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Oppose in part	Seeks amendments to CCZ-R18 to provide for demolition as a restricted discretionary activity where it does not comply with CCZ-R18.1. Supports the intention of the rule to enable demolition of this rule to provide for a new building, and supports the preclusion of public and limited notification, we have concerns that as notified it may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a larger site to enable development. A restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.	Opposes the Non-complying activity status at CCZ-R18.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to CCZ-R18 to provide for demolition as a restricted discretionary activity where it does not comply with CCZ-R18.1.</p> <p>Supports the intention of the rule to enable demolition of this rule to provide for a new building, and supports the preclusion of public and limited notification, we have concerns that as notified it may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a larger site to enable development.</p> <p>A restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.</p>	<p>Option 1: Amend CCZ-R18.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to have a Restricted Discretionary activity status as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Activity Status: Non-complying <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p>...</p>
Fabric Property Limited	425.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Amend	Alternatively, seeks for a discretionary activity status, which would be consistent with MCZ-R19 in the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	<p>Option 2: Amend CCZ-R18.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to have a Discretionary activity status as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Activity Status: Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u></p> <p>...</p>
Paul Burnaby	44.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) is partially supported because of the preclusion of public notification.	Retain the preclusion for public notification under CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
Paul Burnaby	44.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) is partially opposed because of the preclusion for limited notification.	<p>Amend CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Notification status:</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2.a which results in non-compliance with CCZ-S5, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain CCZ-R19.1 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports the preclusion of limited and public notification under CCZ-R19.2.	Retain notification clauses under CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R19 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide the Council discretion to consider all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Amend CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) so that the references to the design guides in the matters of discretion are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought.
Wellington City Council	266.157	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Considers a notification status statement is missing in relation to developments where all standards are met.	<p>Amend CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Notification status:</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2.a which complies with all standards is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. (...)</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.245	art 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point subject to the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.245	art 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.318	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	Supports the rule as the construction or, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures within the CCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
McDonald's	274.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	Oppose the requirement for restricted discretionary consent where additions and alterations change the exterior to the building above veranda level and are visible from public spaces.	Retain CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures), subject to amendment outlined other submission points.
McDonald's	274.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Considers where compliance can be achieved with the relevant standards, this should be a permitted activity otherwise McDonald's considered there to be a risk that this will result in the perverse outcome of parts of exterior facades not being updated.	Seeks the following amendment to CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: 1a. Any alterations or additions to a building or structure that: i. Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; or ii. Relate to a building frontage below veranda level, including entranceways and glazing and compliance with CCZ-S8 is achieved; or iii. Do not result in the creation of new residential units; and iv. Are not visible from public spaces; and v. i. Comply with standards CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S5, CCZS6, CCZ-S7 and CCZ-S8.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.195	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose	Opposed to the cross reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide within the matters of discretion. The cross reference to the policies of the CCZ is sufficient to ensure that development achieves a "good quality, well-functioning environment" as required by CCZ-O3.	Amend CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and 5.4. ...
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.295	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under CCZ-R19. Does not oppose the inclusion of matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZS1 – CCZ-S13. Considers however the matters of discretion in Clause 1 are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Furthermore, opposes the inclusion of CCZ-P11 in Clause 1 relating to the City Outcomes Contribution or the reasons provided in response to CCZ-P11 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.	Retain CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.296	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under CCZ-R19. Does not oppose the inclusion of matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1 – CCZ-S13. Considers however the matters of discretion in Clause 1 are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Furthermore, opposes the inclusion of CCZ-P11 in Clause 1 relating to the City Outcomes Contribution or the reasons provided in response to CCZ-P11 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.	Amend CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: ... 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12 (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); ... 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); and 5. The Residential Design Guide (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); and 6. For retirement villages: i. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; ii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;iii. When assessing the matters in 2(a)(2), and 2(a)(6)(i) –(iii), consider: a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. iv. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. <u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.297	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under CCZ-R19. Does not oppose the inclusion of matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1 – CCZ-S13. Considers however the matters of discretion in Clause 1 are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Furthermore, opposes the inclusion of CCZ-P11 in Clause 1 relating to the City Outcomes Contribution or the reasons provided in response to CCZ-P11 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.	Amend CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2 which complies with CCZ-S5, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2 which results from non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7 and CCZ-S8 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2 where compliance is achieved with CCZ-S1 - CCZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.115	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Supports that alterations and additions to buildings or structures are permitted, however the requirement that they do not alter the external appearance of a building or structure would likely make all alterations and additions non-compliant with the permitted activity rule. It is considered that the other standards are sufficient to control alterations and additions that can occur as a permitted activity. Argosy also supports alterations and additions to buildings or structures that do not comply with CCZ-R19.1 being a restricted discretionary activity. However, Argosy opposes Policy CCZ-P11 and the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution being included in matters of discretion, as stated above. Supports applications for resource consent made in respect of CCZ-R19.2.a being precluded from limited or public notification because this is appropriate for alterations or additions to existing buildings within a city centre to achieve the intended development capacity.	Amend CCZ-R19 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures): 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Any alterations or additions to a building or structure that: i. Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; or 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R19.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. Construction impacts on the transport network; 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide , including guideline G107 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and 5. The Residential Design Guide.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.11	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	The relief sought will enable intensification, consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act.	Allow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.11	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	The relief sought will enable intensification, consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.727	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, and particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought, and to remove reference to the “City Outcomes Contribution”. Considers it is unclear why the creation of new residential units needs control as residential activities are encouraged in the City Centre and other rules control the location of residential activities.	Retain CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) and seeks amendments.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.74	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	Supports that applications for consent under CCZ-R19.2.a being precluded from public and limited notification.	Retain CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
Investore Property Limited	405.132	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.103	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.103	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.133	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.104	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.104	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.168	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Submitter generally supports the intent of the Design Guides, but opposes their inclusion in the District Plan for the following reasons: - In many areas, the Design Guides overlap with the objectives and policies in Part 3. This will cause confusion for both planners and developers in attempting to interpret the Design Guides alongside Part 3. In particular, the submitter queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan. - It will be simpler to update the Design Guides to reflect best practice if they remain non-statutory. - The way the Design Guides are included as relevant criteria for restricted discretionary activities significantly expands the Council's discretion beyond what could normally be expected, for example, the Residential Design Guide contains various provisions dealing with internal areas such as G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage).	Amend CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building, and ...
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	Submission point 416.168 supports FSNI submission point 476.1 & 476.102.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.258	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.258	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Fabric Property Limited	425.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	<p>Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-R19.2.4 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. Construction impacts on the transport network; and</p> <p>4. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and</p> <p>...</p>
Fabric Property Limited	425.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R19 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures), with amendments.
Fabric Property Limited	425.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R19 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain CCZ-R19.1 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified, with respect to the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.
Fabric Property Limited	425.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	The requirement that additions and alterations do not alter the external appearance of a building or structure would likely make all alterations and additions non-compliant with the permitted activity rule. It is considered that the other standards are sufficient to control alterations and additions that can occur as a permitted activity, and Fabric opposes rule CCZ-R19.1. a.i.	Opposes CCZ-19.1.a.i (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) insofar as this would make all alterations and additions that alter the external appearance of the building non-compliant with the permitted activity rule.
Fabric Property Limited	425.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R19 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-19.2.1 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) with respect to the CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Fabric Property Limited	425.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R19 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-19.2.4 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) with respect to the references to the design guides as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.71	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R19 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain notification clauses under CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports the preclusion of limited and public notification under CCZ-R20.2.	Retain notification clauses under CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Seeks that the references to the design guides in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide the Council discretion to consider all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Amend CCZ-R10.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) so that the references to the design guides in the matters of discretion are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought.
Stratum Management Limited	249.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	<p>Considers that Rule CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) controls the construction of new buildings in the zone.</p> <p>It includes two non-notification statements that reference various standards. Under the first statement, non-compliance with certain standards can be addressed without either public or limited notification. This statement is supported.</p> <p>Under the second statement, non-compliance with the listed standards can be addressed without public notification, but limited notification remains a possibility, to be determined in accordance with the applicable statutory tests. This statement is supported overall, but deletion of the reference to standard CCZ-S1 is sought. CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is the maximum height standard. The effects of a maximum height breach can be determined without need for limited notification as they can be objectively assessed with reference to the potential effects caused.</p> <p>An additional non-notification statement is sought for a situation where all standards are complied with. This would appear to be inferred in the construction of the rule but should be objectively stated as the non-notification statements are only currently engaged where at least one standard is not complied with.</p> <p>A minor change is sought to matter of discretion (3) to clarify its applicability.</p>	<p>Seeks that the third matter of discretion under CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) is amended as follows:</p> <p>3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline 97.407 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that <u>does not meet the minimum height requirements, or exceeds</u> the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stratum Management Limited	249.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	<p>Considers that Rule CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) controls the construction of new buildings in the zone.</p> <p>It includes two non-notification statements that reference various standards. Under the first statement, non-compliance with certain standards can be addressed without either public or limited notification. This statement is supported.</p> <p>Under the second statement, non-compliance with the listed standards can be addressed without public notification, but limited notification remains a possibility, to be determined in accordance with the applicable statutory tests. This statement is supported overall, but deletion of the reference to standard CCZ-S1 is sought. CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is the maximum height standard. The effects of a maximum height breach can be determined without need for limited notification as they can be objectively assessed with reference to the potential effects caused.</p> <p>An additional non-notification statement is sought for a situation where all standards are complied with. This would appear to be inferred in the construction of the rule but should be objectively stated as the non-notification statements are only currently engaged where at least one standard is not complied with.</p> <p>A minor change is sought to matter of discretion (3) to clarify its applicability.</p>	<p>Seeks that CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) is amended to include new non-notification statement as follows:</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule R20.2.a which does not result in any non-compliances with the listed standards is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></p>
Stratum Management Limited	249.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	<p>Considers that Rule CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) controls the construction of new buildings in the zone.</p> <p>It includes two non-notification statements that reference various standards. Under the first statement, non-compliance with certain standards can be addressed without either public or limited notification. This statement is supported.</p> <p>Under the second statement, non-compliance with the listed standards can be addressed without public notification, but limited notification remains a possibility, to be determined in accordance with the applicable statutory tests. This statement is supported overall, but deletion of the reference to standard CCZ-S1 is sought. CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is the maximum height standard. The effects of a maximum height breach can be determined without need for limited notification as they can be objectively assessed with reference to the potential effects caused.</p> <p>An additional non-notification statement is sought for a situation where all standards are complied with. This would appear to be inferred in the construction of the rule but should be objectively stated as the non-notification statements are only currently engaged where at least one standard is not complied with.</p> <p>A minor change is sought to matter of discretion (3) to clarify its applicability.</p>	<p>Seeks that the second non notification statement under CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) is amended to remove the reference to standard CCZ-S1 (Maximum height).</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.152	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose	<p>Considers that height is very important for controlling and regulating effects and as such should be specifically referenced as a discretionary matter and part of the notification tests.</p>	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.48	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose	<p>Height is very important for controlling and regulating effects and as such should be specifically referenced as a discretionary matter and part of the notification tests.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.158	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Considers a notification status statement is missing in relation to developments where all standards are met.	Amend CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: Notification status: <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R20.2.a which complies with all standards is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. (...)</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.246	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point subject to the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.246	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.319	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support	Supports the rule as the construction or, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures within the CCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.196	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose	Opposed to the cross reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide within the matters of discretion. The cross reference to the policies of the CCZ is sufficient to ensure that development achieves a "good quality, well-functioning environment" as required by CCZ-O3.	Amend CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and 5-4. 6-5. 7-6. ...
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.298	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R20 and the permitting of the construction of buildings and structures when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards. Considers that the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). Considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.88	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that CCZ-R20.2 should be amended to reflect changes to standard CCZ-S4 which would exclude supermarkets from compliance with the minimum building height standard. There are also concerns around the inclusion of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide within these matters of discretion on account of the unnecessary scope this introduces in a restricted discretionary consenting framework. As such, it is specifically sought that that this is excluded from the matters of discretion for new supermarket buildings.	<p>Amend CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. <u>For all buildings excluding supermarkets</u>, compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R20.1, excluding CCZ-S4, cannot be achieved.</p> <p>b. <u>For supermarkets compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R20.1, cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Note: Supermarkets are not required to comply with CCZ-S4</u></p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline 6107.97 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (<u>excluding supermarkets</u>); 4. The Residential Design Guide; 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.89	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that CCZ-R20.2 should be amended to reflect changes to standard CCZ-S4 which would exclude supermarkets from compliance with the minimum building height standard. There are also concerns around the inclusion of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide within these matters of discretion on account of the unnecessary scope this introduces in a restricted discretionary consenting framework. As such, it is specifically sought that that this is excluded from the matters of discretion for new supermarket buildings.	<p>Amend CCZ-R20.3 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>3. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of CCZ-S4 cannot be achieved, <u>unless the development is a supermarket.</u></p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ- R20.3 which results in non-compliance with CCZ-S4 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</p> <p>Comment:</p>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support	Submission point 359.89 CCZ-R20 has similar outcome to FSNI submission point 476.57.	Allow / Allow submission if submission point 476.57 is rejected.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.116	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Supports construction of buildings being a permitted activity where it complies with Rule CCZ-R20.1 or a restricted discretionary activity where it complies with Rule CCZ-R20.2 except as stated below. Argosy opposes Policy CCZ-P11 and the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution being included in matters of discretion, as stated above. Argosy also opposes “the extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints” being included as a matter of discretion. This is unclear and could have the effect of giving the consent authority unrestricted discretion, and should be deleted. Alternatively, it should be amended to identify the types of constraints which may be relevant. For example, similar language could be used to the assessment criteria for some restricted discretionary activities in the City Centre zone of the Auckland Unitary Plan which include “whether there are particular site development characteristics in terms of unusual site size, shape or orientation, or the location and nature of existing buildings which have constrained the form of the development proposed” (H8.8.2). Argosy also opposes buildings below the minimum building height of 22m being a discretionary activity, and seeks for this to be a restricted discretionary activity. This would enable flexibility where there are practical constraints on buildings being constructed which are below 22m, while enabling the Council to retain its discretion in relation to matters which relate to maximising the benefits of intensification.	Amend CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures): 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R20.1, excluding CCZ-S4, cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building;
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.12	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support	The relief sought will enable intensification, consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act.	Allow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.12	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support	The relief sought will enable intensification, consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act.	Allow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.729	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, and particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought, and to remove reference to the “City Outcomes Contribution”	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) and seeks amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.730	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Supports this rule in part, and particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought, and to remove reference to the “City Outcomes Contribution”	Amend CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: 1. Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R20.1, excluding CCZ-S4, cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8 , CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1 , CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8 , CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10 , CCZ-S11 , CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. <u>The following urban design outcomes</u> <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood; and</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings;</u> 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 5. The Residential Design Guide;

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.164	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the relief sought, however, The RVA seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.164	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the relief sought, however, Ryman seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20.
Oyster Management Limited	404.75	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports construction of buildings being a permitted activity where it complies with Rule CCZ-R20.1 or a restricted discretionary activity where it complies with Rule CCZ-R20.2.	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.76	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose	Considers that point 5 of the Matters of Discretion in CCZ-R20.2 is unclear and may result in Council having unrestricted discretion. Considers this should be deleted, or amended to identify types of constraints that may be relevant [Refer to original submission for full reason] .	Amend CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The Residential Design Guide; 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. OR Amend point 5 above to clarify what types of site constraints may be relevant.
Investore Property Limited	405.134	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.105	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.105	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.135	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.106	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.106	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.278	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Not specified	Ryman supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to “City Outcome Contributions” and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with Ryman’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by Ryman.
Fabric Property Limited	425.72	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	<p>Opposed to the ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ for ‘over height’ development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of “density done well” as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-R20.2.3 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building.</p> <p>...</p>
Fabric Property Limited	425.73	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R20 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures), with amendments.
Fabric Property Limited	425.74	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council’s discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-20.2.1 (Construction of buildings and structures) with respect to the CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.
Fabric Property Limited	425.75	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council’s discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-20.2.3 (Construction of buildings and structures) with respect to the references to the design guides as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.
Fabric Property Limited	425.76	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council’s discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-20.2.4 (Construction of buildings and structures) with respect to the references to the design guides as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.
Fabric Property Limited	425.77	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose in part	Seeks clarification on “the extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints” in the matters of discretion. This is unclear and could have the effect of giving the consent authority unrestricted discretion, and should be deleted. Alternatively, it should be amended to identify the types of constraints which may be relevant.	Opposes CCZ-R20.2.5 (Construction of buildings and structures) with respect to ‘the extent and effect of any site constraints’.
Fabric Property Limited	425.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Seeks clarification on “the extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints” in the matters of discretion. This is unclear and could have the effect of giving the consent authority unrestricted discretion, and should be deleted. Alternatively, it should be amended to identify the types of constraints which may be relevant.	<p>Clarify CCZ-R20.2.5 (Construction of buildings and structures) is amended to identify the types of constraints which may be relevant.</p> <p>[As an alternative to deleting this matter of discretion]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Amend CCZ-20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 4. The Residential Design Guide; 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 3.6. The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network; and 4.7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure.
Fabric Property Limited	425.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R20 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain notification clauses under CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.320	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Support in part	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	Supports CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.321	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Amend	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	Amend CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... 3. The relevant guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide; and 4. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure; and <u>5. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, including for firefighting purposes.</u>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.280	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.280	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Not specified	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.117	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Support	Supports the conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities being a restricted discretionary activity as this may be appropriate as part of a well-functioning urban environment.	Retain CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.731	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, and particularly supports the preclusion public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought.	Retain CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) and seeks amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.732	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Amend	Supports this rule in part, and particularly supports the preclusion public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought.	Amend CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P1, CCZ-P4 and CCZ-P10; 2. The extent of compliance with standards CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10 and CCZ-S13 and satisfaction of associated assessment criteria; 3. The relevant guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide; <u>The following centres urban design outcomes:</u> <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings; and</u> 4. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure....
Oyster Management Limited	404.77	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Amend	Considers that the RD activity status of converting buildings or parts of buildings is likely to prevent conversions occurring. Considers there should be a tiered activity status approach subject to standards, appropriate matters of control, or discretion.	Amend Rule CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) to provide for conversion of office to residential as either a permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity subject to compliance with appropriate standards (permitted), or appropriate matters of control and discretion (controlled and restricted discretionary).
Oyster Management Limited	404.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Support	Supports that building conversions will not be limited or publicly notified.	Retain notification status of CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) for all activity statuses.
Investore Property Limited	405.136	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain CCZ-R21.1 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.107	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.107	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.137	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend CCZ-R21.1 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.108	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.108	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.171	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Amend	Submitter considers that changes are required to CCZ-R21 for the following reasons: - The Design Guides should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - “The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure” – This should be managed via development contributions / financial contributions.	Amend CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) as follows: ... 2. The relevant guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide; and 4. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. ...
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.260	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.279	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Not specified	The RVA supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to “City Outcome Contributions” and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by The RVA.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.260	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.279	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Not specified	Ryman supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to “City Outcome Contributions” and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by Ryman.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.322	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R22	Support in part	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Supports CCZ-R22 (Outdoor storage areas), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.323	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R22	Amend	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Amend CCZ-R22 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site. b. Screening does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.172	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R1	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.173	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R2	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.174	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R3	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.175	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R4	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.176	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R5	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.177	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R6	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].
Parliamentary Service	375.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	There are two separate CCZ-PREC01-R7 in the CCZ chapter.	Amend the City Centre Zone chapter to remove the double CCZ-PREC01-R7 provision. [Inferred decision requested]
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.118	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	This is because: - This provision elevates what is normally a design guide into a rule. A design guide should be separate to a plan. The Design Guide should be an external document to the District Plan and be referenced as a guide only. - Further, this provision, provides a mechanism for the Council to require these aspects as part of a development. This is inappropriate. A development should be assessed on its merits.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures, additions and alterations to buildings and structures): Matters of discretion are: ... 2. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide;
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.32	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-R7	Oppose	The design guides include important matters. It is entirely appropriate to reference them in a rule for a restricted discretionary activity.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.178	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that at minimum, amend CCZ-PREC01-R7 (All other land use activities) by re-numbering the CCZ-PREC01-R7 as CCZ-PREC01-R8.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.179	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	Submitter notes this rule number is incorrect. Based on current drafting it should be number CCZ-PREC01-R8.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures, additions and alterations to buildings and structures) rule numbering to CCZ-PREC01-R8.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.27	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-R7	Support	The submission identifies a minor error in the Plan's numbering and seeks that it is corrected to avoid confusion.	Allow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.180	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	Submitter notes that the notification status for CCZ-PREC01-R7 requires any application for resource consent to be publicly notified. Submitter considers that this will unnecessarily fetter development in the Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct and also add cost and delay to even minor alterations or additions to structures within the precinct. Submitter considers that Council has not provided sufficient justification for mandatory notification.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures, additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as follows: Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PREC01-R7.1 must be publicly notified. An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PREC01-R7.1 which complies with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3 and CCZ-S5 to CCZ-S13 is precluded from being either limited or publicly notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.28	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-R7	Support	This area is one of Wellington's most important public spaces (the other being the nearby Waterfront). The public have a very high level of interest in this area. New buildings and additions and alterations (as defined in the Plan) all have the potential to affect the character and quality of the public space they help create. They should thus all be subject to mandatory public notification.	Disallow
Andrew Haddleton	23.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes the height of 28.5m along Kent Terrace as this will block views and sunlight.	Reject the increased building height provided for at CCZ-S1.
Andrew Haddleton	23.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the allowable height of buildings along Kent Terrace specifically those up to 28.5m will block views and sunlight.	Seeks that the allowable building height on the Courtenay Place end of Kent Terrace be 18m.
Paul Burnaby	44.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that 110 Wakefield St (West Plaza Hotel) should have a maximum height of 73m to match the maximum height of the immediately adjoining building at 103 Wakefield St.	Amend height control at 110 Wakefield St (West Plaza Hotel) to 73m.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.153	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers the amendment requested significantly exceeds the notified height control in the proposed district plan (42m) and is not justified on the basis that the site "adjoins" a different site that is across the road. Considers a 73m building at 101 Wakefield Street would create unreasonable shading effects near Civic Square including in the parklet in Lombard Street.	Disallow
Juliet Cooke	68.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ standards will lead to inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values and are therefore contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan.</p> <p>Heritage and character are qualifying matters under MRZ Pt1 Sch 1.</p> <p>Considers that height limits in Height Control Area 9 would allow inappropriate scale of development adjacent to land which is zoned for residential purposes or has character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>Considers that Moir Street will have adverse effects due to the potential for development in neighbouring CCZ zoning.</p> <p>Moir street is a key and coherent character and heritage area.</p> <p>Moir street is unique with the amount of overlapping relevant overlays.</p> <p>[See submission for further detail]</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1.1 (Maximum Height) to add k as follows:</p> <p>1. The following maximum...</p> <p><u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania St 15m</u></p> <p>[Refer to original submission for map of area]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tracey Paterson	74.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 as currently drafted.</p> <p>CCZ-S1 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is unique due to its classification as MRZ, Character Precinct, Heritage Area and adjacency to CCZ. As currently drafted, the standards of the proposed plan will allow buildings of up to 28.5m high to tower over 1-2 story heritage cottages on Moir St. The proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation.</p> <p>The Standards of the CCZ proposed Plan will lead to significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values on Moir Street.</p> <p>The standards will result in outcomes that are contrary to the objectives and policies of the PDP (CCZ)</p>	<p>Reject CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) -</p> <p>i. Height Area 9 - South-East, South-West Zone Edge</p>
Tracey Paterson	74.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 to add a Height Control Area of 15m for Hania Street.</p> <p>The current provision would allow inappropriate scale of development adjacent to land which is zoned for residential purposes or has a character or heritage overlay.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Hania Street - 15m</u></p>
Conor Hill	76.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes height limits in the CCZ as these set limits on achieving as much development as possible.</p> <p>Considers that developers and geotechnical experts should determine what these are.</p>	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) in its entirety.
Nico Maiden	77.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Height limits are arbitrary and unnecessary because new builds require resource consents.</p> <p>Removal of height limits will enable more compact housing in the city centre.</p> <p>Removal of height limits will help comply with NPS-UD.</p>	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) in its entirety.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support in part	<p>The University seeks an exception to the Height Control Area 1 limit to reflect the existing scale of buildings on the Rutherford House site (23 Lambton Quay).</p>	<p>Amend standard CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p>Location</p> <p>a. Height Control Area 1 – Thorndon Quay (<u>except Rutherford House site (23 Lambton Quay)</u>)</p> <p>Limit</p> <p><u>35.4m (Rutherford House site (23 Lambton Quay) - 56m)</u></p>
Darko Petrovic	124.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that height limits in all sections of the Central CBD area that do not interfere with viewshafts should be removed.</p> <p>Imposing height limits on central area building developments will reduce the intensification potential of the plan and limit the development potential at a time when diverse housing supply in the central area is needed. If removing height limits is not a possibility, a compromise solution would be to have the height limits increased substantially.</p>	Seeks that height limits in all sections of the Central CBD area that do not interfere with viewshafts be removed.
Darko Petrovic	124.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Height Control Area 5 (CBD East) is too restrictive and should be removed.</p> <p>Imposing height limits on central area building developments will reduce the intensification potential of the plan and limit the development potential at a time when diverse housing supply in the central area is needed. If removing height limits is not a possibility, a compromise solution would be to have the height limits increased substantially.</p>	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) to remove Height Control Area 5 (CBD East).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Darko Petrovic	124.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Height Control Area 6 (CBD West) is too restrictive and should be removed. Imposing height limits on central area building developments will reduce the intensification potential of the plan and limit the development potential at a time when diverse housing supply in the central area is needed. If removing height limits is not a possibility, a compromise solution would be to have the height limits increased substantially.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) to remove Height Control Area 6 (CBD West).
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Precinct seeks amendments to CCZ-S1 to provide unlimited building heights in the City Centre zone. Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires district plans of Tier 1 urban environments such as Wellington to enable “building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification” in city centre zones. For the City Centre zone this should mean unlimited building heights. Unlimited building heights in the City Centre area are appropriate given the emphasis in the Wellington Spatial Plan and Proposed District Plan on the City Centre for accommodating future growth, recognising the height of existing buildings in these areas, and taking into account the absence of any directly adjoining residential areas that could potentially be adversely affected. This would also be consistent with CCZ-P5 which recognises the benefits of enabling greater height and scale of development in the City Centre. According to CCZ-O1 the Wellington City Centre is intended to be the primary commercial centre for the wider Wellington region. Yet the intensification planning instruments notified in Hutt City and Upper Hutt City provide for a greater scale of development than Wellington City with unlimited heights in their centres. Unlimited building heights in the Wellington City Centre would be consistent with its role as the primary commercial centre for the region. The heights provided under CCZ-S1 are particularly constraining for Precinct’s sites in Thorndon including 20 Aitken Street and the Bowen Campus where a Maximum height of 27m applies. This is despite the fact that some of the existing buildings in this area are over 60m high. If the request to provide unlimited heights is not granted for these areas, Precinct requests that CCZ-S1 is amended to provide for building heights at least as great as that of the existing buildings.	Seeks amendments to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to provide unlimited building heights in the City Centre zone.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.131	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers the submission is more enabling than justified. Considers the calibration of heights in accordance with the notified height control areas is more appropriate for a medium-sized coastal/harbour city that is susceptible to earthquakes and other natural hazards	Disallow
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	If the request for unlimited building heights is not granted, Precinct requests that CCZ-S1 is amended to provide for building heights at least as great as that of the existing buildings.	Seeks that if CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is not amended to provide for unlimited building heights, this standard be amended to provide for building heights at least as great as that of the existing buildings.
James and Karen Fairhall	160.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that Height Control Area 9, in particular the interface between the Eastern side of Hania Street and the Western side of Moir Street, conflicts with the qualifying matters relating to CCZ-S1. Moir Street has quaint one to two storey little cottages built in the late 1980s which are all part of a Heritage and Special Character Area. Relating to the first qualifying matter: 28.5m buildings will absolutely destroy the streetscape of Moir Street which has been enjoyed and celebrated for years. Relating to the second qualifying matter: 28.5m buildings will completely remove any sense of privacy and dominate the little cottages of Moir Street (not to mention the affect on loss of sunlight and the corresponding affect on the health of the homes and residents). Relating to the third qualifying matter: Accept new houses need to be developed, however the scale needs to be done right. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
James and Karen Fairhall	160.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. and CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.a.ii. and CCZ-P9.2.a.iii.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.</p>
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p><u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u></p> <p>[refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11].</p>
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [Refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below: CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7. CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e. CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2. CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2. MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts). HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage). PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission. [Inferred decision requested].
Athena Papadopoulos	183.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Athena Papadopoulos	183.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Lara Bland	184.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.</p>
Lara Bland	184.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</p> <p>[refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]</p>
Lara Bland	184.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Geoff Palmer	188.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.
Geoff Palmer	188.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]
Geoff Palmer	188.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below: CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7. CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e. CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2. CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2. MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts). HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage). PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission. [Inferred decision requested].
Andrew Flanagan	198.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Seeks that all height limits are removed on developments in the City Centre Zone.	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height).
Wellington City Youth Council	201.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Supports the increase to the building height limits in Te Aro and along a portion of Adelaide road to accommodate for more people such as young professionals and students living in CBD.	Retain building heights in CCZ-S1 (Maximum building heights) for Te Aro and Adelaide Road as notified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Supports keeping the building heights on the edge of City Centre in order to maintain a smooth transition into graduated residential areas.	Retain building heights in CCZ-S1 (Maximum building heights) as notified.
Dougal and Libby List	207.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dougal and Libby List	207.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p><u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u></p> <p>[Refer to original submission, including an illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]</p>
Dougal and Libby List	207.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design) as follows: CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Craig Forrester	210.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m and seeks amendment.</p>
Craig Forrester	210.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p><u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u></p> <p>[refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]</p>
Jill Wilson	218.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes 12 storey building along Cable and Wakefield Street.</p> <p>Considers that the harbour side is a major asset for visitors and residents and that high rise building along the streets would impede visual access to the water.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as it relates to Wakefield Street and Cable Street.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Century Group Limited	238.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that the lack of an unlimited height control, or at the least an increase in the height limits throughout the City Centre Zone, is inconsistent with Policy 3(a) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 which requires the district plans of Tier 1 territorial authorities to enable specified outcomes, including “in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification” (Policy 3(a)). The Council’s s32 Assessment does not adequately recognise this or respond to this requirement, and fails to recognise that economic conditions which constrain or enable high density/scale development will fluctuate within the lifespan of a district plan. Considers the section 32 analysis has not considered an option of unlimited building heights together with the application of other design controls and criteria.</p> <p>Considers that the Property (83-87 Waterloo Quay) is not subject to any protected views, or any other specific constraints that would otherwise justify the use of a 50m height limit (noting the Airport Designation WIAL1 is some 100m above the level of the Property), particularly in the absence of an identified ‘qualifying matter’. The 50m Maximum Height standard, as it applies to the Property (83-87 Waterloo Quay) and the adjoining land, is inadequate with regards to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. Considers that other standards and designations are proposed to manage other outcomes that relate to the height of development.</p>	<p>Amend CC-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p>Location</p> <p>1.b. Height Control Area 2 - Waterloo Quay Section</p> <p>Limit</p> <p>50m <u>Unlimited</u></p>
Stratum Management Limited	249.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Imposition of height limits does not give effect to Policy 3(a) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. The policy requires, in city centre zones, district plans to enable “building heights and urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification.” The imposition of maximum building heights does not achieve this intent.</p>	Remove standard CCZ-S1 (Maximum height).
Generation Zero Inc	254.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Considers that a maximum height control in the City Centre Zone is inappropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inconsistent with the policy direction of the NPS-UD - out of step with other local authorities. - focusses on preserving existing amenity -insufficient analysis and justification undertaken. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete provision CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) so that there are no maximum height limits in the City Centre Zone.
Wheeler Grace Trust	261.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Considers that the proposed Height Controls in Selwyn Terrace are inappropriate.</p> <p>6 Storey buildings would significantly detract from the residential amenity of Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) so that Selwyn terrace, Thorndon does not have a 27m maximum building height.
170 Wakefield Limited	267.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers it appropriate to increase the Height Control Area over 170 Wakefield St in order for the District Plan to be consistent with the NPS-UD, with respecting the WIAL1 designation. [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Seeks to amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), Height Control Area 7 from 43.8m to 60m.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.154	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Considers the amendment requested significantly exceeds the notified height control in the proposed district plan (42m) and is not justified.</p>	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.324	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	<p>Supports the standard as the maximum height for any building is between 25m-93m</p>	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Eldin Family Trust	287.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Considers that regardless of the zoning applied to Selwyn Terrace a minimum building height of 22m or a maximum if either 21m or 27m would be inappropriate.</p> <p>Considers that these building heights are inconsistent with the Viewshafts VS1 (The Beehive) and VS4 (The Beehive and The Cenotaph – Whitmore Street) which would clash with the viewshaft.</p> <p>Considers that tall buildings in Selwyn Terrace would detract from the residential amenity, special character and heritage of Selwyn Terrace and increase pressure on access, parking and turning.</p> <p>Considers that developers would face difficulty in complying with the minimum height requirements due to covenants on titles.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) with respect to Selwyn Terrace (and the nearby areas of Hill Street and Guildford Terrace) being subject to the 27m maximum height control (Height control area 3).
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Height Control Area 8 in the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is opposed due to the new CCZ limit of 42m everywhere as a minimum height is expandable by up to 50% extra in height. This leaves all existing home owners in buildings 6-9 storeys tall now facing the prospect of being surrounded by towers 14-20 storeys tall. These developments will also have negative effects on property values and cast shadows for entire blocks southward.</p> <p>Te Aro's soils are also not good ground to build tall buildings on.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum heights) Heigh Control Area 8 - Te Aro. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.163	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the new CCZ (City Centre Zone) limits of 42m everywhere as a minimum height in CCZ, and expandable by up to 50% extra in height, leaves all existing home owners in buildings 6-9 storeys tall now facing the prospect of being surrounded by towers 14-20 storeys tall. These developments will also have negative effects on property values and cast shadows for entire blocks southward.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.	Seeks that all height limits at CCZ-S1 (Maximum heights) are removed.
James Coyle	307.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.88	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Considers that it is necessary to protect heritage values of Mt Victoria heritage area (curtilage). [Interred reference to submission 312.6]	Allow
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hanja Street - 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11].
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.204	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.89	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Considers that it is necessary to protect heritage values of Mt Victoria heritage area (curtilage). [Interred reference to submission 312.7]	Allow
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission. [Inferred decision requested].
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.197	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.
Peter Kennedy	353.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support in part	Supports CCZ-S1 in part in that the properties at 25 and 25A Taranaki Street are subject to the height control of 42.5m above ground level. The submitter notes that the owners of 25 and 25A Taranaki Street generally support the increase in height from the 27m provided in the Operative District Plan to 42.5m in the Proposed District Plan.	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested								
Peter Kennedy	353.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that given the sites are located in the City Centre Zone, and for the district plan to adopt the NPS-UD Policy 3.a, the height restriction of 42.5m should be removed [Refer to original submission for NPS-UD Policy 3 reference].</p> <p>The submitter considers that to fully 'maximise benefits of intensification' the height of any structure should be determined by the buildability and constraints of the site such as ground conditions. Economic viability and design will naturally constrain the building heights as well, however the district plan should not limit height in the central zone so it can properly align with the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The submitter notes that nearly all of Wellington falls subject to the WIAL 1 designation, which restrict new buildings or structures from being above the RL of 56.98m unless shielded by an existing immovable object. The submitter considers that the Mount Victoria ridgeline extends well above this RL and shields the centre city from the airport. The submitter considers as such the maximum RL should be restricted by the height of the Mount Victoria.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to truly align the Proposed District Plan with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development while respecting WIAL 1 designation, as follows:</p> <p>1. The following maximum height limits must be complied with (measured above ground level unless otherwise specified):</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Limit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>...</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>h. Height Control Area 8 –Te Aro</td> <td>42.5 <u>60m</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>...</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Location	Limit	...		h. Height Control Area 8 –Te Aro	42.5 <u>60m</u>	...	
Location	Limit												
...													
h. Height Control Area 8 –Te Aro	42.5 <u>60m</u>												
...													
U.S. Embassy Wellington	366.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Concerned about any structure adjacent to the United States Embassy being built to a height of 27 metres, particularly without any requirement for the Embassy to be notified of and consent to the proposed building project for security reasons	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) so that properties identified on a map surrounding the United States Embassy have a maximum height of 10m.</p> <p>[See original submission for map]</p>								
Jane Szentivanyi	376.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	CCZ-S1 is opposed as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites. As currently drafted, CCZ-S11 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties, as well as recognised heritage and character values which cannot be mitigated through design. As such, the provision is contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan.	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and seeks amendment.								
Jane Szentivanyi	376.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1 should be amended to have a new height control for the area along the eastern side of Hania Street.	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>h. Height Control Area 10 - Adelaide Road</p> <p>i. Height Control Area 11 - eastern side of Hania St 15m</p> <p>[Refer to map in submission]</p>								
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.481	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Whilst the submitter recognises the importance of safety in regards to Maximum build height of structures, the Wellington Central City Zone currently fails to adequately utilize the large amount of accessible open space provided by building tops. As such the submitter considers the standard should allow for the development of urban farming infrastructure, as these would likely extend beyond the 1m in diameter restriction placed upon decorative features, however these would need to be immobile and enclosed in order to prevent safety issues through structural compromise via weather events.	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p>This standard does not apply to...</p> <p><u>B) Enclosed immobile garden beds providing these do not extend beyond 2m in diameter or 1m in height.</u></p>								
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.119	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Seeks an amendment to the assessment criteria where the standard is infringed to include the extent to which a taller building would contribute to business capacity in the city. The NPS-UD requires tier 1 territorial authorities to provide sufficient development capacity for both housing and business, and Policy 3 recognises that building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification. The Proposed Plan must give effect to the NPS-UD, and this could be achieved in part by amending the assessment criteria as submitted.	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height):</p> <p>Matters of discretion:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>4. The extent to which taller buildings would contribute to maximising the benefits of intensification in the city</u></p>								
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.733	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Opposes the City Centre building height controls as notified and seeks that the building heights are simplified. Considers the Central Wellington City and the City Centre Zone should provide for unlimited building heights to encourage intensification and development. There are rules and standards in the District Plan that will control bulk, location and height of buildings in the city centre. Considers height should not be limited in the City Centre. Seeks simplification of the height controls.	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and seeks amendments.								

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.50	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.734	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Opposes the City Centre building height controls as notified and seeks that the building heights are simplified. Considers the Central Wellington City and the City Centre Zone should provide for unlimited building heights to encourage intensification and development. There are rules and standards in the District Plan that will control bulk, location and height of buildings in the city centre. Considers height should not be limited in the City Centre. Seeks simplification of the height controls.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>There is no maximum height for buildings and structures in the City Centre Zone</u> <u>Location Limit</u> a. Height Control Area 1 – Thorndon Quay 25.4m b. Height Control Area 2 – Waterloo Quay section 50m c. Height Control Area 3 – Bulk of Thorndon 27m d. Height Control Area 4 – Mid and Upper Molesworth Street 43.8m e. Height Control Area 5 – CBD East 48.5m – 95m f. Height Control Area 6 – CBD West 75m – 95m g. Height Control Area 7 – Eastern Edge of the CBD 42.5m h. Height Control Area 8 – Te Aro 42.5m i. Height Control Area 9 – South East, South West Zone Edge Adelaide Road 28.5m j. Height Control Area 10 – Adelaide Road 42.5m
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.130	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers the submission is more enabling than justified. Considers the calibration of heights in accordance with the notified height control areas is more appropriate for a medium-sized coastal/harbour city that is susceptible to earthquakes and other natural hazards	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.128	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.40	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	This amendment is more enabling than justified. Calibration of heights in accordance with the notified height control areas is more appropriate for a medium-sized coastal/harbour city that is susceptible to earthquakes and other natural hazards	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.39	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	This amendment is more enabling than justified. Calibration of heights in accordance with the notified height control areas is more appropriate for a medium-sized coastal/harbour city that is susceptible to earthquakes and other natural hazards	Disallow
Oyster Management Limited	404.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers the assessment criteria for non-compliance with CCZ-S1 should also include assessment of the extra business capacity added by infringing on height. Notes that the NPS-UD requires tier 1 territorial authorities to provide sufficient development capacity for both housing and business, and Policy 3 recognises that building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; 2. Dominance and privacy effects on adjoining sites; and 3. The extent to which taller buildings would substantially contribute to increasing residential accommodation in the city; <u>and</u> 4. <u>The extent to which taller buildings would contribute to maximising the benefits of intensification in the city" (or words to similar effect).</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.169	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow
Oyster Management Limited	404.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Supports the 75m Height Control Area applying to Lambton Quay.	Retain CCZ-S1.f (Maximum Height) Height Control Area 6 - CBD West's 75m Height Control Area extent as notified. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].
VicLabour	414.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes maximum height limits in the city centre zone. Identifies that Council staff recommended unlimited heights, backed by evidence. Considers there are a range of of checks on building quality and safety that would regulate new builds. Considers that facilitating the development of more residential and office space will support greater affordability. Considers there is a lack of support for new forms of density in the CBD. Considers that maximum height restrictions pose an unnecessary restriction on development and contributes to sprawl.	Seeks that maximum height limits in the City Centre Zone as notified are removed and unlimited height limits are introduced.
VicLabour	414.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Opposes maximum height limits in the city centre zone. Identifies that Council staff recommended unlimited heights, backed by evidence. Considers there are a range of of checks on building quality and safety that would regulate new builds. Considers that facilitating the development of more residential and office space will support greater affordability. Considers there is a lack of support for new forms of density in the CBD. Considers that maximum height restrictions pose an unnecessary restriction on development and contributes to sprawl.	Seeks that maximum height limits in the City Centre Zone as notified are removed and unlimited height limits are introduced.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.181	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that maintaining the height limits within the City Centre Zone is not justified. The City Centre Zone is intended to be the 'beating heart' of Wellington City and to permit the highest level of density. The height limits restrict options for developers and make it harder to deliver quality developments which appropriately respond to the site. All significant development within the City Centre Zone is a restricted discretionary activity, allowing Council significant input and the means to ensure only quality developments are granted consent. That discretion provides a sufficient level of protection. Height limits also risk creating a 'flat haircut' type city, rather than one that contains a diversity of buildings.	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) in its entirety. [inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.182	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes CCZ-S1 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specifying height limits is an unnecessary constraint on development and is inconsistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) which requires district plans to “enable, in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible” (Policy 3). - The building height limits artificially inflate height over other design considerations when assessing the merits of a proposal such as effects on wind and sunlight, potentially to the detriment of overall design excellence. - The requirement to comply with other objective performance criteria such as overshadowing, daylight access, protected view shafts and wind sufficiently contain the environmental impact of subject developments without the further imposition of height constraints. - The building height limits do not allow for a diversity of height within the CCZ, which we consider contributes to a more engaging urban form and allows for better design and urban outcomes. - In any case, the heights currently specified provide a false sense of future development within the city centre as they do not affect activity status (restricted discretionary) and can be extended through, for example, application of the City Outcomes Contributions. 	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) in its entirety.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.183	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Submitter opposes CCZ-S1 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specifying height limits is an unnecessary constraint on development and is inconsistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) which requires district plans to “enable, in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible” (Policy 3). - The building height limits artificially inflate height over other design considerations when assessing the merits of a proposal such as effects on wind and sunlight, potentially to the detriment of overall design excellence. - The requirement to comply with other objective performance criteria such as overshadowing, daylight access, protected view shafts and wind sufficiently contain the environmental impact of subject developments without the further imposition of height constraints. - The building height limits do not allow for a diversity of height within the CCZ, which we consider contributes to a more engaging urban form and allows for better design and urban outcomes. - In any case, the heights currently specified provide a false sense of future development within the city centre as they do not affect activity status (restricted discretionary) and can be extended through, for example, application of the City Outcomes Contributions. 	Seeks that as an alternative to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) maximum heights, floor area ratios relative to lot sizes could be used as a method to control bulk and calculated based on the heights currently allowed. Submitter considers that this would enable more holistic design outcomes that prioritise performance outcomes as opposed to arguably arbitrary height limits.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.184	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Submitter considers that if height limits are retained, there should be further scope for development above the façade height, e.g. plant rooms, sloping roofs, etc. It is the view from the street which is the greatest concern (i.e. the height of the parapet). The way the current height limits are drafted encourages a 'flat haircut' style of building and limits potential roof designs [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Submitter seeks that if CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) height limits are retained, that CCZ-S1 be amended as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: ... b. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m; and c. Lift overruns provided these do not exceed the height by more than 4m. <u>d. Circumstances where up to 50% of a building's roof in elevation exceeds the maximum height where the entire roof slopes 15° or more; or</u> <u>e. Circumstances where, in respect of flat roofs or roofs sloping less than 15°, non-habitable rooms (such as plant rooms) and other roof-top structures may exceed the height, provided those structures are set back from the leading edge of the parapet by at least 2 metres and do not exceed 50% of the overall roof area.</u> ... [Inferred decision requested].
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.185	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers for the Wellington Train Station Precinct that intensification should be most prevalent where major existing public infrastructure is available, particularly public transport. Submitter considers to that end, building height limits (not withstanding earlier comments regarding height limits in general) around the Train Station should be maximised. Submitter notes the 50m height limit above the rail corridor enabling a potential over-station development – the submitter strongly supports this initiative and believe even further height is warranted here. This height should be extended to nearby sites including the station itself, and around Thorndon Quay, Waterloo Quay and Lambton Quay – the majority of which is currently constrained to between 27m and 40m. The submitter believes there are sufficient other controls in place to manage responsible use of height.	Seeks that for the Wellington Train Station precinct CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended, notwithstanding the submitters other comments regarding height controls, to increase the height limit above the rail corridor to the extent possible and ensure the height limit of nearby areas is at a similar scale.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.186	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that for the Tasman Street block, that the block bounded by Buckle Street, Tasman Street, Rugby Street and Sussex Street appears as an anomaly (28.5m) to the height limits of the similarly-zoned blocks immediately to the north (42.5m) and to the south (42.5m). Submitter considers that it is clear that 28.5m is utilised as a transitional height from the 42.5m zone to the lower 21m and 11m height limits, however it is unclear what justification there is for the anomaly on this block given the intensification of the entire Adelaide Road precinct immediately south, and the Te Aro precinct immediately north.	Seeks that the Tasman Street block CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended, notwithstanding the submitters other comments regarding height controls, to increase the height limit of the Tasman Street block to be consistent with the surrounding blocks, and consistent with the intent of the NPS-UD.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Seeks amendments to CCZ-S1 to provide unlimited building heights in the City Centre zone as it applies to the “High City” area that was identified in the Wellington Spatial Plan (centred on Lower Willis Street/Boulcott Street/The Terrace/Featherston Street/Lambton Quay/Customhouse Quay), and as it applies to properties at 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay, and 215 Lambton Quay.</p> <p>Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires district plans of Tier 1 urban environments such as Wellington to enable “building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification” in city centre zones. We interpret this to mean that the City Centre, or at minimum parts of the City Centre, should have no maximum building heights.</p> <p>Unlimited building heights in the central City Centre area are appropriate given the emphasis in the Wellington Spatial Plan and Proposed Plan on the City Centre for accommodating future growth, recognising the height of existing buildings in these areas, and taking into account the absence of any directly adjoining residential areas that could potentially be adversely affected. This would also be consistent with CCZ-P5 which recognises the benefits of enabling greater height and scale of development in the City Centre.</p> <p>According to CCZ-O1 the Wellington City Centre is intended to be the primary commercial centre for the wider Wellington region. Yet the intensification planning instruments notified in Hutt City and Upper Hutt City provide for a greater scale of development than Wellington City with unlimited heights in their centres. Unlimited building heights in the Wellington City Centre would be consistent with its role as the primary commercial centre for the region.</p>	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) with respect to the imposition of height limits in the City Centre Zone.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.1	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	The submission seeks unlimited building heights in part of the City Centre Zone. It is not clear to what extent this would capture precincts and other valued areas including viewshafts and protected sunlight areas. Wellington Civic Trust does not support this notion.	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to CCZ-S1 to provide unlimited building heights in the City Centre zone as it applies to the “High City” area that was identified in the Wellington Spatial Plan (centred on Lower Willis Street/Boulcott Street/The Terrace/Featherston Street/Lambton Quay/Customhouse Quay), and as it applies to properties at 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay, and 215 Lambton Quay.</p> <p>Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires district plans of Tier 1 urban environments such as Wellington to enable “building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification” in city centre zones. We interpret this to mean that the City Centre, or at minimum parts of the City Centre, should have no maximum building heights.</p> <p>Unlimited building heights in the central City Centre area are appropriate given the emphasis in the Wellington Spatial Plan and Proposed Plan on the City Centre for accommodating future growth, recognising the height of existing buildings in these areas, and taking into account the absence of any directly adjoining residential areas that could potentially be adversely affected. This would also be consistent with CCZ-P5 which recognises the benefits of enabling greater height and scale of development in the City Centre.</p> <p>According to CCZ-O1 the Wellington City Centre is intended to be the primary commercial centre for the wider Wellington region. Yet the intensification planning instruments notified in Hutt City and Upper Hutt City provide for a greater scale of development than Wellington City with unlimited heights in their centres. Unlimited building heights in the Wellington City Centre would be consistent with its role as the primary commercial centre for the region.</p>	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to remove all height limits and provide unlimited building heights in the High City areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.2	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	The submission seeks unlimited building heights in part of the City Centre Zone. It is not clear to what extent this would capture precincts and other valued areas including viewshafts and protected sunlight areas. Wellington Civic Trust does not support this notion.	Disallow
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S1 as Reading Wellington Properties Limited is in the process of developing a masterplan for all of its properties in Wellington, with high design thresholds. Given the sites prominence, the design should not be constrained by a permitted height limit.	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) in its entirety.
Chrissie Potter	446.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.
Chrissie Potter	446.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]
Dorothy Thompson	449.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.
Dorothy Thompson	449.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: ... <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S2	Support	Supports CCZ-S2 (Height Controls) around Old St Pauls Church.	Retain Height Controls around Old St Paul's Church, Mulgrave Street as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.96	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S2	Support	Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings 10min walkable catchment Specific heritage identification and assessment Views contributing to sense of place and identity Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell Boffa Miskell streetscapes Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings CCZ encroachment on residential zones Old St Pauls height controls Preserve viewshalfs	Allow
Century Group Limited	238.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S2	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S2 (Old St Paul's Church - Adjoining site specific building height)
Stratum Management Limited	249.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S2	Support	Supports the imposition of a minimum height standard.	Retain standard CCZ-S2 (Minimum height) as notified.
Juliet Cooke	68.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ standards will lead to inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values and are therefore contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan. Heritage and character are qualifying matters under MRZ Pt1 Sch 1. Considers that proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development. Moir Street will be impacted. Moir street is a key and coherent character and heritage area. Moir street is unique with the amount of overlapping relevant overlays. [See submission for further detail]	Amend CCZ-S3.1 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned Areas...) as follows: 1. Identified character... a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct, <u>and</u> b. For any site adjoining a site identified within the MRZ within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than <u>15m</u> .
Tracey Paterson	74.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S3 as currently drafted. CCZ-S1 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design. Moir Street is unique due to its classification as MRZ, Character Precinct, Heritage Area and adjacency to CCZ. As currently drafted, the standards of the proposed plan will allow buildings of up to 28.5m high to tower over 1-2 story heritage cottages on Moir St. The proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation. The Standards of the CCZ proposed Plan will lead to significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values on Moir Street. The standards will result in outcomes that are contrary to the objectives and policies of the PDP (CCZ)	Reject CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Tracey Paterson	74.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Amend CCZ-S3 to set a more appropriate recession plane provision between the CCZ and MRZ.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct. <u>b. For any site adjoining a site identified within the Medium Density Residential Zone within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u>
James and Karen Fairhall	160.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. Considers that the 8m height and 60 degree recession planes in CCZ-S3 is not enough to prevent a devastating dominance over Moir Street's little one to two storey 1880s cottages. The shading effects will be substantial. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.
James and Karen Fairhall	160.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. Considers that the 8m height and 60 degree recession planes in CCZ-S3 is not enough to prevent a devastating dominance over Moir Street's little one to two storey 1880s cottages. The shading effects will be substantial. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. ... <u>2. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u> ...
James and Karen Fairhall	160.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property. Considers that the 8m height and 60 degree recession planes in CCZ-S3 is not enough to prevent a devastating dominance over Moir Street's little one to two storey 1880s cottages. The shading effects will be substantial. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. ... <u>3. For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</u>
James and Karen Fairhall	160.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
James and Karen Fairhall	160.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. and CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.a.ii. and CCZ-P9.2.a.iii.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .</p>
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... 2. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m. ...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... 3. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</u></p>
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1. ... 2. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m. ... </p>
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 3):</p> <p>1. ... 3. For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</p>
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Athena Papadopoulos	183.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height).</p>
Athena Papadopoulos	183.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Athena Papadopoulos	183.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p>2. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u></p> <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Athena Papadopoulos	183.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m 5m above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below: CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7. CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e. CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2. CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2. MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts). HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage). PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission. [Inferred decision requested].
Lara Bland	184.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height).
Lara Bland	184.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m 5m above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lara Bland	184.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1. ... 2. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u> ...</p>
Lara Bland	184.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Lara Bland	184.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Geoff Palmer	188.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Geoff Palmer	188.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Geoff Palmer	188.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1.</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>2. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u></p> <p>...</p>
Geoff Palmer	188.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Geoff Palmer	188.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Dougal and Libby List	207.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .</p>
Dougal and Libby List	207.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Dougal and Libby List	207.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p><u>b. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u></p> <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dougal and Libby List	207.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... c. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (1 story).</u></p> <p>...</p>
Dougal and Libby List	207.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Dougal and Libby List	207.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as follows: CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Craig Forrester	210.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) and seeks amendment.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Craig Forrester	210.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>Considers that the currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>Considers that adverse effects will result including: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m 5m above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Craig Forrester	210.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>Considers that the currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>Considers that adverse effects will result including: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... 2. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m. </p>
Craig Forrester	210.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... 3. For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</p>
Century Group Limited	238.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas - Adjoining the site specific building and structure height) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.325	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Support	Supports the standard as the maximum height for any building is between 25m-93m	Retain CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas - Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2): 1. ... <u>2. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u> ...
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 3): 1. ... <u>3. For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</u>
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chrissie Potter	446.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>Considers that the significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1. ... b. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u></p> <p>...</p>
Chrissie Potter	446.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p> <p>Considers that as Moir Street is also designated a heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Dorothy Thompson	449.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height).</p>
Dorothy Thompson	449.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>Considers that the significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>
Dorothy Thompson	449.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>Considers that the significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1. ... b. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u></p> <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dorothy Thompson	449.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p> <p>Considers that as Moir Street is also designated a heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S4 as it may be appropriate and necessary to provide building heights less than 22m in certain areas and the standard is seen as unnecessarily constraining.	Delete CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.164	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow
Century Group Limited	238.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building heights) as notified.
Wheeler Grace Trust	261.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Considers that the proposed Height Controls in Selwyn Terrace are inappropriate.</p> <p>Supports the proposal that Selwyn Terrace is HRZ with 21m Height Control area.</p> <p>6 Storey buildings would significantly detract from the residential amenity of Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) so that Selwyn terrace, Thorndon does not have a 22m minimum building height.
McDonald's	274.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Eldin Family Trust	287.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Considers that regardless of the zoning applied to Selwyn Terrace a minimum building height of 22m or a maximum if either 21m or 27m would be inappropriate.</p> <p>Considers that these building heights are inconsistent with the Viewshafts VS1 (The Beehive) and VS4 (The Beehive and The Cenotaph – Whitmore Street) which would clash with the viewshaft.</p> <p>Considers that tall buildings in Selwyn Terrace would detract from the residential amenity, special character and heritage of Selwyn Terrace and increase pressure on access, parking and turning.</p> <p>Considers that developers would face difficulty in complying with the minimum height requirements due to covenants on titles.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) with respect to Selwyn Terrace (and the nearby areas of Hill Street and Guildford Terrace) being subject to the 22m minimum height control (Height control area 3).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.198	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Oppose There are many buildings with a height less than the required minimum that will contribute positively to a well-functioning urban environment. The proposed standard will result in too many buildings requiring resource consent and is not an efficient or effective method to implement the policies of the Proposed District Plan.	Delete CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.66	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	Submission point 349.198 supports FSNI submission point 476.57.	Allow
Woolworths New Zealand	359.90	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	CCZ-S4 should be amended to exclude supermarkets, as this is an overly onerous standard when the PDP should be promoting development in the Centres. The standard could also be refined to be a building frontage height standard and limited to specified streets as identified on the planning maps to achieve centre vibrancy and amenity.	Amend CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) as follows: 1. A minimum height of 22m is required for new buildings or structures. This standard does not apply to: 1. Any site adjoining a site located within a character precinct or Residentially Zoned Heritage Area and thus subject to CCZ-S3; and 2. Any site within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct. 3. <u>Any new supermarket building</u>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	Submission point 359.90 CCZ-S4 has similar outcome to FSNI submission point 476.57.	Allow / Allow submission if submission point 476.57 is rejected.
Z Energy Limited	361.121	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support in part	CCZ-S4 is supported in so much as it seeks to enable a higher density of activities in the CC by enabling buildings of greater heights than other zones. This standard applies to every new 'building' or 'structure', which are both defined in the PDP and essentially includes any physical object that is fixed to the ground with no qualifying dimensions.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.122	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S4 should include an exclusion for any building or structure which is unable to be occupied. The intent of this rule is to relate to occupiable buildings rather than any structure that may be fixed to the ground (e.g. sign, pole, box, above ground water tanks, rubbish bins or compounds), which is unlikely to meet this 22m height requirement often for operational and functional necessity and triggers resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. It is acknowledged that the assessment criteria requires consideration of any functional or operational need for a reduction in height. However, it is considered that an additional exclusion be included for ancillary structures that are not intended to be roofed or occupied by people.	Amend CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: 1. Any site adjoining a site located within a character precinct or Residentially Zoned Heritage Area and thus subject to CCZ-S3; and 2. Any site within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct 3. <u>Any ancillary building or structure unable to be occupied by people.</u>
U.S. Embassy Wellington	366.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Concerned about the minimum building height requirement of 21m in the City Centre zone around the United States Embassy for security reasons.	Amend the minimum building height standard CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) so that it does not apply to sites surrounding the United States Embassy as identified on a map provided. [Inferred decision requested] [See original submission for map]
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.30	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	The US Embassy is City Centre Zone. Immediately east of the Embassy are superior quality character and heritage residential properties. The TRA seeks a change from the HDRZ proposed to a MDRZ for the Hobson precinct situated east of the Embassy.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.120	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	Opposes the proposed minimum building height of 22m. Appreciates that the intention of this standard is to ensure new development in the CBD realises as much development capacity as possible, in accordance with NPS-UD. However, it may not be possible or practical for temporary buildings on sites (such as containers or temporary offices) to reach the minimum building height of 22m. However, there is still a functional need for such buildings to be located in the City Centre on a temporary basis, and it would be inappropriate and potentially onerous to obtain a discretionary resource consent in every situation where a temporary building or structure below 22m is to be erected in the City Centre zone. Therefore, Argosy seeks an exception to Standard CCZ-S4 in relation to temporary buildings. Argosy supports the assessment criteria where the standard is infringed to include recognising that a reduced height may be necessary to provide for the functional or operational needs of a proposed activity, or due to topographical or other site constraints	Amend CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height): <u>This standard does not apply to temporary buildings and structures.</u>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.67	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	Submission point 383.120 partly supports FSNI submission point 476.57.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	CCZ-S4 is supported as it excludes buildings and structures in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct from the minimum height of buildings standard.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) as notified.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.187	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	Supports CCZ-S4 in part. Submitter is generally supportive of requiring sufficiently dense development within the CCZ, it should be acknowledged that 6 storeys will not always be appropriate for every site.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) with amendment.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Submission point 416.187 seeks to amend CCZ-S4. FSNI submission point 476.57 seeks to delete CCZ-S4 in its entirety.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.188	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	Submitter considers that while they are generally supportive of requiring sufficiently dense development within the CCZ, it should be acknowledged that 6 storeys will not always be appropriate for every site.	Seeks that for CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) Council should consider reducing the height limit.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.189	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	Submitter considers that while they are generally supportive of requiring sufficiently dense development within the CCZ, it should be acknowledged that 6 storeys will not always be appropriate for every site.	Seeks that for CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) Council should consider amending the standard to provide clarity on the factors which will be considered if the minimum building height is not achieved (e.g. quality urban design outcome).
Foodstuffs North Island	476.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S5 as it may be appropriate to provide ground floor heights lower than 4m in certain areas and the standard is seen as unnecessarily constraining.	Delete (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Century Group Limited	238.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stratum Management Limited	249.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Support in part	Supports the proposed minimum 4m ground floor height as it applies to non-residential buildings. Considers that for residential apartment buildings the 4m ground floor height is not required, serves no useful purpose, and imposes additional construction costs and therefore increases apartment prices. Considers that while conversion of commercial buildings to residential use is often feasible, it is rare that a residential building can be converted to commercial use and therefore a 4m ground floor height is less appropriate for residential buildings.	Retain CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) subject to amendment.
Stratum Management Limited	249.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Amend	Supports the proposed minimum 4m ground floor height as it applies to non-residential buildings. Considers that for residential apartment buildings the 4m ground floor height is not required, serves no useful purpose, and imposes additional construction costs and therefore increases apartment prices. Considers that while conversion of commercial buildings to residential use is often feasible, it is rare that a residential building can be converted to commercial use and therefore a 4m ground floor height is less appropriate for residential buildings.	Amend CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) as follows: The minimum ground floor height to <u>the underside of a structural slab or equivalent shall be:</u> 1. <u>For non-residential and mixed use buildings - 4m.</u> 2. <u>For residential buildings - 3m.</u>
McDonald's	274.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.199	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Oppose	Opposed to the minimum floor-to-floor ceiling heights for new development. The standard is overly prescriptive, does not provide for the specific requirements of drive-through facilities, and is unworkable from an operational perspective, and will only serve to increase the cost and/or regulatory processes of the development.	Delete CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.68	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Support	Submission point 349.199 supports FSNI submission point 476.58.	Allow
Fabric Property Limited	425.83	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S5 and seeks its deletion. Considers that it may be appropriate to provide ground floor heights lower than 4 metres in certain areas and that the standard as notified is unnecessarily constraining.	Delete CCZ-S5 (Minimum Ground Floor Heights) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S6	Support	Supports maintaining the protection of sunlight access to listed public space in City Centre, including increasing the number of protected parks.	Retain CCZ-S6 (Minimum sunlight access - public space) as notified.
Century Group Limited	238.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S6	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S6 (Minimum sunlight access - public space) as notified.
Khoi Phan	326.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S6	Oppose	Considers that minimum sunlight requirement will further restrict our housing need. We are Wellington and now Whakatu Nelson.	Remove CCZ-S6 (Minimum sunlight access – public space) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.200	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S6	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-S6 (Minimum sunlight access – public space) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.735	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S8 should be amended so that active frontage controls only apply where necessary, such as along principal roads/arterials not necessary along connecting streets. Only buildings that are located along any street edge should be controlled, rather than buildings on the whole site where an active frontage applies. Active frontage controls on streets and buildings where these matters do not apply should be deleted. These amendments recognise that active frontage controls are useful to achieve well-functioning urban environments where they are specifically applied on key roads where character and amenity values anticipated by underlying zoning are present.	Amend CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) to only apply for buildings that are located along principal roads/arterials and along any street edge.
Catherine Penetito	474.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S6	Amend	Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced. The Hall of Memories, the Carillon and the old museum building are too important to be overshadowed by residential or other buildings.	Seeks that sunlight access must be maintained in a minimum of 80% of Pukeahu Park rather than the current 70% as specified in CCZ-S6 (Minimum sunlight access - public space). [Inferred decision requested].
Century Group Limited	238.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S7 (Verandas) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.201	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-S7 (Verandahs) as notified.
Z Energy Limited	361.123	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Support in part	CCZ-S7 is partially supported as relates to specific sites identified on the Planning Maps with a 'verandah control'.	Retain CCZ-S7 (Verandahs) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.124	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S7 should be amended to have greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. It is sought that this standard not apply to buildings where there is functional requirement to not include a verandah. (Option A)	Amend CCZ-S7 (Verandahs) as follows: 1. Verandahs must be provided on building elevations on identified street frontages <u>except where there is a functional requirement for a building to not contain a verandah.</u> ...
Z Energy Limited	361.125	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S7 should be amended to have greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. It is sought that this standard not apply to service stations. (Option B)	Amend CCZ-S7 (Verandahs) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Any scheduled building identified in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings; b. Any building where compliance with the standard results in an encroachment into the dripline of an existing street tree. <u>c. Service stations</u>
Z Energy Limited	361.126	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S7 should be amended to have greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. It is sought that this standard recognise functional requirement in the assessment criteria. (Option C)	Amend CCZ-S7 (Verandahs) as follows: ... 1. The extent to which any non-compliance: a. Will adversely affect the comfort and convenience of pedestrians; b. Will result in further street trees being added to public space as part the development; and <u>c. Is required for on-site functional or operational needs</u>

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

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Oyster Management Limited	404.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Considers CCZ-S8 to be overly restrictive and fails to recognise there are reasons that a frontage may not be built to the street edge along the full width of the site, e.g. to provide for vehicle or pedestrian entrance, or public space.	Amend CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows: Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary, excluding vehicle and pedestrian access and public open spaces;
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.190	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Submitter considers that there should be more flexibility to breach the CCZ-S8 where the overall design has a positive effect on the streetscape.	Amend CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows: ... Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. The extent to which: a. Any non-compliance is required for on-site functional needs or operational needs; b. The building frontage is designed and located to create a strong visual alignment with adjoining buildings <u>or otherwise enhances the streetscape;</u> and ...
Fabric Property Limited	425.84	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Considers that the properties at 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay are subject to the Active Frontage Control. Standard CCZ-S8.1.a provides that any new building or addition to an existing building adjoining an identified street with an active frontage control must be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary. Considers that this control is overly restrictive and fails to recognise that there are robust reasons for a frontage to not be built up to the street edge along the full width of the site. For example, there may be a need for a vehicle or pedestrian entrance or public space	Amend Standard CCZ-S9 as follows: 1. ... a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary, excluding vehicle and pedestrian access and public open spaces; ...
Foodstuffs North Island	476.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Oppose in part	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive. In FSNi's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity. Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Amend the CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows: 1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building an adjoining identified street with an active frontage control <u>for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building, must:</u> a) Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; b) Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and c) Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary. Except that: This does not apply to any heritage building identified in SCHED1-heritage buildings; and 2. Any <u>new building or</u> ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: ...
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.49	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.49	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	476.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.</p> <p>Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend the CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows:</p> <p>1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building an adjoining identified street with an active frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building, must:</p> <p>a) Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary;</p> <p>b) Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and</p> <p>c) Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.</p> <p>Except that:</p> <p>This does not apply to any heritage building identified in SCHED1-heritage buildings; and</p> <p>2. Any <u>new building or</u> ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that:</p> <p>...</p>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. The RVA considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. The RVA considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow
Century Group Limited	238.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Amend	Seeks that the minimum unit size for studio units is reduced to 30m2. Considers that Stratum has significant experience in the development of city centre residential buildings, including studio and dual key units. Stratum's model has been refined through significant experience and in Stratum's view a 30m2 studio unit can deliver successful outcomes. Stratum is not opposed to the other unit sizes specified.	<p>Amend CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) as follows:</p> <p>Residential units, including any dual key units, must meet the following minimum sizes:</p> <p>a. Studio units 350m2</p> <p>b. 1 bedroom unit: 40m2</p> <p>c. 2+ bedroom unit: 55m2</p>
Stratum Management Limited	249.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Support in part	Stratum is not opposed to the other unit sizes specified at CCZ-S9.	Retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) with respect to 1 and 2+ bedroom unit sizes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.736	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Support in part	Supports this standard in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility.	Retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.737	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Amend	Supports this standard in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility.	<p>Amend CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) as follows:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Residential Unit Type: Minimum Net Floor Area</p> <p>b. Studio unit 305m2</p> <p>c. 1 <u>or more</u> bedroom unit 40m2</p> <p>d. 2+ bedroom unit 55m2</p> <p>.....</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.191	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Oppose	<p>Submitter is seeking fewer prescriptive standards.</p> <p>Submitter considers that Wellington needs to ensure that we are not unnecessarily preventing innovation by prescribing housing standards, such as minimum unit sizes and outdoor living space requirements (in particular, within the City Centre Zone). While the standards currently drafted will be appropriate for many uses, they may not suit everyone and they do not respond to emerging trends in apartment design.</p> <p>The standards also risk stifling affordable housing within the City Centre Zone by preventing more affordable building typologies.</p>	<p>Delete CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential – unit size) in its entirety.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.151	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Oppose	Considers the minimum unit standards support amenity values in the CCZ.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.47	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Oppose	Minimum unit standards support amenity values in the CCZ.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.192	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Oppose	<p>Opposes CCZ-S9 as the submitter considers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in CCZ-P4 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure. 	Delete CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential – unit size) in its entirety.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.193	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Amend	<p>Opposes MCZ-S7 as the submitter considers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in CCZ-P4 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure. 	Seeks that if Council does decide to retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential – unit size) minimum residential unit sizes, it should be clearly defined that hotel accommodation, student accommodation and other similar accommodation types are distinct from residential unit sizes. The definition of residential units does not clearly exclude student accommodation and may render it subject to these minimum sizes.
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Support	Supports the permitted apartment sizes in CCZ-S9.	Retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential – unit size) as notified.
Paul Burnaby	44.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Amend	Considers that a provision should be made for 'juliet balconies' in CCZ-S10.	Add a provision in CCZ-S10 (Residential – outdoor living space) regarding 'juliet balconies'.
Century Group Limited	238.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stratum Management Limited	249.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	<p>Considers that this standard requires that each residential unit must be provided with an outdoor living space of a minimum size, or that communal living space is provided. In an apartment context, private outdoor living space would be provided in the form of balcony space. There is no equivalent provision in the operative district plan. Stratum has developed various buildings, both with and without balcony space. Stratum's experience suggests that balcony spaces are rarely used in Wellington, often become storage areas, and that they are generally incompatible with typical weather conditions. At a practical level, this requirement will impose additional costs on development. The requirement to provide a 5m2 balcony for an apartment will add an additional \$60,000 to the sale price for each apartment. For an 8m2 balcony, this costs will be in the order of \$100,000. For a typical building of some 100 units, this is a \$10M cost imposition. A communal open space of some 150m2 would add about \$2M of cost. These additional costs result directly from the construction cost of the additional floor area, noting that this is additional to the minimum unit size required by CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size). The requirement will have a significant and direct impact on housing affordability. The provision of communal open space will have a similar effect.</p> <p>Stratum's recent development experience provides that the requirement is not necessary. The provision of Juliet balconies and fully openable sliding doors provide apartments with a strong connection to the outdoors. Moreover, the significant amenity provided within the public environment - public parks, the waterfront, Oriental Bay and Mt Victoria for instance - is a driving factor for the growth in central city residents.</p>	Remove standard CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.738	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	Opposes this standard and considers the City Centre is a zone where it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities.	Delete CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.141	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	Considers that residential outdoor living space provides significant amenity value for residents. Considers it is not appropriate to assume that access to public spaces and facilities is a fair or adequate substitute.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.41	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	Residential outdoor living space provides significant amenity value for residents. It is not appropriate to assume that access to public spaces and facilities is a fair substitute.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.40	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	Residential outdoor living space provides significant amenity value for residents. It is not appropriate to assume that access to public spaces and facilities is a fair substitute.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.194	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	<p>Submitter is seeking fewer prescriptive standards.</p> <p>Submitter considers that Wellington needs to ensure that we are not unnecessarily preventing innovation by prescribing housing standards, such as minimum unit sizes and outdoor living space requirements (in particular, within the City Centre Zone). While the standards currently drafted will be appropriate for many uses, they may not suit everyone and they do not respond to emerging trends in apartment design.</p> <p>The standards also risk stifling affordable housing within the City Centre Zone by preventing more affordable building typologies.</p>	<p>Delete CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space) in its entirety.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.195	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	<p>Opposes CCZ-S10 as the submitter considers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum outdoor living space sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from lack of outdoor living space are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum outdoor living space sizes do not reflect the policy in CCZ-P4 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure. 	Delete CCZ-S10 (Residential – outdoor living space) in its entirety.
Tracey Paterson	74.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose	<p>Opposes CCZ-S11 as currently drafted.</p> <p>CCZ-S1 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is unique due to its classification as MRZ, Character Precinct, Heritage Area and adjacency to CCZ. As currently drafted, the standards of the proposed plan will allow buildings of up to 28.5m high to tower over 1-2 story heritage cottages on Moir St. The proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation.</p> <p>The Standards of the CCZ proposed Plan will lead to significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values on Moir Street.</p> <p>The standards will result in outcomes that are contrary to the objectives and policies of the PDP (CCZ)</p>	Reject CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as drafted.
Tracey Paterson	74.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	CCZ-S11 should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site.</u></p>
Athena Papadopoulos	183.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site,</u> as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Athena Papadopoulos	183.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Lara Bland	184.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site</u>, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lara Bland	184.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Geoff Palmer	188.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site</u>, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Geoff Palmer	188.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design): CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Dougal and Libby List	207.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site</u>, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dougal and Libby List	207.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as follows: CCZ-05.4. and CCZ-05.7.</p> <p>CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-07.1. and CCZ-07.2.a. to CCZ-07.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-02 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Century Group Limited	238.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Support	<p>Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.</p>	<p>Retain CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as notified.</p>
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site</u>, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.301	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 8 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for retirement villages are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) and seeks amendment.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.302	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 8 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for retirement villages are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows: 1. ... [diagram] <u>This standard does not apply to retirement villages.</u>
Jane Szentivanyi	376.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose in part	CCZ-S11 is opposed as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites. As currently drafted, CCZ-S11 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties, as well as recognised heritage and character values which cannot be mitigated through design. As such, the provision is contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan.	Opposes CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) and seeks amendment.
Jane Szentivanyi	376.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.	Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows: 1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site</u> , as shown in Diagram 18 below. ...
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.739	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose	Opposes this standard as considers it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.	Delete CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.142	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose	Considers the CCZ-S11 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance, shading and privacy intrusion effects.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.42	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose	The CCZ-S11 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance, shading and privacy intrusion effects.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.41	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose	The CCZ-S11 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance, shading and privacy intrusion effects.	Disallow
Chrissie Potter	446.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites. Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows: 1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site</u> , as shown in Diagram 18 below.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dorothy Thompson	449.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site</u>, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Considers that this standard will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.	Delete CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.
Century Group Limited	238.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Considers that the standard appears to seek to address the creation of long and featureless building facades. This outcome would appear to be better addressed through design guidance (and associated discretion tied to the design guide) than through a standard. There are various design techniques that can address the issue that the standard is attempting to control.	Delete standard CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth).
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.203	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.81	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Submission point 349.203 seeks to retain CCZ-S12 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.101 seeks to delete CCZ-S12 in it's entirety.	Disallow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.303	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose in part	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) and seeks amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.304	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Amend	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	<p>Amend CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... [diagram] <u>This standard does not apply to retirement villages.</u></p>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.740	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes this standard as considers it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.	Delete CCZ-S12 (Minimum building depth) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.143	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Considers the CCZ-S12 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
LIVE WELLington	FS96.43	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	The CCZ-S12 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.42	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	The CCZ-S12 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance.	Disallow
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.196	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and the submitter does not consider that it meets the section 32 Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Delete CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.
Fabric Property Limited	425.85	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S12, which sets a maximum building depth of 25m. This standard will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.	Delete CCZ-S12 (Maximum Building Depth) in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes the Centre standards which sets a maximum 25m continuous depth of any external side wall. The word “continuous” is defined as forming an unbroken whole, without being interrupted. It is unclear whether the standard would still apply if the side wall was modulated. It would appear that the intent of these standards relates to privacy and dominance effects on neighbours and preventing a long featureless building façade. Privacy and dominance effects are more appropriately dealt with via the height, height in relation to boundary and outlook space standards. Furthermore, any new building in a Centre zone that is visible from the public realm requires consent and consideration of objectives and policies that also address amenity and design. Considers that the standards on maximum building depth are unnecessary and will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design.	Delete CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.
Century Group Limited	238.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S13	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S13 (Outlook space) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.741	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S13	Oppose	Opposes this provision as considers it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living.	Delete CCZ-S13 (Outlook space) in its entirety.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.144	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S13	Oppose	Considers Kāinga Ora's submission provides no evidence or reassurance that residential units will inevitably achieve a decent standard of living without meeting this standard. Considers the PDP should not compromise the amenity value of providing “a decent standard of living”.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.44	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S13	Oppose	Kainga Ora's submission provides no evidence of reassurance that residential units will inevitably achieve a decent standard of living without meeting this standard. The PDP should not compromise the amenity value of providing “a decent standard of living”.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.43	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S13	Oppose	Kainga Ora's submission provides no evidence of reassurance that residential units will inevitably achieve a decent standard of living without meeting this standard. The PDP should not compromise the amenity value of providing “a decent standard of living”.	Disallow

General Industrial Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Burnaby	44.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-S1	Support	Supports the Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct provisions (precinct, objectives, policies, rules and standards), including the proposed 40m maximum height standard (CCZ-PREC01-S1) and request that the Council confirms those provisions.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-S1 precinct and associated provisions as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.60	Industrial Zones / General point on Industrial Zones / General point on Industrial Zones	Support	Considers that industrial areas should continue to be provided for as this results in areas that comply with health and safety standards. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that industrial areas continue to be provided for.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.280	Industrial Zones / General point on Industrial Zones / General point on Industrial Zones	Support in part	Considers the approach taken in this zone aligns with Policy 32 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.281	Industrial Zones / General point on Industrial Zones / General point on Industrial Zones	Amend	Considers the provisions of the industrial zone to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure the General Industrial Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.38	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / General GIZ	Support	Supports the idea of providing business activities spaces for industrial areas of city centre.	Supports retention of the General Industrial Zone as notified
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.62	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / General GIZ	Oppose	Considers that the zone frameworks (Commercial and General Industrial) do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (COMZ-R4 and GIZR6). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage. Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in commercial and industrial zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.	Opposes land use activity rule framework for the General Industrial Zone as notified and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Shelly Bay Road Limited	324.2	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / General GIZ	Oppose	<p>The General Industrial zoning of 3 Shelly Bay is opposed. A Mixed Use zoning is considered to be more appropriate.</p> <p>The site known as Burnham Wharf is currently zoned as Business 2 Zone and subject to specific operational port rules. The site is currently being used as a car storage and bus parking area. The proposed district plan is to rezone this as a general industrial zone.</p> <p>The properties on the opposite side of the road are to be zoned either residential or mixed use. The General Industrial Zone does not allow for residential activities. The owners of the property request that the zone is changed from General Industrial Zone to Mixed Use to allow for the potential of future residential activities to occur. This would be in keeping with the surrounding wharf areas, such as Shelly Bay and allow for residential development in a desirable area close to Miramar.</p> <p>As this land is not held by the port authorities, it is not being used for port (or heavy industrial) activities. It will likely never be used as a functioning wharf again as the infrastructure and related buildings are removed from site. Thus, keeping this zoned for shipping or industrial activities will mean that the owners who wish to alleviate the residential housing market strain will need to put in a considerable amount of effort at the consenting stage. As such the most appropriate zone for this land is mixed use as it is a better management of resources. Any reverse sensitivity effects (such as noise and light) can be controlled with standards as is currently achieved in the central and centres area.</p>	Rezone 3 Shelly Bay from General Industrial Zone to Mixed Use Zone.
Waka Kotahi	370.406	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / General GIZ	Support	Supports the provisions in this zone.	Retain the General Industrial Zone chapter as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.31	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / General GIZ	Support in part	The GIZ chapter is supported, as waste facilities must be protected from reverse sensitivity to ensure their ongoing operation. In the future the Wellington region may also need to consider composting operations for the treatment of the food waste produced. A composting facility is often difficult to establish and is best established with a buffer area in order to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain the General Industrial Zone chapter, with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.83	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / General GIZ	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the General Industrial Zone provides for gyms.
CentrePort Limited	402.145	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / General GIZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that there should be recognition that Burnham and Miramar Wharves are located in the Coastal Marine Area and Burnham Wharf is used for Operational Port Activities. It is included in the Regional Policy Statement definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as being one of the three locations in Wellington Harbour for Commercial Port Activities. The land immediately adjoining Burnham Wharf is zoned General Industry there is an interrelationship with Port Activities. An alternative is to cross reference this matter in introductions of the Special Purpose Port Zone and Miramar/Burnham Precincts in the General Industrial Area.	Seeks that recognition of Miramar and Burnham Wharves location in the Coastal Marine Area and Burnham Wharf's use for Operational Port Activities is cross referenced in the introduction of the General Industrial Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.63	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / New GIZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the zone frameworks (Commercial and General Industrial) do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (COMZ-R4 and GIZ-R6). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification.</p> <p>Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage.</p> <p>Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in commercial and industrial zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.</p>	<p>Amend land use activity rule framework for the General Industrial Zone to include a permitted rule applying to "community corrections activities" as follows:</p> <p><u>GIZ-RX Community Corrections Activities</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>
Ministry of Education	400.146	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / New GIZ	Amend	<p>Seeks that educational facilities are provided for in the GIZ as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure that may need to be located in within industrial areas, particularly training facilities.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Ministry acknowledges the potential effects and reverse sensitivity issues to be considered.</p> <p>The Ministry therefore request an activity status of Discretionary for educational facilities in this zone [see original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Add new rule to GIZ chapter (General Industrial Zone) as follows:</p> <p><u>GIZ-RX Educational Facilities</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where</u></p> <p><u>GIZ-S1 – GIZ-S6 are complied with.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>a. The scale, intensity and/or character of the buildings and associated activity.</u></p> <p><u>b. Noise levels</u></p> <p><u>c. The placement of buildings on the site.</u></p> <p><u>d. The provision of suitable and safe access.</u></p> <p><u>e. The extent of impervious surfaces and landscaping.</u></p> <p><u>f. The effects of matters of reverse sensitivity.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-Complying</u></p>
Oyster Management Limited	404.84	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / New GIZ	Amend	<p>Seeks that a new rule be added to enable "indoor exercise facilities" to be established as a Permitted activity in the General Industrial Zone. Submitter considers that the Industrial Zone is suitable for Indoor Exercise Facilities (such as gyms) because it includes large scale buildings that can accommodate such facilities and Indoor Exercise Facilities are not sensitive to the effects from industrial activities.</p>	<p>Add new rule as follows:</p> <p>GRZ-RX: Indoor exercise facilities</p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.130	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / New GIZ	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin industrial zones which do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Add new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>GIZ-SX:</u></p> <p><u>Boundary setbacks.</u></p> <p><u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u></p> <p>AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.41	Part 3 / Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / New GIZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.204	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-01	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.32	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-01	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain Objective GIZ-01 (Purpose) with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.33	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-01	Amend	Considers that the proposed objective is not specific enough to deter sensitive activities from occurring. Further amendments are required to ensure reverse sensitivities effects are avoided.	Amend Objective GIZ-01 (Purpose) to be more specific and to ensure reverse sensitivities effects are avoided.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.205	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-02	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-02 (Sensitive activities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.71	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-03	Support	Supports the provision for service retail.	Retain GIZ-03 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.206	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-03	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-03 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.91	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-03	Amend	GIZ-03 should be amended to accommodate supermarkets within the zone and reflect the proposed discretionary activity status under Rule GIZ-R4. The proposed amendments enable consideration of reverse sensitivity and operational and functional needs while also retaining recognition of the centres hierarchy.	Amend GIZ-03 (Commercial activities) as follows: Commercial activities are not established in the General Industrial Zone unless they: 1.Are ancillary to industrial activities; or 2. Are of a nature and scale that does not undermine the hierarchy of Centres. <u>or</u> 3. <u>Demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate in the zone; or</u> 4. <u>Demonstrate that no adverse reverse sensitivity effects on permitted industrial activities in the surrounding zone arise.</u>
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.26	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-03	Support	Submission point 359.91 GIZ-03 has similar outcome to FSNi submission point 476.60.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.326	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-04	Support	Supports the objective as it recognises the importance of the functional and/or operational needs of development. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may have a functional and/or operational need to locate stations within the General Industrial Zone in the future.	Retain GIZ-04 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.207	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-04	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-04 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.208	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-05	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-05 (Managing effects) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.64	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P1	Oppose	<p>Considers that the zone frameworks (Commercial and General Industrial) do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (COMZ-R4 and GIZ-R6). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification.</p> <p>Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage.</p> <p>Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in commercial and industrial zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.</p>	Opposes GIZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified and seeks amendment.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.65	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P1	Amend	<p>Considers that the zone frameworks (Commercial and General Industrial) do not enable community corrections activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (COMZ-R4 and GIZ-R6). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification.</p> <p>Industrial and commercial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities; in particular community work components often require large sites for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage.</p> <p>Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in commercial and industrial zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones. Furthermore, as community corrections facilities are not sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial environments (e.g. noise, high traffic movements, etc), they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.</p>	<p>Amend General Industrial Zone Policy GIZ-P1 (Enabled activities) to reference "community corrections activities" as follows:</p> <p>GIZ-P1 Enabled Activities</p> <p>Enable industrial activities <u>and community corrections activities</u> in the General Industrial Zone.</p>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.209	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P1	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.210	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P2	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-P2 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.211	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P3	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-P3 (sensitive activities) as notified.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.34	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P3	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain GIZ-P3 (Sensitive activities) with amendment.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.35	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P3	Amend	Considers that the proposed policy is not specific enough to deter sensitive activities from occurring. Further amendments are required to ensure reverse sensitivities effects are avoided.	Amend GIZ-P3 (Sensitive activities) to be more specific and to ensure reverse sensitivities effects are avoided.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McDonald's	274.72	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P4	Support	Supports the provision for service retail.	Retain GIZ-P4 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.212	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P4	Amend	Support with amendment When compared to other commercial activities that are provided for as a permitted activity within the General Industrial Zone (including trade supply retail, building improvement centre, service retail, or yard-based retail), no clear justification or rationale has been provided as to why drive-through restaurant activities cannot be provided for as a permitted activity. Consistent with the purpose of the General Industrial Zone, drive-through restaurants are compatible with the adverse effects generated from industrial activities and are of a scale and nature that do not undermine the hierarchy of Centres. It is therefore appropriate to provide for drive-through facilities as a permitted activity and to amend the policies of the General Industrial Zone accordingly.	Amend GIZ-P4 (Commercial activities) as follows: GIZ-P4 Commercial activities Avoid commercial activities in the General Industrial Zone except for: 1. Office, retail and other commercial activities which are ancillary to industrial activities; and 2. Trade supply retail, wholesalers, building improvement centres, service retail, <u>drive-through restaurant</u> , and yard based retail.
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.2	Part 3 / Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P4	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports this submission seeking drive-through activities as permitted in the General Industrial Zone (GIZ). In other cities, such as Auckland, drive-through restaurants are provided for a permitted activities in comparable zones.	Allow
Woolworths New Zealand	359.92	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P4	Amend	Considers that GIZ-P4 should be amended to accommodate supermarkets within the zone and reflect the proposed discretionary activity status under Rule GIZ-R4. The proposed amendments enable consideration of operational and functional needs while also retain recognition of the centres hierarchy.	Amend GIZ-P4 (Commercial activities) as follows: Avoid commercial activities in the General Industrial Zone <u>that do not demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone and that result in unacceptable adverse effects that undermine the vibrancy of Centres, recognising that some commercial activities can be comfortably accommodated within the zone, including</u> except for: 1. Office, retail and other commercial activities which are ancillary to industrial activities; and 2. Trade supply retail, wholesalers, building improvement centres, service retail and yard based retail.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.27	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P4	Support	Submission point 359.92 GIZ-P4 has similar outcomes to FSNI submission point 476.60.	Allow / Allow submission in part.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.59	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P4	Support in part	Considers that GIZ-O3.2. (Commercial activities) acknowledges the ability of certain commercial activities that are of a nature and scale that do not undermine the hierarchy of Centres however Policy GIZ-P4 lists only certain commercial activities.	Retain GIZ-O3.2. (Commercial activities) as notified.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.60	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P4	Amend	Considers that GIZ-O3.2. (Commercial activities) acknowledges the ability of certain commercial activities that are of a nature and scale that do not undermine the hierarchy of Centres however Policy GIZ-P4 lists only certain commercial activities.	Amend GIZ-P4 (Commercial activities) as follows: Avoid commercial activities in the General Industrial Zone except for: 1. Office, retail and other commercial activities which are ancillary to industrial activities; and or 2. Trade supply retail, wholesalers, building improvement centres, service retail and yard based retail; or <u>3. Are of a nature and scale that does not undermine the hierarchy of Centres.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.213	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P5	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-P5 (Design of new development) as notified.
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.3	Part 3 / Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P5	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports this submission seeking drive-through activities as permitted in the General Industrial Zone (GIZ). In other cities, such as Auckland, drive-through restaurants are provided for a permitted activities in comparable zones.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.214	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P6	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-P6 (Zone interfaces) as notified.
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.4	Part 3 / Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-P6	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports this submission seeking drive-through activities as permitted in the General Industrial Zone (GIZ). In other cities, such as Auckland, drive-through restaurants are provided for a permitted activities in comparable zones.	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.327	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R3	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the delivery of new emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate new stations in the GIZ.	Retain GIZ-R3 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.85	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R3	Support	Supports the Permitted activity status for emergency service facilities in the General Industrial Zone. The industrial area includes large scale buildings that are appropriate for emergency service facilities [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain GIZ-R3 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.73	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R4	Support	Supports that commercial activities (McDonald's restaurants) are permitted activities in the COMZ, MUZ and GIZ	Retain GIZ-R4.1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
McDonald's	274.74	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R4	Support	Supports the provision for service retail.	Retain GIZ-R4 (Commercial activities) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.215	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R4	Amend	Support with amendment For the reasons discussed in submission point on GIZ-P4, submitter considers it appropriate to provide for drive-through restaurant activities as a permitted activity within the General Industrial Zone.	Amend GIZ-R4 (Commercial activities) as follows: GIZ-R4 Commercial activities 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is trade supply retail, a wholesaler, a building improvement centre, service retail, <u>drive-through restaurant</u> , or yard based retail.
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.5	Part 3 / Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R4	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports this submission seeking drive-through activities as permitted in the General Industrial Zone (GIZ). In other cities, such as Auckland, drive-through restaurants are provided for a permitted activities in comparable zones.	Allow
Woolworths New Zealand	359.93	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R4	Amend	Considers that a non-complying activity status for supermarkets within the General Industrial zone (under rule GIZ-R4.2) is unnecessary and that a discretionary activity consent is more appropriate for supermarkets in the General Industrial zone. GIZ-R4 should therefore be amended. There is no prior awareness of any economic evidence prepared by the Council that identifies industrial land supply as being so significantly scarce relative to demand that non-industrial activities cannot be countenanced.	Amend GIZ-R4.2 (Commercial activities) as follows: 2. Activity status: Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of GIZ-R4.1 cannot be achieved.
Ministry of Education	400.147	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R5	Support in part	Supports GIZ-R5 in part.	Retain GIZ-R5 (Sensitive activities not ancillary to a permitted activity) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.148	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R5	Amend	Seeks GIZ-R5 be amended so that educational facilities are provided for in the GIZ. The Ministry considers that educational facilities should be provided for in the GIZ as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure that may need to be located in within industrial areas, particularly training facilities. Notwithstanding this, the Ministry acknowledges the potential effects and reverse sensitivity issues to be considered. The Ministry therefore request an activity status of Discretionary for educational facilities in this zone [see original submission for full reasons].	Amend GIZ-R5 (Sensitive activities not ancillary to a permitted activity) as follows: Sensitive activities not ancillary to a permitted activity (<u>Except educational facilities</u>) 1. Activity status: Non-complying

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.328	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R8	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the GIZ is a permitted activity.	Retain GIZ-R8 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.216	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R8	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-R8 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.329	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R9	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the GIZ is a permitted activity.	Retain GIZ-R9 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.217	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R9	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-R9 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.282	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R9	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain GIZ-R9 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.283	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R9	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend GIZ-R9 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.330	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R10	Support	Supports the rule as the construction or, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures within the CCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain GIZ-R10 (Construction of or additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.218	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R10	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-R10 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.331	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R11	Support in part	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Supports GIZ-R11 (Outdoor storage areas), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.332	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-R11	Amend	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Amend GIZ-R11 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site. <u>b. Screening does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.333	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S1	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports GIZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures for the purpose of GIZ-R10.1 and GIZ-PREC01-R1.1), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.334	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S1	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend GIZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures for the purpose of GIZ-R10.1 and GIZ-PREC01-R1.1: This standard does not apply to: ... <u>b. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.219	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S1	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures for the purpose of GIZ-R10.1 and GIZ-PREC01-R1.1) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.86	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that the height limit for the Newlands industrial area (including 6 Hurring Place and 12 Newlands Road) should be increased from 15m to 20m, as a 15m height limit does not allow for large-scale industrial buildings expected in the General Industrial Zone and the submitter considers that this height limit is too restrictive for this area. Notes that a 20m height limit is consistent with industrial zones in other districts.	Amend GIZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures for the purpose of GIZ-R10.1 and GIZ-PREC01-R1.1) as follows: ... Height Control Area 2 ... Newlands: 15 <u>20</u> metres [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].
Oyster Management Limited	404.87	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the height limit for the Newlands industrial area (including 6 Hurring Place and 12 Newlands Road) should be increased from 15m to 20m, as a 15m height limit does not allow for large-scale industrial buildings expected in the General Industrial Zone and the submitter considers that this height limit is too restrictive for this area. Notes that a 20m height limit is consistent with industrial zones in other districts.	Amend GIZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures for the purpose of GIZ-R10.1 and GIZ-PREC01-R1.1) as follows: ... Height Control Area 2 ... Newlands: 15 <u>20</u> metres [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.220	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S2	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-S2 (Maximum height of buildings and structures for the purpose of GIZ-R10.2 and GIZ-PREC01-R1.2) as notified.
Oyster Management Limited	404.88	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S2	Support in part	Supports having a separate standard for additional height as a restricted discretionary activity.	Retain GIZ-S2 (Maximum height of buildings and structures for the purpose of GIZ-R10.2 and GIZ-PREC01-R1.2) with amendments.
Oyster Management Limited	404.89	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S2	Oppose in part	Considers the provision of a height standard as a restricted discretionary activity is useful. Submitter considers that it is appropriate to increase the Permitted height to 20m, seeks that the RD height limit be increased to 24m [Submitter also requests amendments to height limits through GIZ-S1].	Amend GIZ-S2 (Maximum height of buildings and structures for the purpose of GIZ-R10.2 and GIZ-PREC01-R1.2) as follows: Height Control Area 4 .. Newlands: 22.5 <u>24</u> metres
Oyster Management Limited	404.90	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S2	Amend	Considers the provision of a height standard as a restricted discretionary activity is useful. Submitter considers that it is appropriate to increase the Permitted height to 20m, seeks that the RD height limit be increased to 24m [Submitter also requests amendments to height limits through GIZ-S1].	Amend GIZ-S2 (Maximum height of buildings and structures for the purpose of GIZ-R10.2 and GIZ-PREC01-R1.2) as follows: Height Control Area 4 .. Newlands: 22.5 <u>24</u> metres

Open Space and Recreation

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.335	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S3	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports GIZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.336	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S3	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend GIZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... e. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 3m measured vertically; and f. Lift overruns, provided these do not exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 1m measured vertically; and g. <u>Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.221	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S3	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.222	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S4	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-S4 (Maximum gross floor area) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.223	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S5	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-S5 (Windows adjacent to Residential Zones) as notified.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.224	Industrial Zones / General Industrial Zone / GIZ-S6	Support	Support	Retain GIZ-S6 (Verandah control) as notified.
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.21	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Not specified	Considers that areas of open space are recognised as essential to human wellbeing. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that alienated areas of the Wellington Town Belt are returned to enhance green space in light of the Housing Accord intensification plan.
James Coyle	307.24	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Not specified	Considers that the Town Belt is relied on too much for providing green areas and numbers may be skewed as a result. While the town belt is an asset it is not accessible to all.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
James Coyle	307.25	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	Considers that more parks and public spaces should be planned to do density well, similar to Carrara Park.	Seeks that more parks and public spaces be planned.
James Coyle	307.26	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there are minimum walking distances to parks and public spaces based on density.
Carolyn Stephens	344.12	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to provide for the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the extent of green spaces be increased.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.284	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Support in part	Supports the provision for customary practices in this zone.	Retain chapter, subject to amendments outlined in other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.285	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	Considers the provisions of the Open Space Zones to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure the Open Space Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.
Inner City Wellington	352.5	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Not specified	Considers that the plan may not be able to directly influence and improve Green Spaces.	Not specified.

Open Space and Recreation - Natural Open Space Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.5	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Not specified	Considers that here are many further issues related to inner city greenery and its protection and extension, and to do with traffic management in the inner city urban area in the District Plan.	Not specified.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.17	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to provide for the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the extent of green spaces be increased.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.83	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Open Space Zone chapter objectives and policies be amended to recognise mana whenua values and aspirations as well as the kaitiakitanga role that Mana Whenua has over the whenua
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.9	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Amend	The NOSZ chapter has no provisions for the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities.	Seeks that the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities is included in the Proposed District Plan as permitted activity in the Natural Open Space Zone.
Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.5	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of the entire site at 9 Comber Place as NOSZ.	Seeks that the entirety of the site at 9 Comber Place is zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.61	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support	Considers that maintaining natural open spaces is an excellent initiative to improve community, wellbeing, and connection with nature. This not only can have mental health benefits but can also mobilise climate or environmental action.	Seeks the retention of natural open spaces.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Boston Real Estate Limited	220.3	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Natural Open Space Zone is inappropriate on a portion of the site because:</p> <p>The current operative plan has split the site into two separate zones, a business area zone and a residential zone.</p> <p>The Natural Open Space Zone is intended to recognise high natural, ecological and historic heritage values.</p> <p>The surrounding properties are maintaining similar zones from the operative district plan to the proposed district plans.</p> <p>it is held in private ownership. This means that the public will have no access along this area or be able to use it.</p> <p>This site is extremely steep and no development has occurred yet due to the difficult site conditions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Natural Open Space Zone at 62 Kaiwharawhara Road is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.13	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Amend	The NOSZ chapter should be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for vehicle-based camping in the Wellington District. Campgrounds can easily meet the objectives, policies and intention of this zone.	Seeks that the NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) chapter be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.393	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support in part	<p>Notes land in this zone contains high ecological and other values. While some areas within this zone will have vegetation removal rules applying because of the SNA overlay, there do not appear to be any other restrictions on vegetation clearance in this zone.</p> <p>We have sought a general vegetation clearance rule in the ECO chapter, outside of SNAs. It seems particularly important in this zone to have such a rule. Amend rules to include a general vegetation clearance rule</p> <p>We also seek a policy in this chapter to protect biodiversity and vegetation values outside SNAs.</p>	Add new rule NOSZ-RX to manage vegetation clearance outside of significant natural areas to protect maintain indigenous biodiversity.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.394	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support in part	<p>Notes land in this zone contains high ecological and other values. While some areas within this zone will have vegetation removal rules applying because of the SNA overlay, there do not appear to be any other restrictions on vegetation clearance in this zone.</p> <p>We have sought a general vegetation clearance rule in the ECO chapter, outside of SNAs. It seems particularly important in this zone to have such a rule. Amend rules to include a general vegetation clearance rule, or alternatively place vegetation clearance limits on the PAs currently in this chapter, in order to protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>We also seek a policy in this chapter to protect biodiversity and vegetation values outside SNAs.</p>	Amend all rules in NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) chapter to include vegetation clearance limits on Permitted activities to protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.395	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support in part	We also seek a policy in this chapter to protect biodiversity and vegetation values outside SNAs.	Add new policy NOSZ-PX to protect biodiversity and vegetation values outside significant natural areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
John Bryce	354.2	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Amend	Considers that if SNAs are to be on residential properties, there should be a comprehensive and meaningful strategy to incentivize willing private participation in the rezoning of residential areas to SNA. These properties should have significant natural features and not just be any area observed on an aerial photograph to be covered in native plants, such as serial Mahoe. SNAs originally proposed for private residential property represented less than 2% of Wellington's SNAs. If WCC incentives are sufficient to outweigh loss of property rights caused by the imposition of SNAs on residential property, then "most people" will willingly participate in the SNAs process, while the remaining ratepayers who do not agree with the imposition of SNA designation on their property, would represent a tiny portion of the total SNAs in Wellington. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that if Significant Natural Areas are to apply to private residentially zoned land, incentives should be offered to incentivise willing private participation in the rezoning of residential areas to Significant Natural Areas.
John Bryce	354.3	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support	Considers that natural environmental feature identified as being of genuine "National Significance" on private property should not be designated an SNA without willing consent of the landowner. Private individuals should not be made to bear the cost of the public benefit of SNA against their will.	Supports that Significant Natural Areas do not apply to private residentially zoned land without landowners' consent.
John Bryce	354.4	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that if Significant Natural Areas are to be imposed, site coverage rules be put in place to limit buildings to a maximum allowable percentage of a residential site include any Significant Natural Area in the total area of the site.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.498	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Oppose	Opposes NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) zoning in the area on the Sea Wall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and seeks that it is rezoned. The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or, A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) zoning in the area on the Sea Wall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and seeks that it is rezoned.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.153	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.499	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Oppose	Considers that the Sewall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is important infrastructure but is not captured within the definition of "Infrastructure" and therefore any maintenance upgrading repair, replacement or development of seawall does not engage infrastructure provisions of the PDP but rather the Natural Open Space Zone. Submitter questions the efficiency and effectiveness of the Natural Open Space zoning and the associated planning framework insofar as it relates to this area. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that an alternative land use zoning is applied to the site that more appropriately recognises the surrounding environment the seawall sits within.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.66	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	Considers it appropriate that there is policy recognition of other activities. This could be achieved through amendment to P4 and provision of a new policy. The Natural Open Space zone is of relevance to Horokiwi as it adjoins the existing quarry to the west. Horokiwi is exploring options for expansion and wishes to ensure that the policy and rule framework within the adjoining zone provides some consenting pathway.	Insert a new policy as follows: <u>NZOS-P4a Other activities</u> <u>Enable other activities within the zone where they have regional benefits.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.500	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new objective to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-O5 Protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>Recognise that the Natural Open Space Zone, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, contains a significant hard engineering structures designed to protect regionally significant infrastructure from coastal erosion, and provide for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade of such structures.</u></p> <p>(Option B).</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.501	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new policy to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ P8 Enabling seawalls that protect regionally significant infrastructure between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u></p> <p><u>Enable the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade of the sea wall and associated activities between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u></p> <p>(Option B).</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.502	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new policy to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-P9 Adverse effects of seawall construction, alteration and additions.</u></p> <p><u>Manage the adverse effects of construction, alterations and additions to the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, including effects on:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Natural and physical resources;</u> <u>2. Amenity values;</u> <u>3. The identified values of Overlays;</u> <u>4. The safe and efficient operation of other infrastructure; and</u> <u>5. The health, well-being and safety of people and communities.</u> <p>(Option B).</p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.503	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new rule to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-R12 Construction, maintenance, alteration, addition, and upgrade of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.504	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new rule to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NZSO-R15 Alteration and addition to existing seawalls (including construction)</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with the Standard NOSZ-S6 is met.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with NOSZ-R15.1 is not met.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>1. The matters in NZSO-P9.</u></p>
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.505	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new standard to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-S6 Seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u></p> <p><u>1. Maintenance, repair, upgrade construction, addition and alteration to the seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point:</u></p> <p><u>a. Any addition shall add no more than 1m in vertical projection to the structure, as it existed on the date on [insert date plan is made operative].</u></p> <p><u>Assessment criteria where the standard is not met:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent to which the additional height is necessary to provide for functional needs or operational needs of the activities on the site; and</u></p> <p><u>2. Whether topographical or other site constraints make compliance with the standard impractical.</u></p> <p><u>3. The importance of protecting the adjacent regionally significant infrastructure.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.131	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin the natural open space zone which does not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Add new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-SX:</u></p> <p><u>Boundary setbacks</u></p> <p><u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u></p> <p>AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.63	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.</p>	<p>Seeks amendments to permit reservoir in Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.5	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.5	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.31	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.54	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.63]	Allow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.64	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Amend	Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.	Seeks that NOSZ-01 (Purpose) is amended to include wording for appropriate infrastructure to be located within the Natural Open Space Zone. [inferred decision requested]
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.6	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jo McKenzie	FS64.6	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Oppose	<p>Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.</p> <p>Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous landuse consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.32	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.55	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Support	<p>Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.63]</p>	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.482	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Amend	Considers it appropriate to include wording to seek that natural open space areas are managed in a way so as to improve water quality and enhance habitat recognising that many of these areas include 'green' and 'blue' corridors of importance to Wellington City	Amend NOSZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: Natural open space areas are <u>predominantly</u> used by the public for informal recreation activities, within un-developed natural areas, in such a way that protects, and where possible enhances, <u>water quality and biodiversity</u> and the predominant character and amenity values of the Natural Open Space Zone which include:
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.506	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Oppose	<p>Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes NOSZ-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.507	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Amend	<p>Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that NOSZ-O1 (Purpose) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.508	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Amend	<p>Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that NOSZ-O1 (Purpose) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.65	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O2	Support in part	<p>Considers that it is important that proposed NOSZ is introduced to protect the recreational, natural, landscape and ecological values of the Open Space areas that the Submitter owns.</p> <p>The Submitter currently permits access onto his land for informal recreation by the public. The land holding provide informal connections from Ngaio to Crow's Nest and the Skyline Walkway– both of which are entirely located within the proposed NOSZ.</p> <p>The Submitter considers this zoning on the balance of the Submitters land acceptable, subject to agreement being reached by WCC with Submitter on the appropriate tenure of the land.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	No relief sought.

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

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jo McKenzie	FS64.7	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	<p>Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.</p> <p>Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous landuse consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.33	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	<p>Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.</p>	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.56	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Support	<p>Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.63]</p>	Allow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.67	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Amend	<p>Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.</p>	<p>Seeks that NOSZ-O1 is amended to include wording for appropriate infrastructure to be located within the Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.8	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	<p>Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.8	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	<p>Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.</p> <p>Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous landuse consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.57	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.67]	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.487	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.515	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.516	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.517	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.68	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose in part	Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.	Seeks that NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) is amended to include wording for appropriate infrastructure to be located within the Natural Open Space Zone. [inferred decision requested]
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.9	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.9	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.34	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.58	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.68]	Allow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.69	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Amend	Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.	Seeks that NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) is amended to include wording for appropriate infrastructure to be located within the Natural Open Space Zone. [inferred decision requested]
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.10	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Jo McKenzie	FS64.10	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous landuse consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.35	Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.59	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.69]	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.488	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.518	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.519	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.520	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.489	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P6	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P6 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.521	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P6	Oppose	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ-P6 (Potentially compativle buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.522	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P6	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P6 (Potentially compativle buildings and structures) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.523	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P6	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P6 (Potentially compativle buildings and structures) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.490	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P7	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P7 (Mana whenua) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.107	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P7	Support in part	Supports NOSZ-P7 (Mana whenua)	Retain NOSZ-P7 (Mana whenua) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.69	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R11	Support	Supports the discretionary activity status within Rule NOSZ-R11 .	Retain NOSZ-R11 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for as a permitted activity) as notified.

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

Open Space and Recreation - Open Space Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.533	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes this rule in part. Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Opposes NOSZ-S2 (Maximum Gross Floor Area) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.534	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S2	Amend	Supports this rule in part. Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Amend NOSZ-S2 (Maximum Gross Floor Area) as follows: NOSZ-S2 Maximum gross floor area 1. This standard does not apply to: a. Additions and alterations to existing buildings at Karori Wildlife Sanctuary (Zealandia, Legal Description Lot 1 DP 313319). <u>b. The maintenance, repair, upgrade, construction, addition or alteration to the seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u> ...
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.535	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S3	Oppose	Opposes this rule in part. Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Opposes NOSZ-S3 (Maximum Building Coverage) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.536	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S3	Amend	Supports this rule in part. Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Amend NOSZ-S3 (Maximum Building Coverage) as follows: NOSZ-S3 Maximum building coverage 1. Maximum building coverage is 5% <u>This standard does not apply to:</u> <u>a. The maintenance, repair, upgrade, construction, addition or alteration to the seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u>
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.10	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	The OSZ chapter has no provisions for the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities.	Seeks that the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities is included in the Proposed District Plan as permitted activity in the Open Space Zone. [Inferred decision requested]
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.70	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Not specified	Considers that the overlays (SAL) do not give effect to both the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone of the Proposed District Plan and National Policy Statement for Urban Development. Considers that there is an opportunity to complete important public linkages to areas that the public value (Crows Nest and Skyline Track for example) rest with an appropriate pattern of development for the land. Kilmarston remain willing to assist Council realise those opportunities. [see original submission]	Seeks that provisions are included for infrastructure to be permitted within the Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ) to provide for a reservoir. [inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.36	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / New OSZ	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.14	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	The NOSZ chapter should be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for vehicle-based camping in the Wellington District. Campgrounds can easily meet the objectives, policies and intention of this zone.	Seeks that the OSZ (Open Space Zone) chapter be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.28	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	Considers that the amount of public and green space to be provided needs to be made explicit.	Clarify the 'Open Space' chapter to explicitly state the amount of public and green spaces provided.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.29	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	Considers that access to green public space in the inner city and suburbs must include provision for children. Development of the Canal Reserve should also consider this.	Seeks that provisions be made for children's access to green public spaces.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.30	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	Considers that three areas within Mt Victoria require special amenity protection in the District Plan: - Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt - Canal Reserve - St Gerards	Seeks that special amenity protection be provided to: - Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt - Canal Reserve - St Gerards
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.10	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Support	Supports the approach of the MVRA submission, which seeks to protect and enhance the townscape of Mount Victoria. While MVRA particularly stresses the importance of protecting the much admired townscape of suburban housing on the lower to mid slopes of the hill, the submitter also agrees with the MVRA submission's reference to 'soft fringes' against the Town Belt, the importance of green and open spaces, and the iconic values of the wider views of Mount Victoria. The submitter particularly supports the reference to special protection being needed for 'Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt' and 'There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matarangi - Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.' Supporting MVRA's reference to special protection for Mount Victoria bus and lookout – Town Belt' and avoiding further intrusions into what is read visually as Town Belt and the critical Mount Victoria Ridgeline, the submitter requests that protection for Mount Victoria Lookout is achieved by number 22 Alexandra Road retaining the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan. [Inferred reference to submission point 342.30]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.9	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Support	<p>Supports the approach of the MVRA submission, which seeks to protect and enhance the townscape of Mount Victoria. While MVRA particularly stresses the importance of protecting the much admired townscape of suburban housing on the lower to mid slopes of the hill, we also agree with their submission's reference to 'soft fringes' against the Town Belt, the importance of green and open spaces, and the iconic values of the wider views of Mount Victoria. The submitter particularly supports the reference to special protection being needed for 'Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt' and 'There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi - Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.'</p> <p>Supporting MVRA's reference to special protection for Mount Victoria bus and lookout – Town Belt' and avoiding further intrusions into what is read visually as Town Belt and the critical Mount Victoria Ridgeline, the submitter requests that protection for Mount Victoria Lookout is achieved by number 22 Alexandra Road retaining the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 342.30]</p>	Allow
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.16	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Support	<p>Considers that the open space network takes on increased importance as a means of providing permeable surfaces to relieve some of the pressure on the storm water system. Open spaces also provide areas for citizens to utilize and enjoy and also supports the growing indigenous bird life in the city.</p>	<p>Retain the Open Space Zone network as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.17	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	<p>Considers that there is opportunity to increase the range of open spaces for the public to enjoy. The town belt is not accessible for all and some underutilised spaces could provide additional open spaces.</p> <p>The submitter provides an example being the green islands between Kent and Cambridge Terraces as an attractive walkway between Courtenay Place and the Basin Reserve. However, notes that it is not easy to walk from island to island. The public space at the eastern end of Courtenay Place (where the tripod sculpture is located) is an underutilised space which could be more inviting.</p> <p>With increased development, density and smaller housing a quality supply of public open spaces becomes more critical. Developers cannot be relied on to create enjoyable open public spaces.</p>	Seeks that the extent of Open Space Zones be increased.
Waka Kotahi	370.407	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	<p>Considers some of the activities permitted in this chapter have the potential to generate significant traffic and have a significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network if not managed appropriately. As trip generation is proposed to be managed in the traffic chapter, specific reference should be included to that chapter. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p>	<p>Seeks to add a note to the Open Space Zone chapter:</p> <p><u>All activities in this chapter must comply with the trip generation thresholds in the transport chapter.</u></p>
Ross Judge	438.1	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	<p>Supports the rezoning of 39 Chapman Street from Open Space Zone to High Density Residential Zone. The 282 m2 area is in the process of being purchased from the WCC and has already been surveyed prior to the sale. The site is intended for housing development in conjunction with the subdivision at the back of 15 Chesterton Street. The site would be within the same walking distance to the Johnsonville railway station and other public transport as other Chesterton Street and Chapman St properties that will be classified as HRZ.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Rezone 39 Chapman Street from Open Space Zone to High Density Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.71	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / New OSZ	Amend	<p>Considers appropriate that amendments to the planning provisions to include provisions for infrastructure to be permitted within the Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ). Considers that permitted infrastructure will assist in servicing future development.</p> <p>Seeks that this can be by proposed designation or appropriate zoning to provide for a reservoir.</p> <p>The Submitters land has been identified for residential development for at least 25 years. Considers that planning restrictions (overlays) over parts of the land do not assist in providing a framework for appropriate subdivision and land use for the subject property.</p> <p>Considers that it is not an effective use of the land resource to provide for a few rural residential properties on and area of land (over 15ha) that has been zoned for residential development. [see original submission]</p>	<p>Seeks that provisions are included for infrastructure to be permitted within the Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ) to provide for a reservoir.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.37	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4, NOSZP5 Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / New OSZ	Oppose	<p>Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.</p>	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.61	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / New OSZ	Support	<p>Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.71]</p>	Allow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.132	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / New OSZ	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin the open space zone which does not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Add new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>OSZ-SX:</u> <u>Boundary setbacks</u> <u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u></p> <p>AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.491	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O1	Amend	<p>Considers it appropriate to include wording to seek that natural open space areas are managed in a way so as to improve water quality and enhance habitat recognising that many of these areas include 'green' and 'blue' corridors of importance to Wellington City</p>	<p>Amend OSZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows:</p> <p>Open space areas are <u>predominantly</u> used by the public for a wide range of passive and active recreation activities, and may accommodate open space community activities, in such a way that maintains, and where possible, enhances the predominant character and amenity values <u>including water quality and biodiversity</u>, of the Open Space Zone,</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.408	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O2	Support	Supports the inclusion of this objective which requires effects on the surrounding area to be managed effectively.	Retain OSZ-O2 (Managing effects) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.492	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O2	Amend	Considers it appropriate to include wording to seek that adverse effects are not 'managed effectively' but rather, avoided, remedied or mitigated: this provides a clearer signal as to the importance of environmental protection of these areas as part of providing for their character and amenity.	Amend OSZ-O2 (Managing effects) as follows: Adverse effects of activities and development undertaken in the Open Space Zone at the Zone interface and the surrounding area are <u>avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.493	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O3	Support	Considers there is insufficient focus on mana whenua and their ability to exercise kaitiakitanga: this objective helps to re-balance this.	Retain OSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.108	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to amend OSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City". [inferred decision requested]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.56	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O3	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.84	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O3	Support in part	Supports that the provision acknowledges Ngāti Toa Rangatira as mana whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara and the relation this has to parks in Wellington.	Retain OSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Waka Kotahi	370.409	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P1	Amend	Considers some of the activities permitted in this chapter have the potential to generate significant traffic and have a significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network – particularly those that are of a larger scale or directly access the state highway network. Waka Kotahi requests that the wording of the policy is amended to include consideration of wider effects on the transport network	Amend OSZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable a wide range of recreational activities, and a limited range of other activities that are compatible with the predominant purpose, character and amenity of the Open Space Zone, while ensuring that their scale and intensity is appropriate <u>and adverse effects on the wider environment, including the transport network, are managed.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.494	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P1	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.495	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P2	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P2 (Small scale mobile commercial activities) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.410	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P3	Amend	Considers some of the activities permitted in this chapter have the potential to generate significant traffic and have a significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network – particularly those that are of a larger scale or directly access the state highway network. Waka Kotahi requests that the wording of the policy is amended to include consideration of wider effects on the transport network	Amend OSZ-P3 (Potentially compatible activities) as follows: ... 1. The activity maximises the use of existing buildings; and 2. Any reverse sensitivity effects can be appropriately managed; <u>and</u> 3. <u>Effects on the wider environment, including the transport network, are managed.</u>
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.496	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P3	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P3 (Potentially compatible activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.497	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P4	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P4 (Enabled buildings and structures) as notified.
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.42	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P4	Oppose	<p>Panorama submits that that if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, OSZ-P4 should not be retained as notified, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.</p> <p>The OSZ is intended for spaces and sites on which buildings and activities are small in scale and ancillary to recreation and other open space activities. The Botanic Gardens Management Plan makes no provision for the site, its building and present uses.</p> <p>Council has intended that the site and its buildings be used for commercial purposes for over 120 years and intends that to continue for at least another 20 years. The objectives, policies and rules of the MUZ are better suited to the site and the territorial authority's functions and obligations under the Act.</p> <p>The location, size, scale and nature of the buildings on this site are not intended for or utilised in a way that is ancillary to open space and conservation activities as presently drafted. They will not enhance the open space values of the adjacent Botanical Gardens or the wider city. However, if they are to remain within the OSZ (which is opposed), the OSZ provisions should be amended to accommodate and provide for the existing activities as permitted activities.</p> <p>The purpose and principles of the Act are better achieved by the site being zoned MUZ or some equivalent zone intended to provide a similar outcome for clusters of commercial activity on fringes of residential zones with public transport connectivity. Alternatively, the OSZ should be amended to enable and provide for the present and similar activities to take place on the site as permitted or controlled activities.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that OSZ-P4 should not be retained as notified if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.498	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P5	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P5 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.43	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P5	Oppose	<p>Panorama submits that that if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, OSZ-P5 should not be retained as notified, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.</p> <p>The OSZ is intended for spaces and sites on which buildings and activities are small in scale and ancillary to recreation and other open space activities. The Botanic Gardens Management Plan makes no provision for the site, its building and present uses.</p> <p>Council has intended that the site and its buildings be used for commercial purposes for over 120 years and intends that to continue for at least another 20 years. The objectives, policies and rules of the MUZ are better suited to the site and the territorial authority's functions and obligations under the Act.</p> <p>The location, size, scale and nature of the buildings on this site are not intended for or utilised in a way that is ancillary to open space and conservation activities as presently drafted. They will not enhance the open space values of the adjacent Botanical Gardens or the wider city. However, if they are to remain within the OSZ (which is opposed), the OSZ provisions should be amended to accommodate and provide for the existing activities as permitted activities.</p> <p>The purpose and principles of the Act are better achieved by the site being zoned MUZ or some equivalent zone intended to provide a similar outcome for clusters of commercial activity on fringes of residential zones with public transport connectivity. Alternatively, the OSZ should be amended to enable and provide for the present and similar activities to take place on the site as permitted or controlled activities.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that OSZ-P5 should not be retained as notified if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.499	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P6	Support	Considers there is insufficient focus on mana whenua and their ability to exercise customary practices. This policy redresses this imbalance.	Retain OSZ-P6 (Mana whenua) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.109	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to amend OSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City". [Inferred decision requested]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.57	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P6	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.85	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P6	Support in part	Provides for customary activities and partnership with mana whenua in management of Wellington parks.	Retain OSZ-P6 (Mana whenua) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.411	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R1	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>Seeks that if activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted. - Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.500	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R1	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R1 (Informal recreation activities) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.412	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R2	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>Seeks that if activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted. - Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.501	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R2	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R2 (Organised sport and recreation activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.502	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R4	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R4 (Customary activities) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.503	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R5	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R5 (Gardens, including community gardens) as notified.

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

Open Space and Recreation - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.44	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R10	Oppose	<p>Panorama submits that that if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, OSZ-R10 should not be retained as notified, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.</p> <p>The OSZ is intended for spaces and sites on which buildings and activities are small in scale and ancillary to recreation and other open space activities. The Botanic Gardens Management Plan makes no provision for the site, its building and present uses.</p> <p>Council has intended that the site and its buildings be used for commercial purposes for over 120 years and intends that to continue for at least another 20 years. The objectives, policies and rules of the MUZ are better suited to the site and the territorial authority's functions and obligations under the Act.</p> <p>The location, size, scale and nature of the buildings on this site are not intended for or utilised in a way that is ancillary to open space and conservation activities as presently drafted. They will not enhance the open space values of the adjacent Botanical Gardens or the wider city. However, if they are to remain within the OSZ (which is opposed), the OSZ provisions should be amended to accommodate and provide for the existing activities as permitted activities.</p> <p>The purpose and principles of the Act are better achieved by the site being zoned MUZ or some equivalent zone intended to provide a similar outcome for clusters of commercial activity on fringes of residential zones with public transport connectivity. Alternatively, the OSZ should be amended to enable and provide for the present and similar activities to take place on the site as permitted or controlled activities.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that OSZ-R10 should not be retained as notified if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.
Waka Kotahi	370.415	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R11	Support	Support discretionary activity status for activities not provided for as this will enable effects to be assessed and managed, including those to the transport network.	Retain OSZ-R11 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for in this table) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.509	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R11	Support	Supports providing for other activities with discretion is appropriate for the open space zone to help ensure these are appropriate to the character and amenity of the area, in accordance with its management plan, and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects	Retain OSZ-R11 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for in this table) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.150	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R11	Support	Supports OSZ-R11. Considering the specific purpose of OSZ, the submitter generally supports the activity status of Discretionary for educational facilities.	Retain OSZ-R11 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for in this table).
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.288	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R12	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain OSZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.289	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R12	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend OSZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.15	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / General SARZ	Amend	The NOSZ chapter should be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for vehicle-based camping in the Wellington District. Campgrounds can easily meet the objectives, policies and intention of this zone.	Seeks that the SARZ (Sports and Active Recreation Zone) chapter be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds.

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

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

Special Purpose Zone - General Points

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.426	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R5	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should also be required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>If activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted. • Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.
Waka Kotahi	370.427	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R6	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should also be required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>If activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted. - Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.
Waka Kotahi	370.428	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R13	Support	Support discretionary activity status for activities not provided for as this will enable effects to be assessed and managed, including those to the transport network.	Retain SARZ-R13 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for as a Permitted Activity) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.151	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R13	Support	Supports SARZ-R13. Considering the specific purpose of the SARZ, the submitter generally supports the activity status of Discretionary for educational facilities.	Retain SARZ-R13 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for as a Permitted Activity) as notified.
James Coyle	307.27	Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Amend	Considers that Carrara Park should be a “special zone” that is clearly hatched to protect sunlight access to the park in winter months.	Add new Special Purpose Zone for Carrara Park to protect the park's sunlight access in winter months. [Inferred decision requested]
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.396	Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Support in part	Opposes any provisions in all Special Purpose Zones lessen the protection given to SNAs, OFLS, SALs, of areas of natural character in the coastal environment. We submit that all provisions in the Special Purpose Zones still have to give effect to the requirements of the Act and national direction, including the NZCPS. Any exemptions from, or lessening of, those requirements are opposed.	Amend Special Purpose Zone chapters to give effect to national direction regarding Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Features and Landscapes, and Significant Amenity Areas in line with national direction instruments, particularly the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.290	Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Amend	Considers the provisions of the Special Purpose Zones to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure the Special Purpose Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.110	Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone be added to the Proposed District Plan and be used as an alternative.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.111	Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone that would include objectives, policies, rules and standards to recognise the cultural and environmental overlays over the site whilst enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.15	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zone / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.111].</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.35	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks.</p> <p>This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow
Lance Lones	FS81.20	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zone / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.

Special Purpose Zone - Airport Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.21	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whanui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whanui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whanui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.111]</p>	Disallow
Save Our Venues	445.9	Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that a further solution to the issue of low acoustic insulation standards in new residential developments in the immediate vicinity of existing live music venues, could include the rezoning of existing music venues into Special Entertainment Precincts. This will allow for a higher level of sound output.</p> <p>Considers that these areas would allow for prioritising the cultural and economic value of these venues and protect them from land use conflict where new expectations of residential amenity can overlap with the existing features of the urban environment.</p> <p>Considers that these standards are already exemplified in the High Noise Area zoned for Courtenay Place, and could extend protections to the venues such as as Meow, San Fran and Valhalla which are currently located in the Central Area Zone.</p> <p>The Entertainment Precinct approach has been implemented successfully in Queenstown and Sydney, and with similar zoning structures to the Auckland Unitary Plan.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the WCC consider creating a Special Entertainment Precinct Zone to protect existing and new music venues.
Yvonne Weeber	340.106	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support in part	<p>The 'physically contiguous' nature of the airport precincts, mentioned in the introduction of the Airport Zone chapter, is supported. While its expedient for the airport to break the area up into different precincts the airport is viewed as one entity by the surrounding neighbourhood and visitors. Any development will have a cumulative environmental, landscape and visual effect on the neighbours and visitors.</p>	Retain 'physically contiguous' airport precincts in the Airport Zone chapter.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.172	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.107	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the 'Terminal Precinct' section in the introduction of the Airport Zone chapter should be amended to include road, pedestrian and cycle access and include information on public transport and cycle parking facilities. The airports land transport connections are described in broad detail in the Main Site Area designation. This should be included within the district plan to support the multimodal transport connection required of an airport and city committed to reducing climate changing emissions of land transport.</p>	<p>Amend the 'Terminal Precinct' section in the introduction of the Airport Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p>For passengers, the Terminal Precinct is the Airport's heart. It comprises the main passenger terminal, access and <u>pedestrian</u> roading, car parking, <u>cycle parking</u>, <u>land public transport hub</u> and commercial and passenger support services including visitor accommodation and conference facilities <u>and vehicle, pedestrian and cycle connection of Stewart Duff Drive</u>. It also contains airside airport facilities such as hangars, aircraft parking stands, and aviation support facilities.</p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.173	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.108	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the WIAL5 (East Side Area) as it uses the area as part of the Miramar Golf Course until such time as airport air traffic growth. It is also supported due to the use of this area for the 'temporary' relocation of parking where it displaces by construction activity in other parts of the airport. The East Side Area should be maintained as a golf course recreation buffer if parking was proposed as a permanent feature of this Precinct.</p>	Retain part of the Miramar Golf Course in WIAL5 (East Side Area).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.174	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.109	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.175	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.110	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Considers that precinct descriptions in the introduction of the Airport Zone chapter should be amended to add a precinct description on the Bridge Street area from the present fence boundary of the airport to Bridge Street. This area was not included in the Main Site Area Designation of the airport. In the 2030 WIAL Masterplan this land is indicated as remote car parking. This is an area that obviously is marked for redevelopment in the future for the airport and needs to be included within the District Plan as a redevelopment enhancement area.</p>	<p>Amend the introduction of the Airport Zone chapter to add a new precinct description as follows:</p> <p><u>Bridge Street Precinct</u> <u>The Bridge Street Precinct comprises land located on the East side of Bridge Street from Cairns Street at the north and Coutts Street to the south. At present the Bridge Street Precinct shall be limited to an open space enhancement area.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.176	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.111	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	Considers that the 'Airport Precinct Plan' should be amended to include a new Bridge Street Precinct. The area between existing boundary fence of the airport to the eastern side of the Bridge Street formed road. This area of land was not considered in the Main Site Area Designation of Wellington Airport and should be considered as a separate enhancement development area.	Amend the 'Airport Precinct Plan' to include the Bridge Street Precinct.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.177	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.130	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	The Airport Zone is generally supported, as it provides for the ongoing management and development of Wellington International Airport. The zoning of Z Broadway, which is located within the proposed Airport Zone is supported.	Retain Airport Zone chapter as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.429	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Not specified	Airport activities should be explicit about the goal of providing integrated public transport to and from the airport.	Airport activities should be explicit about the goal of providing integrated public transport to and from the airport.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.232	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	WIAL supports this submission in principle, however considers that the rules within the Airport Zone will need to provide for such an activity.	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.56	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Supports any change to the Airport Zone that strengthens the goal of an integrated public transport system to and from the airport. [Inferred reference to submission 370.429]	Allow / Seeks the inclusion of airport activities should be explicit about the goal of providing integrated public transport to and from the airport.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.7	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Support the overview of the East Side Precinct. This overview limits car parking to the temporary relocation of parking where it is displaced by construction activity in other parts of the Airport which is supported. Since the ESA land Requirement was wholly justified on Airside expansion, we submit that public car parking is not an airside activity and should have been prohibited. The temporary restriction is an acceptable alternative. Note that Condition 5 of the WIAL designation is at odds with this.	Retain the overview of the East Side Precinct as in the introduction of the Airport Zone as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.231	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that WIAL has prepared a new Airport Zone chapter that seeks to create better alignment between the Airport Zone and designations, while also providing for activities that are not provided for by the designation or by WIAL as the requiring authority.	Disallow
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.8	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	Considers that the description of Airport Noise and reference to the Air Noise Overlay is not clear in that it does not state both inner and outer extent.	Amend Airport Noise description as follows: The management of noise associated with the Airport's operations is addressed in the District Plan Noise Chapter. Noise is subject to the following interrelated controls: 1. District Plan provisions which reference specific noise restrictions. 2. District Plan provisions which reference the Airport's Noise Management Plan (NMP). 3. The NMP, which sits outside of the District Plan. 4. The Air Noise Overlay (ANO's) of the Inner Air Noise Overlay and the Outer Air Noise Overlay – which is demarcated on the District Plan maps, and referenced in District Plan provisions and the NMP. The extent and nature of the ANO's are guided by the recommendations of New Zealand Standard NZS6805:1992 Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.233	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that WIAL is proposing to replace these definitions in their entirety with the well established terms (and associated definitions) "Air Noise Boundary" and "60dB Ldn Noise Boundary".	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission to be disallowed.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.112	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to amend Special Purpose Airport Zone to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City".
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.58	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.537	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Submitter acknowledges that the margins of its site at Lyall Bay and Evans Bay are within the coastal environment, as defined by the NZCPS and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement. However both margins are heavily modified for airport activities and roading infrastructure. Submitter expresses concern that the complex relationship between the Coastal Environment, Infrastructure and Airport Zone provisions creates an inefficient consenting pathway for airport and airport related activities.	Not Specified
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.55	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated opposes WIAL's amendments and changes to the airport zone proposed by Wellington International Airport. Seeks clarification from Wellington City Council on the relationship between the Airport zone and WIAL's designations and how the Airport Zone should be written into the plan. Submitter notes that areas of land zoned in the Airport Zone are not in WIAL designations e.g. The Bridge Street East area is not in the Main Site Area Designation maps.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan, but note that the Airport Zone does include land that is not in the WIAL designations.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.57	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Wellington Airport Evans Bay (northern edge) and Lyall Bay (southern edge) are within the coastal environment. The margins are constantly being inundated by natural coastal process. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.538	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Submitter acknowledges that the margins of its site at Lyall Bay and Evans Bay are within the coastal environment, as defined by the NZCPS and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement. However both margins are heavily modified for airport activities and roading infrastructure.</p> <p>Submitter expresses concern that the complex relationship between the Coastal Environment, Infrastructure and Airport Zone provisions creates an inefficient consenting pathway for airport and airport related activities.</p>	<p>If the Airport Zone within the Coastal Environment at Lyall Bay and Evans Bay is not removed:</p> <p>Seeks that the relationship and consenting pathway for activities within the coastal environment (insofar as they relate to activities undertaken with an Airport purpose) are enabled, streamlined and reflective of the existing environment. (Option B).</p>
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.58	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Wellington Airport Evans Bay (northern edge) and Lyall Bay (southern edge) are within the coastal environment. The margins are constantly being inundated by natural coastal process. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.539	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the introductory text of Airport Zone chapter.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.56 to 4.61 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that introduction to Airport Zone chapter is amended to be replaced with the text in Annexure B of original submission.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.59	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Opposes the total re-writing of the Airport Zone. The Airport Zone includes land that is not in Wellington Airport Designations e.g. Bridge Street East. There needs to be clarification on how the Airport Zone and Designations interrelate. Does not want the designation being forgotten in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan, but note that the Airport Zone does include land that is not in the WIAL designations.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.154	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.540	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Considers that Airports provide services beyond traditional 'runways and terminals', and provide a range of industrial, commercial and logistical land uses.</p> <p>Considers that it is becoming increasingly important for airport operators to retain sufficient flexibility to properly enable forward planning and development necessary to respond to changing demands that arise at a modern airport.</p> <p>Per case law, commercial activities form part of modern airports.</p> <p>The airport zone chapter does not adequately recognise the diverse and evolving nature of an airport and creates an inefficient and ineffective consenting framework that fails to recognise that a broad range of activities are reasonably anticipated within the zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Airport Zone operates independently of the WIAL designation.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.60	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Opposes the total re-writing of the Airport Zone. The Airport Zone includes land that is not in Wellington Airport Designations e.g. Bridge Street East. There needs to be clarification on how the Airport Zone and Designations interrelate. Does not want the designation being forgotten in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan, but note that the Airport Zone does include land that is not in the WIAL designations.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.155	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.541	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Considers that Airports provide services beyond traditional 'runways and terminals', and provide a range of industrial, commercial and logistical land uses.</p> <p>Considers that it is becoming increasingly important for airport operators to retain sufficient flexibility to properly enable forward planning and development necessary to respond to changing demands that arise at a modern airport.</p> <p>Per case law, commercial activities form part of modern airports.</p> <p>The airport zone chapter does not adequately recognise the diverse and evolving nature of an airport and creates an inefficient and ineffective consenting framework that fails to recognise that a broad range of activities are reasonably anticipated within the zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that where WIAL designation conditions are "replicated" as rules or standards within the Airport Zone, the further nuancing (and in some cases, deletion) of those provisions is required in order to ensure the controls are appropriate and enforceable, particularly with respect to the management of aircraft noise effects.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.61	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Opposes the total re-writing of the Airport Zone. The Airport Zone includes land that is not in Wellington Airport Designations e.g. Bridge Street East. There needs to be clarification on how the Airport Zone and Designations interrelate. Does not want the designation being forgotten in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan, but note that the Airport Zone does include land that is not in the WIAL designations.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.156	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.542	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Considers that Airports provide services beyond traditional 'runways and terminals', and provide a range of industrial, commercial and logistical land uses.</p> <p>Considers that it is becoming increasingly important for airport operators to retain sufficient flexibility to properly enable forward planning and development necessary to respond to changing demands that arise at a modern airport.</p> <p>Per case law, commercial activities form part of modern airports.</p> <p>The airport zone chapter does not adequately recognise the diverse and evolving nature of an airport and creates an inefficient and ineffective consenting framework that fails to recognise that a broad range of activities are reasonably anticipated within the zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Airport Zone chapter is amended to to remove the overlap between rules and standards that relate to "activities" and "buildings and structures".
Z Energy Limited	FS33.2	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Z Energy supports this rule which provides for non-airport activities (e.g. service stations) as a restricted discretionary activity subject to compliance with standards. It is assumed that the intent of this rule is to relate to 'new' non-airport activities and not to operational changes or expansion of existing non-airport activities.	<p>Amend provision by adding the following to WIAL relief sought:</p> <p>AIRPZ-R2 Non-airport activities</p> <p>Activity Status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. All relevant standards in AIRPZ-S3 to AIRPZ-S4 are met; <u>and</u></p> <p>b. <u>The activity is for a new non-airport activity</u></p> <p>...</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	FS33.5	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	<p>Z Energy supports this rule as, compared to the notified rule, does not differentiate activity status based on the type of activity (e.g. non-airport activity) the building or structure is intended to accommodate.</p> <p>The amended rule also appears to more clearly capture maintenance, repair, additions and alterations of existing buildings or structures with the activity status determined on compliance with built form standards and standards relating to specific precincts. Z Energy supports this approach.</p> <p>Z Energy considers that demolition or removal of existing buildings or structures should also be included in the permitted activity rule to be consistent with the approach adopted in the other PDP zone chapters.</p>	<p>Amend provision by adding the following to WIAL relief sought: AIRPZ-R3 Buildings and structures 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. All relevant standards in AIRPZ-S1 to AIRPZ-S2 are met; or b. <u>The activity is for the demolition or removal of existing buildings or structures</u></p>
Z Energy Limited	FS33.7	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Z Energy supports this amended standard as it removes the discrepancy in the notified version of AIRPZ-S3 which seeks to restrict all retail activities, service retail, restaurants and other food and beverage facilities including takeaway food facilities and commercial activities to the Terminal Precinct, noting that several of these abovementioned activities are currently located outside of the Terminal Precinct.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.62	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Opposes the total re-writing of the Airport Zone. The Airport Zone includes land that is not in Wellington Airport Designations e.g. Bridge Street East. There needs to be clarification on how the Airport Zone and Designations interrelate. Does not want the designation being forgotten in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan, but note that the Airport Zone does include land that is not in the WIAL designations.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.157	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.543	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Considers that Airports provide services beyond traditional 'runways and terminals', and provide a range of industrial, commercial and logistical land uses.</p> <p>Considers that it is becoming increasingly important for airport operators to retain sufficient flexibility to properly enable forward planning and development necessary to respond to changing demands that arise at a modern airport.</p> <p>Per case law, commercial activities form part of modern airports.</p> <p>The airport zone chapter does not adequately recognise the diverse and evolving nature of an airport and creates an inefficient and ineffective consenting framework that fails to recognise that a broad range of activities are reasonably anticipated within the zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks a re-write of the Airport Chapter. Has provided a redrafted chapter in Appendix B of the original submission.</p> <p>[See Appendix B of the original submission]</p>
Z Energy Limited	FS33.1	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Z Energy generally supports the new Airport Zone chapter proposed by WIAL but seeks clarity on some of the specific provisions in line with the matters raised in Z Energy's original submission to seek to ensure that the provisions provide for the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of Z Broadway. Notwithstanding this general support, specific amendments to provisions proposed by the WIAL are sought by Z Energy.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	FS33.3	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Z Energy supports this rule which provides for non-airport activities (e.g. service stations) as a restricted discretionary activity subject to compliance with standards. It is assumed that the intent of this rule is to relate to 'new' non-airport activities and not to operational changes or expansion of existing non-airport activities.	Amend provision by adding the following to WIAL relief sought: AIRPZ-R2 Non-airport activities Activity Status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. All relevant standards in AIRPZ-S3 to AIRPZ-S4 are met; <u>and</u> b. <u>The activity is for a new non-airport activity</u> ...
Z Energy Limited	FS33.4	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Z Energy supports this rule as, compared to the notified rule, does not differentiate activity status based on the type of activity (e.g. non-airport activity) the building or structure is intended to accommodate. The amended rule also appears to more clearly capture maintenance, repair, additions and alterations of existing buildings or structures with the activity status determined on compliance with built form standards and standards relating to specific precincts. Z Energy supports this approach. Z Energy considers that demolition or removal of existing buildings or structures should also be included in the permitted activity rule to be consistent with the approach adopted in the other PDP zone chapters.	Amend provision by adding the following to WIAL relief sought: AIRPZ-R3 Buildings and structures 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. All relevant standards in AIRPZ-S1 to AIRPZ-S2 are met; or b. <u>The activity is for the demolition or removal of existing buildings or structures</u>
Z Energy Limited	FS33.6	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Z Energy supports this amended standard as it removes the discrepancy in the notified version of AIRPZ-S3 which seeks to restrict all retail activities, service retail, restaurants and other food and beverage facilities including takeaway food facilities and commercial activities to the Terminal Precinct, noting that several of these abovementioned activities are currently located outside of the Terminal Precinct.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.63	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Opposes the total re-writing of the Airport Zone. The Airport Zone includes land that is not in Wellington Airport Designations e.g. Bridge Street East. There needs to be clarification on how the Airport Zone and Designations interrelate. Does not want the designation being forgotten in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan, but note that the Airport Zone does include land that is not in the WIAL designations.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.158	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.544	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Not specified	Considers that the Airport Zone is subject to a number of natural hazard and coastal related overlays which render other rules obsolete.	Clarify the resulting activity status for a subdivision activity within the Airport Zone.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.64	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	Opposes the total re-writing of the Airport Zone. The Airport Zone includes land that is not in Wellington Airport Designations e.g. Bridge Street East. There needs to be clarification on how the Airport Zone and Designations interrelate. Does not want the designation being forgotten in the District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks the submission points be disallowed or amended as to how designations be considered in the plan, but note that the Airport Zone does include land that is not in the WIAL designations.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.159	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.62	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Support the 'physically contiguous' nature of the airport precincts. While its expedient for the airport to break the area up into different precincts the airport is viewed as one entity by the surrounding neighbourhood and visitors. Any development will have a cumulative environmental, landscape and visual effect on the neighbours and visitors.	Retain reference to airport precincts being physically contiguous in the Airport Zone introduction as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.200	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.63	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Considers amending the introduction (terminal precinct) description to include road, pedestrian and cycle access and include information on public transport and cycle parking facilities. The airports land transport connections are described in broad detail in the Main Site Area designation. This should be included within the district plan to support the multimodal transport connection required of an airport and city committed to reducing climate changing emissions of land transport.</p>	<p>Amend the description of the Terminal Precinct as follows:</p> <p>For passengers, the Terminal Precinct is the Airport's heart. It comprises the main passenger terminal, access and <u>pedestrian</u> roading, car parking, <u>cycle parking, land public transport hub</u> and commercial and passenger support services including visitor accommodation and conference facilities <u>and vehicle, pedestrian and cycle connection of Stewart Duff Drive</u>. It also contains airside airport facilities such as hangars, aircraft parking stands, and aviation support facilities.</p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.201	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.64	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Considers amending the introduction (Terminal Precinct and East Side Precinct) descriptions to include the vehicle, pedestrian and cycle connection of Stewart Duff Drive, a WIAL private road, between State Highway and Moa Point Road.</p> <p>Stewart Duff Drive connection may change with the expansion of the Airport into the East Side Area. The submitter considers it a fundamental connection between the southern coast at Moa Point Road and Miramar. This connection adds to the resilience of the southern and Miramar population and should be noted in the Wellington City District Plan.</p>	<p>Amend the description of the Terminal Precinct and East Side Precinct as follows:</p> <p>For passengers, the Terminal Precinct is the Airport's heart. It comprises the main passenger terminal, access and <u>pedestrian</u> roading, car parking, <u>cycle parking, land public transport hub</u> and commercial and passenger support services including visitor accommodation and conference facilities <u>and vehicle, pedestrian and cycle connection of Stewart Duff Drive</u>. It also contains airside airport facilities such as hangars, aircraft parking stands, and aviation support facilities.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.202	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.65	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Supports the East Side Precinct and the continued use of the area as part of the Miramar Golf Course until such time as airport air traffic growth	Retain the description of the East side precinct as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.203	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.66	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Support	Support the use of the East Side Precinct area for the 'temporary' relocation of parking where it displaces by construction activity in other parts of the airport.	Retain as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.204	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.67	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Not specified	Considers that The East Side Area should be maintained as a golf course recreation buffer if parking was proposed as a permanent feature of this Precinct.	Seeks that the East Side Area be maintained as a golf course recreation buffer if parking was proposed as a permanent feature of this Precinct.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.205	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.68	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on the Miramar South Precinct. Please refer to the original submission.	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.206	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / General AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.131	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Amend	Considers that the Airport Zone chapter should be amended to have new and appropriate provisions included for the demolition, maintenance, upgrades and repair of buildings and structures as a permitted activity, which is a consistent approach adopted in several of the PDP zone chapters. These rules in other zones provide clarity that maintenance, repair, upgrades and removal of obsolete structures can be undertaken as a permitted activity.	Add a new Rule in the Airport Zone chapter as follows: <u>AIRPZ-R5 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures)</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.234	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of this rule in principle and considers it provides certainty and clarity. WIAL prefers however, the alternate drafting WIAL proposed in its primary submission.	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.
Z Energy Limited	361.132	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Amend	Considers that the Airport Zone chapter should be amended to have new and appropriate provisions included for the demolition, maintenance, upgrades and repair of buildings and structures as a permitted activity, which is a consistent approach adopted in several of the PDP zone chapters. These rules in other zones provide clarity that maintenance, repair, upgrades and removal of obsolete structures can be undertaken as a permitted activity.	Add a new Rule in the Airport Zone chapter as follows: <u>AIRPZ-R6 (Demolition or removal of buildings or structures)</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.235	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of this rule in principle and considers it provides certainty and clarity. WIAL prefers however, the alternate drafting WIAL proposed in its primary submission.	Allow
Z Energy Limited	361.133	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the Airport Zone chapter should be amended to have new and appropriate provisions included for the demolition, maintenance, upgrades and repair of buildings and structures as a permitted activity, which is a consistent approach adopted in several of the PDP zone chapters. These rules in other zones provide clarity that maintenance, repair, upgrades and removal of obsolete structures can be undertaken as a permitted activity.</p> <p>If AIRPZ-R4 only applies to additions and alterations to existing buildings and existing structures, it is considered appropriate to include a new rule enabling additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with the relevant built form standards. The standards and the proposed matters of discretion ensure appropriate levels of built form are enabled for all airport, airport-related and non-airport activities.</p>	<p>Add a new Rule in the Airport Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>AIRPZ-R7 (Additions or alterations to buildings and structures)</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with AIRPZ-S1 and AIRPZ-S2 is achieved.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with AIRPZ-S1 and AIRPZ-S2 cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>a. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards; and b. Relevant matters listed in policy AIRPZ-P5.</u></p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.236	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Support	WIAL supports in principle, the inclusion of this rule and considers it provides certainty and clarity, particularly as such rules are provided for in other chapters of the Proposed Plan.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.545	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to add reference to the obstacle limitation surface to draw plan users attention to designation requirements, to ensure that the designation is able to serve it's important purpose.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.160	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.69	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Amend	Considers amending the precinct descriptions by adding a precinct description on the Bridge Street area from the present fence boundary of the airport to Bridge Street. This area was not included in the Main Site Area Designation of the airport. In the 2030 WIAL Masterplan this land is indicated as remote car parking. This is an area that obviously is marked for redevelopment in the future for the airport and needs to be included within the District Plan as a redevelopment enhancement area.	<p>Amend the Airport Zone to include a new Bridge Street Precinct with a description as follows:</p> <p><u>The Bridge Street Precinct comprises land located on the East side of Bridge Street from Cairns Street at the north and Coutts Street to the south. At present the Bridge Street Precinct shall be limited to an open space enhancement area.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.207	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.70	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Amend	Considers the need to amend the Airport Precinct Plans to include a new Bridge Street Precinct the area between existing boundary fence of the airport to the eastern side of the Bridge Street formed road.	Amend the Airport Precinct Plan to include a new Bridge Street Precinct for the area between existing boundary fence of the airport to the eastern side of the Bridge Street formed road.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.208	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / New AIRPZ	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.112	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-01	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.178	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-01	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.134	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-01	Support	Supports Objectives AIRPZ-01 to AIRPZ-06 which seek to enable airport activities and ensure airport related and non-airport activities support are compatible with the ongoing operation of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-01 (Purpose of the Airport Zone) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.71	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-01	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on this provision. Please refer to the original submission.	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.209	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-01	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.113	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-02	Support in part	Supports AIRPZ-02 due to the higher standard of design of the large buildings and structures where they are visible to the public domain. Seeks amendment.	Retain Objective AIRPZ-02 (Development of the Airport Zone) with amendment
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.179	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-02	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.114	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-02	Amend	Considers AIRPZ-02 should be amended to add a fourth point that any development of the airport zone should support the enablement of carbon neutrality development.	Amend Objective AIRPZ-02 (Development of the Airport Zone) as follows: The dual character of the Airport Zone as a working environment and a regional / international gateway is balanced, recognising: 1. The Airport's role as an air and land transport hub that provides for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods; 2. There will be development that reflects the purpose of the Airport Zone, and for airport related purposes that provide the Airport with other forms of support; and 3. A higher standard of design may be necessary where large buildings or structures are adjacent to or visible from the public domain. <u>4. Any development on the airport zone should support the enablement of a carbon neutral development.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.180	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O2	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.135	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O2	Support	Supports Objectives AIRPZ-O1 to AIRPZ-O6 which seek to enable airport activities and ensure airport related and non-airport activities support are compatible with the ongoing operation of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-O2 (Development of the Airport Zone) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.430	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O2	Support in part	Objective AIRPZ-O2 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Objective AIRPZ-O2 (Development of the Airport Zone) and seeks amendment.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.237	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O2	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of this subparagraph in principle.	Allow
Waka Kotahi	370.431	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O2	Amend	Considers that AIRPZ-O2 should explicitly support the integration of the airport with the public transport network, given the wide ranging benefits to the public in terms of convenience, connectivity, alleviation of congestion, carbon reduction.	Amend Objective AIRPZ-O2 (Development of the Airport Zone) as follows: The dual character of the Airport Zone as a working environment and a regional / international gateway is balanced, recognising: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Airport's role as an air and land transport hub that provides for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods; 2. There will be development that reflects the purpose of the Airport Zone, and for airport related purposes that provide the Airport with other forms of support; and 3. A higher standard of design may be necessary where large buildings or structures are adjacent to or visible from the public domain; <u>and</u> 4. <u>The wide-ranging benefits of convenient connection of the airport to the city's public transport network.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.238	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O3	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of this subparagraph in principle.	Allow
Guardians of the Bays	452.72	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O2	Support in part	Support the higher standard of design of the large buildings and structures where they are visible to the public domain.	Retain AIRPZ-O2 (Development of the Airport Zone) subject to amendments below.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.210	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O2	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.73	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O2	Amend	<p>Consider an amendment is required to add a fourth point that any development of the airport zone should support the enablement of carbon neutrality development.</p>	<p>Amend AIRPZ-O2 ((Development of the Airport Zone) as follows:</p> <p>The dual character of the Airport Zone as a working environment and a regional / international gateway is balanced, recognising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Airport's role as an air and land transport hub that provides for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods; 2. There will be development that reflects the purpose of the Airport Zone, and for airport related purposes that provide the Airport with other forms of support; and 3. A higher standard of design may be necessary where large buildings or structures are adjacent to or visible from the public domain; <u>and</u> 4. <u>Any development on the airport zone should support the enablement of a carbon neutral development.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.211	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O2	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.115	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O3	Amend	<p>Considers that AIRPZ-O3, Clause 3, should be clarified as it does not make sense in this objective. This clause does not flow in the same way as the other objectives. Clause 3 is all encompassing in respect to the reverse sensitivity of the airport over the entire District Plan. Clause 3 needs to be re-written with some constraints on what the airport believes its geographical boundaries are in respect to reverse sensitivity.</p>	<p>Amend AIRPZ-O3 (Compatibility of other activities) as follows: Airport related and non-airport activities are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compatible with the efficient operation, maintenance, and upgrading of the Airport and its associated effects; 2. Compatible with the efficient and integrated functioning of other transport networks; and 3. <u>The operation of the Airport is protected from reverse sensitivity effects within airport noise and airport flight contours outside the Airport Zone.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.181	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O3	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.136	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O3	Support	Supports Objectives AIRPZ-O1 to AIRPZ-O6 which seek to enable airport activities and ensure airport related and non-airport activities support are compatible with the ongoing operation of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-O3 (Compatibility of other activities) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.74	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O3	Amend	Considers amending point 3 as it does make does not make sense in this objective. This clause does not flow in the same way as the other objectives.	Amend AIRPZ-O3 (Compatibility of other activities) as follows: Airport related and non-airport activities are: 1. Compatible with the efficient operation, maintenance, and upgrading of the Airport and its associated effects; 2. Compatible with the efficient and integrated functioning of other transport networks; and 3. <u>The operation of the Airport is protected from reverse sensitivity effects within the airport noise and airport flight contours outside the Airport Zone.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.212	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O3	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.116	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain AIRPZ-O4 (Adverse effects generated by activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.182	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O4	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.137	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O4	Support	Supports Objectives AIRPZ-O1 to AIRPZ-O6 which seek to enable airport activities and ensure airport related and non-airport activities support are compatible with the ongoing operation of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-O4 (Adverse effects generated by activities) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.75	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O4	Support	Supports AIRPZ-O4 (Adverse effects generated by activities).	Retain AIRPZ-O4 (Adverse effects generated by activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.213	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O4	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.117	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O5	Support	AIRPZ-O5 is supported.	Retain AIRPZ-O5 (Carbon neutrality) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.183	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-05	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.138	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-05	Support	Supports Objectives AIRPZ-01 to AIRPZ-06 which seek to enable airport activities and ensure airport related and non-airport activities support are compatible with the ongoing operation of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-05 (Carbon neutrality) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.432	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-05	Support	Supports the decarbonisation of airport activities.	Retain AIRPZ-05 (Carbon neutrality) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.76	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-05	Support	Supports AIRPZ-05 (Carbon Neutrality).	Retain AIRPZ-05 (Carbon Neutrality)as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.214	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-05	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.118	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-06	Amend	Considers AIRPZ-06 should be amended to clarify the term 'resilience'. 'Resilience' needs to relate to the air and land transport hub otherwise it is too broad an objective.	<p>Amend AIRPS-06 (Airport resilience) as follows:</p> <p>The resilience of the Airport and its supporting infrastructure, including other transport links, is maintained or enhanced, while providing for the Airport's operational and functional requirements <u>as an air and land transport hub.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.184	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O6	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.139	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O6	Support	Supports Objectives AIRPZ-O1 to AIRPZ-O6 which seek to enable airport activities and ensure airport related and non-airport activities support are compatible with the ongoing operation of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-O6 (Airport resilience) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.77	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O6	Amend	Considers amending this objective as 'resilience' needs to relate to the air and land transport hub otherwise it is too broad an objective.	Amend AIRPZ-O6 (Airport resilience) as follows: The resilience of the Airport and its supporting infrastructure, including other transport links, is maintained or enhanced, while providing for the Airport's operational and functional requirements <u>as an air and land transport hub.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.215	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-O6	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.119	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P1	Amend	Considers that AIRPZ-P1 should be amended to specify the transport functions relate to the airport and are not separate to it.	Amend AIRPZ-P1 (Airport purposes activities, buildings and structures) as follows: Enable Airport Purposes activities, buildings and structures, including but not limited to those that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate the transport of people and cargo by aircraft; and 2. Are ancillary activities or services that provide essential support to the transport function <u>to the airport.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.185	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P1	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.140	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P1	Support	Supports Policies AIRPZ-P1 to AIRPZ-P5 which seek to enable airport and airport related activities while ensuring that any new non-airport activities do not compromise any airport functions or detract from the character of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-P1 (Airport purposes activities, buildings and structures) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.78	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P1	Amend	Considers amending the policy to specify the transport functions relate to the airport and are not separate to it.	<p>Amend AIRPZ-P1 (Airport purposes activities, buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Enable Airport Purposes activities, buildings and structures, including but not limited to those that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate the transport of people and cargo by aircraft; and 2. Are ancillary activities or services that provide essential support to the transport functions <u>to the airport.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.216	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P1	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.120	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P2	Support	AIRPZ-P2 is supported, especially bullet point 3 on carbon neutral outcomes through transport decarbonisation and energy regeneration.	Retain AIRPZ-P2 (Airport Related activities, buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.186	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P2	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.141	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P2	Support	Supports Policies AIRPZ-P1 to AIRPZ-P5 which seek to enable airport and airport related activities while ensuring that any new non-airport activities do not compromise any airport functions or detract from the character of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-P2 (Airport Related activities, buildings and structures) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.79	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P2	Support	Supports AIRPZ-P2 (Airport Related activities, buildings and structures).	Retain AIRPZ-P2 (Airport Related activities, buildings and structures) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.217	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P2	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.121	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P3	Support in part	AIRPZ-P3 is supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain AIRPZ-P3 (Non-airport activities) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.187	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P3	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.122	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P3	Amend	<p>Considers that AIRPZ-P3 should be amended to provide clarification around non-airport related activities that can have adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the surrounding neighbourhood. The addition of the surrounding neighbourhood should be added in clause 2.</p>	<p>Amend AIRPZ-P3 (Non-airport activities) as follows:</p> <p>Discourage new non-airport related activities that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compromise the long-term availability of land for airport or airport related activities; 2. Give rise to adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the transportation network <u>and surrounding neighbourhood</u>; <p>...</p>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.188	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P3	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.142	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P3	Support	<p>Supports Policies AIRPZ-P1 to AIRPZ-P5 which seek to enable airport and airport related activities while ensuring that any new non-airport activities do not compromise any airport functions or detract from the character of the airport.</p>	Retain AIRPZ-P3 (Non-airport activities) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.80	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P3	Support in part	<p>Supports AIRPZ-P3 (Non-airport activities) in part.</p>	Retain AAIRPZ-P3 (Non-airport activities) subject to amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.218	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P3	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.81	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P3	Amend	<p>Considers amendments are required around non-airport related activities that can have adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the surrounding neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Amend AIRPZ-P3 (Non-airport activities) as follows: Discourage new non-airport related activities that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compromise the long-term availability of land for airport or airport related activities; 2. Give rise to adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the transportation network <u>and surrounding neighbourhood</u>; 3. Significantly compromise the achievement of carbon neutral outcomes in the Airport as a whole; or 4. Are incompatible with the overall urban form of adjacent zones. Where non-airport activities are allowed, limit their nature, scale and extent to be generally compatible with the outcomes sought under AIRPZ-P1 and AIRPZ-P2
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.219	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P3	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.123	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P4	Support in part	<p>AIRPZ-P4 is supported, but an amendment is sought.</p>	<p>Retain AIRPZ-P4 (Airport character) with amendment.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.189	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P4	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.124	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P4	Amend	Considers that AIRPZ-P4 should be amended to include the West Side Precinct that includes the Airport Retail Park on the eastern side of Tirangi Road within this list of areas that create the airport character. This is especially relevant with the new control tower on Tirangi Road that adds character to this area and should be created with any new developments. This is in contrast to the Executed aircraft hanger which has create a considerable negative visual and landscape amenity. In addition the Bridge Street Precinct should be included as an area for enhancement.	Amend AIRPZ-P4 (Airport character) as follows: ... <u>7. The West Side Precinct including the Airport Retail Park on the eastern side of Tirangi Road and the new airport control tower and relationship with Lvall Bay.</u> <u>8. Enhance the character of the Bridge Street Precinct.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.190	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P4	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.143	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P4	Support	Supports Policies AIRPZ-P1 to AIRPZ-P5 which seek to enable airport and airport related activities while ensuring that any new non-airport activities do not compromise any airport functions or detract from the character of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-P4 (Airport character) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.82	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P4	Support in part	Supports AIRPZ-P4 (Airport character) in part.	Retain AIRPZ-P4 (Airport character) subject to amendments below.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.220	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P4	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.83	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P4	Amend	Considers amendments are required to include the the West Side Precinct that includes the Airport Retail Park on the eastern side of Tirangi Road within this list of areas that create the airport character, and that the Bridge Street Precinct be included as an area for enhancement.	Amend AIRPZ-P4 as follows: ...7. <u>The West Side Precinct including the Airport Retail Park on the eastern side of Tirangi Road and the new airport control tower and relationship with Lyall Bay.</u> 8. <u>Enhance the character of the Bridge Street Precinct.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.221	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P4	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.125	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P5	Support	AIRPZ-P5 is supported, bullet 7 is fully endorsed, as well as "the need to measure, report and pursue decarbonisation of airport related activities, including embedded emissions from construction, and activity attracted by the Airport (such as public and private transport)."	Retain AIRPZ-P5 (Management of effects) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.191	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P5	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Z Energy Limited	361.144	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P5	Support	Supports Policies AIRPZ-P1 to AIRPZ-P5 which seek to enable airport and airport related activities while ensuring that any new non-airport activities do not compromise any airport functions or detract from the character of the airport.	Retain AIRPZ-P5 (Management of effects) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.84	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P5	Support	Supports AIRPZ-P5 (Management of effects).	Retain AIRPZ-P5 (Management of effects) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.222	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-P5	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.126	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R1	Support	AIRPZ-R1 is supported.	Retain AIRPZ-R1 (Airport purposes) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.192	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R1	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.85	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R1	Support	Supports AIRPZ-R1 (Airport purposes).	Retain AIRPZ-R1 (Airport purposes) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.223	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R1	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.127	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R2	Support	AIRPZ-R2 is supported.	Retain AIRPZ-R2 (Airport related activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.193	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R2	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.86	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R2	Support	Supports AIRPZ-R2 (Airport related activities).	Retain AIRPZ-R2 (Airport related activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.224	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R2	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Yvonne Weeber	340.128	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R3	Support	AIRPZ-R3 is supported.	Retain AIRPZ-R3 (Non-airport activities) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.194	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R3	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.145	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R3	Support in part	<p>AIRPZ-R3 is supported as it requires resource consent for all non-airport activities as they may not support the operational and functional requirements of the Airport zone. However, it is sought that this rule provides for the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of the Z Broadway service station, which is located in the Broadway Precinct. It is considered that AIRPN-R3 relates to only new non-airport related activities, and any changes to the Z Broadway service station should not trigger a non-complying activity application that must be publicly notified.</p> <p>It is accepted that a service station would meet the definition of a 'non-airport activity' as it is not an 'airport activity' or 'airport related activity'. In this respect, it is understood that Rule AIRPZ-R3(1) provides for 'non-airport activities' as a discretionary activity on the basis the activity complies with standards AIRPZ-S1, AIRPZ-S2 and AIRPZ-S3. Otherwise, it is a non-complying activity under rule AIRPZ-R3(2) and must be publicly notified.</p>	Retain AIRPZ-R3 (Non-airport activities) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.146	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R3	Amend	Considers AIRPZ-R3 should be amended to clarify whether the rule permits ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of the existing Z Broadway service station without triggering a non-complying resource consent that must be publicly notified.	<p>Amend AIRPZ-R3 (Non-airport activities) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Activity status: Discretionary <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The <u>new</u> activity is a non-airport activity; and <p>...</p>
Z Energy Limited	361.147	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R3	Amend	Considers AIRPZ-R3 should be amended to clarify whether the rule permits ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of the existing Z Broadway service station without triggering a non-complying resource consent that must be publicly notified.	Seeks to clarify that Rule AIRPZ-R3 ((Non-airport activities) permits ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of the Z Broadway service station (located in the Broadway Precinct).
Guardians of the Bays	452.87	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R3	Support	Supports AIRPZ-R3 (Non-airport activities).	Retain AIRPZ-R3 (Non-airport activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.225	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R3	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.129	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R4	Support	AIRPZ-R4 is supported.	Retain AIRPZ-R4 (Buildings and structures) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.195	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R4	Oppose	<p>WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.148	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R4	Support in part	AIRPZ-R4 is supported for its general intent which seeks to manage building and structure activities. However, clarification is sought on whether this rule applies to only new buildings or structures and not additions and alterations to existing buildings and existing structures.	Retain AIRPZ-R4 (Buildings and structures) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.149	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R4	Amend	Considers AIRPZ-R4 should be clarified to mention whether this rule applies to only new buildings or structures and not additions and alterations to existing buildings and existing structures.	Amend AIRPZ-R4 (Buildings and structures) to clarify whether the rule applies to only new buildings or structures and not additions and alterations to existing buildings and existing structures.
Guardians of the Bays	452.88	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R4	Support	Supports AIRPZ-R4 (Buildings and structures).	Retain AIRPZ-R4 (Buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.226	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-R4	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.130	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S1	Support in part	The standards and assessment criteria of the Maximum height and location of buildings and structures are supported for the Main Site Area and the East Side Areas, but not Miramar South precinct and Rongotai Ridge precinct.	Not specified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.196	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S1	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.89	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S1	Support	Supports standards and assessment criteria of the Maximum height and location of buildings and structures. [submitter stated amend' as the required action but stated they supported the provision and did not seek relief, refer to original submission].	Retain AIRPZ-S1 (Maximum height and location of buildings and structures (except Miramar South precinct and Rongotai Ridge precinct) as notified [inferred decision requested].
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.227	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S1	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone. 	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Yvonne Weeber	340.131	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the title of AIRPZ-S2 should be amended. Maximum height and location of buildings and structures (Miramar South precinct and Rongotai Ridge precinct)	Amend the title of AIRPZ-S2 (Maximum height and location of buildings and structures (Miramar South precinct and Rongotai Ridge precinct)) as follows: AIRPZ-S2 Maximum height and location of buildings and structures (Miramar South precinct and Rongotai Ridge precinct)
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.197	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S2	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.90	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S2	Support	Supports AIRPZ-S2 (Maximum height and location of buildings and structures (Miramar South precinct and Rongotai Ridge precinct))	Retain AIRPZ-S2 (Maximum height and location of buildings and structures (Miramar South precinct and Rongotai Ridge precinct)) as notified.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.228	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S2	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.132	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Support in part	AIRPZ-S3 is supported for its standard as and assessment criteria, as well as: • restrictions on commercial activity in the precincts surrounding the airport runway at the Tirangi Road Retail Park, the Broadway Precinct. • limitations on the activities within the Miramar South Precinct. • limited range of activities within the Terminal Precinct. An amendment is sought.	Retain AIRPZ-S3 (Commercial, retail and access restrictions) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.198	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.133	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Amend	Considers that AIRPZ-S3 should be amended to have restrictions around the activities of the Bridge Street Precinct.	Amend AIRPZ-S3 (Commercial, retail and access restrictions) as follows: ... Except that: 5. Ancillary retail in the Miramar South and South Coast precincts is permitted but shall not exceed 10% of the gross floor area of all buildings in either precinct. 6. <u>Bridge Street Precinct shall be limited to an open space enhancement area with no buildings.</u>
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.199	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Z Energy Limited	361.150	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Support in part	AIRPZ-S3 is supported, as it seeks to control the location and scale of commercial and retail activities and restrict vehicle access across the Calabar Road / SH1 frontage. In particular, Standard AIRPZ-S3(3) seeks to restrict all retail and commercial activities to the Terminal Precinct but does not recognise existing retail activities (e.g. service station) that are currently located outside of this precinct.	Retain AIRPZ-S3 (Commercial, retail and access restrictions) with amendment.
Z Energy Limited	361.151	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Amend	Considers that AIRPZ-S3 should be amended to only apply to new retail and commercial activities to ensure the ongoing operation of the existing Z service station and other retail activities (e.g. Burger King).	Amend AIRPZ-S3 (Commercial, retail and access restrictions) as follows: ... 3. <u>New</u> retail activities, service retail, restaurants and other food and beverage facilities including takeaway food facilities and commercial activities shall be located within the Terminal Precinct; and ...

Special Purpose Zone - Corrections Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.91	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Support in part	Supports standards and assessment criteria particularly - - restrictions on commercial activity in the precincts surrounding the airport runway at the Tirangi Road Retail Park, the Broadway Precinct - limitations on the activities within the Miramar South Precinct. - limited range of activities within the Terminal Precinct	Retain AIRPZ-S3 subject to amendments below.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.229	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Guardians of the Bays	452.92	Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Amend	Considers restrictions are required around the activities of the Bridge Street Precinct.	Amend AIRPZ-S3 as follows: ... 6. Bridge Street Precinct shall be limited to an open space enhancement area with no buildings.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.230	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Airport Zone / AIRPZ-S3	Oppose	WIAL has proposed alternative drafting of the Airport Zone which tries to better align the outcomes sought via WIAL's existing Designations with the Airport Zone (as appropriate, noting not all of WIAL's landholdings are designated). Notwithstanding this, 1. WIAL supports the suggested incorporation of references to pedestrian access, cycling parking and land transport hubs into the description of the Terminal Precinct; 2. WIAL opposes the proposed new "Bridge Street Precinct" and considers it is appropriate to retain it as part of the wider airside / operational area of the airport and should not be unduly constrained by it been retained for "Open Space" activities, noting that only very low scale activity could occur in this area due to the obstacle limitation surface restrictions over this land. 3. Supports the intent to encourage carbon neutral development, however requiring it for all development is impracticable and does not appropriately reflect or take account of the technical or operational requirements of airports. 4. WIAL opposes the other matters raised to the extent that they conflict with the matters set out in WIAL's primary submission which proposes alternative drafting for the Airport Zone.	Disallow
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.66	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / General CORZ	Oppose	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary.	Remove the references to "supported residential care activity" from the Large Lot Residential zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.67	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / General CORZ	Support in part	Considers that the Corrections Zone, in conjunction with the Arohata Prison designation, provides an appropriate planning framework to enable the continued operation and development of Arohata Prison (including both custodial and non-custodial activities). Ara Poutama's position is that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary. However, if Council are to retain the definition of "supported residential care activity" then there is a minor drafting error within Policy CORZ-P2 and Rule CORZ-R4, whereby "supported residential care accommodation" is referenced; this needs to be amended to reflect the terminology otherwise proposed in the PDP definition (i.e. "supported residential care activities").	Retain the Corrections Zone, with amendment.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.68	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / CORZ-P2	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain CORZ-P2.3 (Compatible activities) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.69	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / CORZ-P2	Oppose in part	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain CORZ-P2.4 (Compatible activities) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.70	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / CORZ-P2	Amend	Considers that the Corrections Zone, in conjunction with the Arohata Prison designation, provides an appropriate planning framework to enable the continued operation and development of Arohata Prison (including both custodial and non-custodial activities). Ara Poutama's position is that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary. However, if Council are to retain the definition of "supported residential care activity" then there is a minor drafting error within Policy CORZ-P2 and Rule CORZ-R4, whereby "supported residential care accommodation" is referenced; this needs to be amended to reflect the terminology otherwise proposed in the PDP definition (i.e. "supported residential care activities").	Amend policy CORZ-P2 (Compatible activities) as follows, if council are to retain the "supported residential care activity" definition: CORZ-P2 Compatible activities Provide for activities that are compatible with the purpose and function of the Corrections Zone including: ... 4. Supported residential care accommodation activities.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.71	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / CORZ-R3	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain CORZ-R3 (Community corrections activities) as notified.

Special Purpose Zone - Future Urban Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.72	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / CORZ-R4	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified.</p> <p>The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.</p>	Retain CORZ-R4 (Supported residential care accommodation) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.73	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / CORZ-R4	Amend	<p>Considers that the Corrections Zone, in conjunction with the Arohata Prison designation, provides an appropriate planning framework to enable the continued operation and development of Arohata Prison (including both custodial and non-custodial activities). Ara Poutama's position is that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary. However, if Council are to retain the definition of "supported residential care activity" then there is a minor drafting error within Policy CORZ-P2 and Rule CORZ-R4, whereby "supported residential care accommodation" is referenced; this needs to be amended to reflect the terminology otherwise proposed in the PDP definition (i.e. "supported residential care activities").</p>	<p>Amend rule CORZ-R4 (Supported residential care accommodation) as follows, if council are to retain the "supported residential care activity" definition:</p> <p>CORZ-R4 Supported residential care accommodation <u>activities</u></p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The maximum number of residents to be accommodated at any one time is 30; and</p> <p>b. No more than five supported residential care accommodation activity buildings are to be located within the Corrections Zone</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.291	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / CORZ-R13	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain CORZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.292	Special Purpose Zones / Corrections Zone / CORZ-R13	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend CORZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.39	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / General FUZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that consideration is given to possible effects upon existing natural environments in the development of "greenfield" zones.
Wellington City Council	266.159	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / General FUZ	Amend	Considers the introduction to the FUZ refers to two development areas, when there are three development areas – two greenfield and one brownfield.	<p>Amend the last two sentences of the Future Urban Zone Introduction as follows:</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>The District Plan currently incorporates two <u>greenfield</u> Development Area overlays <u>within the Future Urban Zone</u>, one being Lincolnshire Farm and the other being Upper Stebbings and Glenside West.</p>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.293	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / General FUZ	Support in part	Supports the direction to coordinate planning and development in this chapter, as this aligns with RPS direction.	Retain chapter, subject to amendments outlined in other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.294	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / General FUZ	Amend	Considers the provisions of the Future Urban Zone to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure the Future Urban Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristic
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.295	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / General FUZ	Amend	Considers the provisions of the Future Urban Zone to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure future urban zone provisions have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 policies 55, UD.3 and 57 as required.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.296	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / General FUZ	Amend	Considers the provisions of the Future Urban Zone to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to give effect to the NPS-FM by ensuring that freshwater bodies are required to be identified and protected during development planning

Special Purpose Zone - Hospital Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.742	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / General FUZ	Oppose	Seeks the deletion of this chapter give that the Future Urban Zone is applied to two Development Areas that have detailed plans and associated zoning that could be applied now so that Wellington achieves its housing capacity minimums and a well-functioning urban environment.	Delete the Future Urban Zone chapter and instead Zone the land at Lincolnshire Farm and Upper Stebbings/Glenside West in accordance with the Development Area provisions, and amendments sought, now.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.86	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / General FUZ	Amend	Concerned that the Residential Design Guide is not given consideration and referred to in any relevant rules for the Future Urban Zone.	Amend appropriate parts of the Future Urban Zone rules to reflect that they will give effect to Residential Design Guide.
Waka Kotahi	370.433	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / FUZ-O1	Support	Objective FUZ-O1 is supported.	Retain Objective FUZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.434	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / FUZ-O2	Support in part	Objective FUZ-O2 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Objective FUZ-O2 (Activities) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.435	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / FUZ-O2	Amend	Supports FUZ-O2 in providing for rural activities in the zone until the land is urbanised. Considers that it is not clear whether new rural activities are sought to be enabled.	Seeks to amend Objective FUZ-O2 (Activities) to clarify on if new rural activities are being enabled.
Ministry of Education	400.152	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / FUZ-R7	Support	Supports FUZ-R7. The submitter notes that FUZ land is held for the purposes of greenfield developments which will enable activities that are in accordance with an associated Development Area. The FUZ has been identified for future urban use. Where the land is ready for use, a Development Area overlay will be incorporated into the District Plan for a given FUZ area which will allow the Ministry to ensure Educational Facilities are well provided for as required [see original submission for full reasons].	Retain FUZ-R7 (All other activities) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.436	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / FUZ-R8	Support	Rule FUZ-R8 is supported as it sets an appropriate activity status to manage adverse effects	Retain Rule FUZ-R8 (Construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.437	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / FUZ-S1	Support in part	Standard FUZ-S1 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Standard FUZ-S1 (Maximum height) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.438	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / FUZ-S1	Amend	Considers it appropriate to provide for greater density in the Future Urban Zone.	Seeks to amend Standard FUZ-S1 (Maximum height) to allow a permitted height of 11m +1m for pitched roofs.
Waka Kotahi	370.439	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / FUZ-S3	Support in part	Standard FUZ-S3 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Standard FUZ-S3 (Boundary setbacks) and seeks amendment.
Waka Kotahi	370.440	Special Purpose Zones / Future Urban Zone / FUZ-S3	Amend	Considers it appropriate to provide for denser development in the Future Urban Zone.	Seeks to amend Standard FUZ-S3 (Boundary setbacks) to provide for setbacks in keeping with the medium density residential standards.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	258.2	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / General HOSPZ	Support	Supports the application of the Special Purpose Hospital Zone at Bowen and Wakefield Hospitals	Retain the Special Purpose Hospital Zoning at Bowen Hospital (98 Churchill Drive) and Wakefield Hospital (30 Florence Street) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.441	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / General HOSPZ	Support	The Hospital Zone provisions are supported. In particular provision of residential development close to the hospital.	Retain the Hospital Zone provisions as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.43	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / General HOSPZ	Support	Supports introduction. It is appropriate that the Introduction recognises that Southern Cross Hospital Wellington and that private hospitals play a role in serving the healthcare needs of Wellington,	Retain Introduction of Special Purpose Hospital Zone as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.113	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / General HOSPZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to amend chapter to provide triggers for active partnership or engagement with Taranaki Whānui in respect of design opportunities with Taranaki Whānui specific associations

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	FS127.1	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / General HOSPZ	Oppose	<p>Southern Cross appreciates that Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui both have significant interests in the Wellington district as mana whenua and kaitiaki, and seek to ensure these are appropriately recognised in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui primary submissions seek amendments to the Special Hospital zone to reflect their mana whenua status. Southern Cross understands that their submissions relate only to the Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora, however this is unclear in some instances and the scope of relief sought.</p> <p>Southern Cross considers that it is appropriate to recognise mana whenua status and enable Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui cultural associations in respect of Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora as currently set out in HOSZ-O2 and HOSZ-P3 of the Proposed Plan. However, for completeness, Southern Cross seeks to clarify that it would not be appropriate to amend other provisions in the Special Purpose Hospital zone which also apply to private hospitals.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.113]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that any amendments to the Introduction of the Special Purpose Hospital zone chapter to give effect to the relief sought by Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui are clear that this relates to the Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.87	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / General HOSPZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the introduction to the chapter statement could be improved by requiring partnership with mana whenua rather than engagement.</p>	Amend the introduction of the Hospital Zone to require partnership rather than engagement with mana whenua.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	FS127.5	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / General HOSPZ	Oppose	<p>Southern Cross appreciates that Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui both have significant interests in the Wellington district as mana whenua and kaitiaki, and seek to ensure these are appropriately recognised in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui primary submissions seek amendments to the Special Hospital zone to reflect their mana whenua status. Southern Cross understands that their submissions relate only to the Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora, however this is unclear in some instances and the scope of relief sought.</p> <p>Southern Cross considers that it is appropriate to recognise mana whenua status and enable Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui cultural associations in respect of Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora as currently set out in HOSZ-O2 and HOSZ-P3 of the Proposed Plan. However, for completeness, Southern Cross seeks to clarify that it would not be appropriate to amend other provisions in the Special Purpose Hospital zone which also apply to private hospitals.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 488.87]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that any amendments to the Introduction of the Special Purpose Hospital zone chapter to give effect to the relief sought by Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui are clear that this relates to the Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora.
Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand	496.2	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / General HOSPZ	Support	<p>The Hospital Zone is supported. The urban context around the Hospital is changing, and the Hospital Zone settings have been updated to reflect this. The proposed settings will better enable the Hospital to deliver health services for the community and region.</p>	Retain the Hospital Zone chapter as notified.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	258.3	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / New HOSPZ	Amend	<p>Considers it appropriate that a new rule enabling healthcare facilities, pharmacies and cafes activities to occur as a permitted activity in the Special Purpose Hospital Zone</p>	<p>Seeks to add new rule to as follows:</p> <p><u>HORZ-R1A: Healthcare facilities, pharmacies and cafes ancillary to a hospital activity.</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u></p>
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.44	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-O1	Support	<p>Supports objective HOSZ-O1.</p> <p>Supports Southern Cross Hospital Wellington being recognised as a regionally significant hospital and the extent to which the Proposed Plan provides for its ongoing operation, function and development to support the economic, health and social wellbeing.</p> <p>Southern Cross Hospital plays a critical role in supporting Health NZ (which has replaced Capital and Coast and Hutt Valley DHBs) to provide urgent or complex surgeries, and plays an important role in providing both publicly and privately funded elective surgeries.</p>	Retain Special Purpose Hospital Zone Objective HOSZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.114	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-O2	Amend	<p>[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].</p>	Seeks that HOSZ-O2 (Mana Whenua) as amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City".

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	FS127.2	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-02	Oppose	<p>Southern Cross appreciates that Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui both have significant interests in the Wellington district as mana whenua and kaitiaki, and seek to ensure these are appropriately recognised in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui primary submissions seek amendments to the Special Hospital zone to reflect their mana whenua status. Southern Cross understands that their submissions relate only to the Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora, however this is unclear in some instances and the scope of relief sought.</p> <p>Southern Cross considers that it is appropriate to recognise mana whenua status and enable Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui cultural associations in respect of Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora as currently set out in HOSZ-02 and HOSZ-P3 of the Proposed Plan. However, for completeness, Southern Cross seeks to clarify that it would not be appropriate to amend other provisions in the Special Purpose Hospital zone which also apply to private hospitals.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.114]</p>	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.59	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-02	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.</p>	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.88	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-02	Support in part	Supports objective HOSZ-02 and reference to mana whenua	Retain HOSZ-02 (Mana whenua) with amendment.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.89	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-02	Amend	Considers that the objective should requiring partnership with mana whenua rather than engagement.	Amend HOSZ-02 (Mana whenua) to require partnership rather than engagement with mana whenua.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	FS127.6	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-02	Oppose	<p>Southern Cross appreciates that Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui both have significant interests in the Wellington district as mana whenua and kaitiaki, and seek to ensure these are appropriately recognised in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui primary submissions seek amendments to the Special Hospital zone to reflect their mana whenua status. Southern Cross understands that their submissions relate only to the Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora, however this is unclear in some instances and the scope of relief sought.</p> <p>Southern Cross considers that it is appropriate to recognise mana whenua status and enable Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui cultural associations in respect of Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora as currently set out in HOSZ-02 and HOSZ-P3 of the Proposed Plan. However, for completeness, Southern Cross seeks to clarify that it would not be appropriate to amend other provisions in the Special Purpose Hospital zone which also apply to private hospitals.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 488.89]</p>	Disallow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.45	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-03	Support in part	Supports the direction of objective HOSZ-03 to recognise that healthcare needs are evolving and its important that the Proposed Plan enables hospitals and healthcare facilities are about to provide choice to their patients, staff and visitors.	Supports objective HOSZ-03 (Evolving demands, service and technological changes), with amendment.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.46	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-03	Amend	<p>Seeks that objective HOSZ-03 is amended to include hospital activities, which would be consistent with the objectives, policies and rules in this zone.</p> <p>The objective refers to "health care facility needs". Health care facilities are define in the Proposed Plan as distinct from hospital activities, and health care facilities expressly exclude hospitals.</p>	<p>Amend Objective HOSZ-03 (Evolving demands, service and technological changes) as follows:</p> <p>The evolving health care facility <u>and hospital</u> needs of Wellington City and the wider region are supported through land use activities and development that:</p> <p>.....</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.1	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-O3	Support	Support. The relief sought will ensure that the evolving needs of hospitals are supported.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.47	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-O3	Amend	Seeks that objective HOSZ-O3 is amended to specify that the objective only applies to the Wellington Regional Hospital I Nga Puna Wai Ora site only. HOSZ-O3(2) also provides for a greater choice of open space for patients, staff and visitors to enjoy, recreate and shelter. This is appropriate for the large Wellington Regional Hospital I Nga Puna Wai Ora site, but not for the private hospital sites which are smaller and need to make more efficient use of their land. The private hospitals also focus on elective surgery where patients are discharged as soon as possible, therefore there is not the same need for outdoor spaces.	Amend Objective HOSZ-O3 (Evolving demands, service and technological changes) as follows: ... 1. Is undertaken in an efficient, well- integrated and strategic manner; 2. The Wellington Regional Hospital I Nga Puna Wai Ora provides a greater choice of open space for patients, staff and visitors to enjoy, recreate and shelter; and 3. Positively contributes to maintaining, and where possible enhancing a safe, comfortable and accessible hospital environment including enhance connectivity through the site.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.2	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-O3	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought to HOSZ-O3(2) is appropriate as it acknowledges the importance of open space for public hospitals only.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.48	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-O4	Support in part	Supports the intention that any adverse effects of activities and development in the Special Purpose Hospital zone are managed appropriately.	Supports objective HOSZ-O4 (Managing adverse effects), with amendment.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.49	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-O4	Amend	Seeks that objective HOSZ-O4 is amended to require this assessment at interfaces with the zone, but not within the zone.	Amend Objective HOSZ-O4 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Adverse effects of activities and development in the Special Purpose Hospital Zone are managed effectively both: 1. Within the Zone, and 2. 1. At interfaces with; a. Heritage buildings
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.3	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-O4	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought to will ensure adverse effects of activities at interfaces with the zone are managed appropriately.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.50	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P1	Support	Supports HOSZ-P1 (Enabled activities) hospital activities being enabled in the Special Purpose Hospital Zone.	Retain policy HOSZ-P1 (Enabled activities)as notified.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.4	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone /HOSZ-P1	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought will support the provision of hospital activities within the Special Purpose Zone – Hospital Zone.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.51	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P2	Support	Supports HOSZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) only allowing other activities which are compatible with the purpose of the zone and will not have adverse effects on the vitality, amenity and function of the zone.	Retain policy HOSZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.5	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone /HOSZ-P2	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought will support the intent of the Special Purpose Zone – Hospital Zone by preventing incompatible activities from establishing within the zone.	Allow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.115	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that HOSZ-P3 (Mana Whenua) as amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City".

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	FS127.3	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P3	Oppose	<p>Southern Cross appreciates that Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui both have significant interests in the Wellington district as mana whenua and kaitiaki, and seek to ensure these are appropriately recognised in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui primary submissions seek amendments to the Special Hospital zone to reflect their mana whenua status. Southern Cross understands that their submissions relate only to the Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora, however this is unclear in some instances and the scope of relief sought.</p> <p>Southern Cross considers that it is appropriate to recognise mana whenua status and enable Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui cultural associations in respect of Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora as currently set out in HOSZ-O2 and HOSZ-P3 of the Proposed Plan. However, for completeness, Southern Cross seeks to clarify that it would not be appropriate to amend other provisions in the Special Purpose Hospital zone which also apply to private hospitals.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.115]</p>	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.60	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P3	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.</p>	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.90	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P3	Support in part	Supports Policy HOSZ-P3 and reference to mana whenua.	Retain HOSZ-P3 (Mana whenua) with amendment.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.91	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P3	Amend	Considers that the policy should requiring partnership with mana whenua rather than engagement.	Amend HOSZ-P3 (Mana whenua) to require partnership rather than engagement with mana whenua.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	FS127.7	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P3	Oppose	<p>Southern Cross appreciates that Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui both have significant interests in the Wellington district as mana whenua and kaitiaki, and seek to ensure these are appropriately recognised in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui primary submissions seek amendments to the Special Hospital zone to reflect their mana whenua status. Southern Cross understands that their submissions relate only to the Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora, however this is unclear in some instances and the scope of relief sought.</p> <p>Southern Cross considers that it is appropriate to recognise mana whenua status and enable Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui cultural associations in respect of Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora as currently set out in HOSZ-O2 and HOSZ-P3 of the Proposed Plan. However, for completeness, Southern Cross seeks to clarify that it would not be appropriate to amend other provisions in the Special Purpose Hospital zone which also apply to private hospitals.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 488.91]</p>	Disallow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.52	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P4	Support	<p>Supports HOSZ-P4 (Urban form, quality and amenity).</p> <p>Supports the direction of Policy HOSZ -P4 to provide for high-quality new development, alterations, additions and public spaces.</p>	Retain policy HOSZ-P4 (Urban form, quality and amenity) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.116	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that HOSZ-P4 (Urban form, quality and amenity) as amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City".

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	FS127.4	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P4	Oppose	<p>Southern Cross appreciates that Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui both have significant interests in the Wellington district as mana whenua and kaitiaki, and seek to ensure these are appropriately recognised in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui primary submissions seek amendments to the Special Hospital zone to reflect their mana whenua status. Southern Cross understands that their submissions relate only to the Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora, however this is unclear in some instances and the scope of relief sought.</p> <p>Southern Cross considers that it is appropriate to recognise mana whenua status and enable Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui cultural associations in respect of Wellington Regional Hospital Ngā Puna Wai Ora as currently set out in HOSZ-O2 and HOSZ-P3 of the Proposed Plan. However, for completeness, Southern Cross seeks to clarify that it would not be appropriate to amend other provisions in the Special Purpose Hospital zone which also apply to private hospitals.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.116]</p>	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.61	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P4	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.</p>	Disallow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.53	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-P5	Support	<p>Supports HOSZ-P5</p> <p>Supports the intention of this policy to encourage development that is adaptable and supports hospitals' roles as resilience anchors and critical facilities after natural hazard events.</p>	Retain policy HOSZ-P5 (Resilience) as notified.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	258.4	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R1	Support	<p>Supports HOSZ-R1 which enables hospital activities to occur in the Special Purpose Hospital Zone as a permitted activity</p>	Retain HOSZ-R1 (Hospital activities) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.54	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R1	Support	<p>Supports hospital activities being permitted in the Special Purpose Hospital Zone.</p>	Retain rule HOSZ-R1 (Hospital activities) as notified.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.6	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R1	Support	<p>Support. Considers that the relief sought will enable the provision of hospital activities within the Special Purpose Zone – Hospital Zone.</p>	Allow
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	258.5	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R2	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes HOSZ-R2 (All other activities) because there are a range of nonhospital activities which are typically ancillary to and found within hospitals, such as healthcare facilities, pharmacies and cafes.</p>	Retain as notified with amendments sought below.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.55	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R2	Support in part	<p>Supports rule in part.</p>	Supports rule HOSZ-R2 (All other activities), with amendment.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.56	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R2	Amend	<p>Considers that 'all other activities' should be restricted discretionary, with the matters of discretion being HOSZ-P2, HOSZ-P4, and HOSZ-P5.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan provides for all other activities as discretionary. Although the definition of 'hospital activities' is broad, there may be changes in how healthcare services are delivered that requires other activities to be located at the hospital to support its function.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan recognises health care facilities as distinct from hospital activities, however healthcare facilities are not specifically provided for in the Special Purpose Hospital zone.</p>	<p>Amend Rule HOSZ-R2 (All other activities) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>HOSZ-P2.</u></p> <p><u>HOSZ-P4.</u></p> <p><u>HOSZ-P5.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.57	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R3	Support	Supports rule HOSZ-R3 maintenance and repair of buildings and structures being permitted.	Retain rule HOSZ-R3 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.297	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R4	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain HOSZ-R4 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.298	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R4	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend HOSZ-R4 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.58	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R4	Support	Supports rule HOSZ-R4 demolition or removal of building and structures being permitted.	Retain rule HOSZ-R4 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.59	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R5	Support in part	Supports additions and alterations that comply with Rule HOSZ-R5.1 being permitted.	Supports Permitted activity status under rule HOSZ-R5.1 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures).
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.60	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R5	Support in part	Supports resource consent applications for additions and alterations that do not comply with Rule HOSZ-R5.1 being a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Supports Restricted Discretionary activity status under rule HOSZ-R5.3 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures).
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.61	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R5	Amend	Supports resource consent applications for additions and alterations that do not comply with Rule HOSZ-R5.1 being precluded from public notification.	Supports notification clauses under rule HOSZ-R5.3 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures).
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.62	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R5	Oppose in part	Opposes the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide being a matter of control and matter of discretion. This is inappropriate, as it elevates the design guide to the status of standards, rather than guidance as it is intended to be. Further, some of the matters addressed in the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide are inappropriate for a hospital development. For example, hospitals are purpose-built and may not be consistent with the built form of other urban developments (G80) and it is impractical for a hospital building to be designed to allow for conversion to other uses (G89).	Opposes part of rule HOSZ-R5.3 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures), seeks amendment.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.7	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R5	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought to remove the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide as a matter of control and discretion recognises that hospitals are purpose built facilities with design requirements which are different to other urban developments.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.63	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R5	Amend	Considers references to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide to be deleted from the Special Purpose Hospital zone chapter. It is noted that discretion is retained over "design, external appearance, siting and verandahs".	Amend Rule HOSZ-R5.3 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as follows: 2. The extent and effect of noncompliance with HOSZS1 and HOSZ-S2; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide; 4. <u>3.</u> Design, external appearance, siting and verandahs; and
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.8	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R5	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought to remove the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide as a matter of control and discretion recognises that hospitals are purpose built facilities with design requirements which are different to other urban developments.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.64	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R6	Support in part	Supports new buildings and structures that comply with HOSZ-R6.1 being permitted.	Supports Permitted activity status under rule HOSZ-R6.1 (Construction of new buildings and structures).
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.9	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R6	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought will enable the intent of the Special Purpose Zones – Hospital Zone to provide for hospital activities and development.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.65	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R6	Support in part	Supports resource consent applications for new buildings and structures that do not comply with Rule HOSZ-R6.1 being a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Supports Restricted Discretionary activity status under rule HOSZ-R6.3 (Construction of new buildings and structures).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.10	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R6	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought will enable the intent of the Special Purpose Zones – Hospital Zone to provide for hospital activities and development.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.66	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R6	Support	Supports resource consent applications for new buildings and structures that do not comply with Rule HOSZ-R6.1 being precluded from public notification.	Supports notification clauses under rule HOSZ-R6.3 (Construction of new buildings and structures).
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.11	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R6	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought will enable the intent of the Special Purpose Zones – Hospital Zone to provide for hospital activities and development.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.67	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R6	Amend	Considers that there should be amendments to the matters of discretion to remove references of HOSZP3 within rule HOSZ-R6. HOSZ-P3 only applies to the Wellington Regional Hospital I Nga Puna Wai Ora and should be deleted.	Amend Rule HOSZ-R6 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: Matters of discretion are: 1. Any relevant matters in HOSZP3 , HOSZ-P4 HOSZ-P5;
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.68	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R6	Amend	Considers references to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide to be deleted from the matters of discretion from Rule HOSZ-R6 (Construction of new buildings and structures). This is inappropriate, as it elevates the design guide to the status of standards, rather than guidance as it is intended to be. Further, some of the matters addressed in the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide are inappropriate for a hospital development. For example, hospitals are purpose-built and may not be consistent with the built form of other urban developments (G80) and it is impractical for a hospital building to be designed to allow for conversion to other uses (G89).	Amend Rule HOSZ-R6 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: 2. The extent and effect of noncompliance with HOSZS1 and HOSZ-S2; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide ; 4. 3. Design, external appearance, siting and verandahs; and
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.12	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R6	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought to remove the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide as a matter of control and discretion recognises that hospitals are purpose built facilities with design requirements which are different to other urban developments.	Allow
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.69	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-R7	Support	Supports outdoor storage being permitted where the storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site.	Retain Rule HOSZ-R7 (Outdoor storage areas) as notified.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	258.6	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-S1	Amend	Considers the more restrictive 14m height control as it applies to the eastern portion of the site is not supported because a more restrictive height in relation to boundary control already applies along those boundaries shared with adjacent residential properties.	Seeks to amend HOSZ-S1.4 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) Wakefield Hospital so that a 21m height control applies across the whole site.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.70	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-S1	Support	Supports height limit in standard HOSZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures). A height control area with a limit of 21m applies to Southern Cross Hospital, and the land to the north and east. This approach meets the intensification requirements of the NPS-UD and reflects the mixed used nature of Southern Cross Hospital's surrounding environment. Specifically, Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires that building heights of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of existing and planned rapid transit stops, the edge of city centre zones, or the edge of metropolitan centre zones. The Site is within a 2-3 minute walk of the City Centre zone, being approximately 156m away.	Retain Standard HOSZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) as notified.
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	258.7	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-S2	Support	Supports the proposed height in relation to boundary standard as notified. Specifically, Vital supports the application of different height in relation to boundary standards as they relate to the height limits proposed on adjacent residential zones.	Retain HOSZ-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.71	Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-S2	Support	Supports the height in relation to boundary controls.	Retain HOSZ-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.

Special Purpose Zone - Port Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Vital Healthcare Property Trust	FS51.13	Part 3/ Special Purpose Zones / Hospital Zone / HOSZ-S2	Support	Support. Considers that the relief sought will enable the intent of the Special Purpose Zones – Hospital Zone to provide for hospital activities and development.	Allow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.117	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the Special Purpose Port Zone introduction as follows: Active engagement with mana whenua will assist in ensuring the mauri/mauri of this area of importance to mana whenua is not diminished through any potential adverse effects created by activities or development within the Precinct. [Inferred decision requested]
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.118	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the Special Purpose Port Zone introduction as follows: Kaiwharawhara and the Kaiwharawhara Stream has long established ecological, historical and cultural associations for the mana whenua of Whanganui a Tara (Wellington), Taranaki Whānui and Ngati Toa Rangatira. Activities within the Multi-User Ferry Precinct must recognise mana whenua as kaitiaki, alongside their relationship with the land. Active engagement with mana whenua will assist in ensuring the mauri/mauri of this area of importance to mana whenua is not diminished through any potential adverse effects created by activities and development within the Precinct. [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.40	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust is seeking improved recognition of the Kaiwharawhara Stream and public space in this area, and supports mana whenua interest in this area.	Allow
CentrePort Limited	402.146	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ	Amend	Considers that there should be recognition that Burnham and Miramar Wharves are located in the Coastal Marine Area and Burnham Wharf is used for Operational Port Activities. It is included in the Regional Policy Statement definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as being one of the three locations in Wellington Harbour for Commercial Port Activities. The land immediately adjoining Burnham Wharf is zoned General Industry there is an interrelationship with Port Activities. An alternative is to cross reference this matter in introductions of the Special Purpose Port Zone and Miramar/Burnham Precincts in the General Industrial Area.	Seeks that recognition of Miramar and Burnham Wharves location in the Coastal Marine Area and Burnham Wharf's use for Operational Port Activities is cross referenced in the introduction of the Special Purpose Zone.
CentrePort Limited	402.147	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC01	Support in part	Considers that the requirement for smaller scale developments to be subject to a plan change and Master Plan is onerous and this should be reflected in the text.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01 Inner Harbour Port Precinct Introduction, with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.148	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC01	Amend	Considers that the requirement for smaller scale developments to be subject to a plan change and Master Plan is onerous and this should be reflected in the text.	Amend 5th paragraph of PORTZ-PREC01 Inner Harbour Port Precinct Introduction as follows. The eventual vision for the Inner Harbour Port Precinct is that it becomes an extension of the Waterfront Zone. In order to achieve this, any <u>significant</u> future comprehensive redevelopment and rezoning of the area would be progressed through a plan change process, including the preparation of a companion masterplan to guide anticipated <u>although smaller scale developments are not required to go through a plan change.</u>
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.47	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P4	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust considers it imperative that no substantial development should take place in this important inner-city precinct area without the benefit of a Master Plan having been prepared and incorporated in the Plan. CentrePort has a good record of previous planning through Master Planning. WCT opposes the suggested rewording, as it could open the door to progressive small developments and lack of proper integrated planning for this important area.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Craig Palmer	492.42	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC02	Amend	Considers that while challenging, the weaving-in of these natural features within PORTZ-PREC02 will recognise recognising the full potential of this nationally significant site. The reward will be a source of pleasure and inspiration for travellers as they depart and arrive by ferry. It will represent man-made buildings and structures co-existing in harmony with nature.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02 (Port Zone - Multi-User Ferry Precinct) to include objectives, policies, and rules that explicitly protect and ensure public access to the following ecological and recreational features: a) the Sanctuary to Sea walkway commencing at Zealandia and finishing at the estuary of the Kaiwharawhara Stream. b) the estuary and its banks to be accorded ecological protection status and maintained as a public reserve. c) the small man-made beach on the north-west corner of the escarpment to be designated as a public reserve featuring indigenous coastal trees and shrubs.
CentrePort Limited	FS30.1	Part 3 / Area Specific Matters / Zones / Special Purposes / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC-02	Oppose	Considers that amendments sought are inconsistent with current development proposals by KiwiRail for the Wellington ferry terminal upgrade.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.38	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC02	Support	The submission encompasses a wider area than the Port Zone and parallels and provides more detail on matters of interest to Wellington Civic Trust within the Kaiwharawhara area. Wellington Civic Trust supports the submission to the extent that it applies to the Port Zone.	Allow
CentrePort Limited	402.149	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-O1	Support in part	Considers that there should be consistent terminology within the plan and the terminology used in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that refers to functional needs and operational requirements.	Retain PORTZ-O1 (Purpose), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.150	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-O1	Amend	Considers that there should be consistent terminology within the plan and the terminology used in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that refers to functional needs and operational requirements.	Amend PORTZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: ... 2. A commercial port area whose functional needs and operational needs requirements are not constrained or compromised by non-port activities, reverse sensitivity, incompatible built form or subdivision.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.133	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-O1	Support	Supports the objective to operate significant infrastructure safety, efficiently and effectively within the Special Purpose Port Zone. KiwiRail further support recognition of the functional and operational need of infrastructure and potential for reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain PORTZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.151	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-O2	Support	Support the intent of this objective.	Retain PORTZ-O2 (Managing effects) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.35	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-O1	Support	Objective PORTZ-PREC01-O1 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-O1 (Purpose of the Inner Harbour Port Precinct) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.152	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-O1	Support	Support the intent of this objective.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-O1 (Purpose of the Inner Harbour Port Precinct) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.48	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC01	Oppose	This submission does not recognise the very visible and important position of the proposed Multi-user Ferry Precinct to people approaching the City from the north and from the sea. The area is a landmark and holds gateway potential. Wellington Civic Trust opposes the change in wording proposed. There is the opportunity to "create" something of significance for the whole city here – an opportunity which should not be overlooked or forgotten.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.36	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-O2	Support	Objective PORTZ-PREC01-O2 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-O2 (Amenity and design) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.153	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-O2	Support	Support the intent of this objective.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-O2 (Amenity and design) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.49	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC01-O2	Oppose	This submission does not recognise the very visible and important position of the proposed Multi-user Ferry Precinct to people approaching the City from the north and from the sea. The area is a landmark and holds gateway potential. Wellington Civic Trust opposes the change in wording proposed. There is the opportunity to “create” something of significance for the whole city here – an opportunity which should not be overlooked or forgotten.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.37	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-O1	Support	Objective PORTZ-PREC02-O1 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-O1 (Purpose of the Multi-User Ferry Precinct) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.154	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-O1	Support	Support the intent of this objective.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-O1 (Purpose of the Multi-User Ferry Precinct) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.50	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC02-O1	Oppose	This submission does not recognise the very visible and important position of the proposed Multi-user Ferry Precinct to people approaching the City from the north and from the sea. The area is a landmark and holds gateway potential. Wellington Civic Trust opposes the change in wording proposed. There is the opportunity to “create” something of significance for the whole city here – an opportunity which should not be overlooked or forgotten.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.134	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-O1	Support	Supports in principle, the Multi-User Ferry Precinct, and objective for the Precinct to be a safe, resilient, convenient, and accessible environment. In particular, KiwiRail support recognition of the strategic importance of this area and the need to provide safe and efficient integration with inter island and the regional transport network.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-O1 (Purpose of the Multi-User Ferry Precinct) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.38	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Support	Objective PORTZ-PREC02-O2 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-O2 (Amenity and design) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.155	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Support in part	Considers that the wording could be improved as the Port is not located at the road or rail entrance to the City. A change to city centre would more accurately reflect this.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-O2 (Amenity and design), with amendments.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.51	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Oppose	This submission does not recognise the very visible and important position of the proposed Multi-user Ferry Precinct to people approaching the City from the north and from the sea. The area is a landmark and holds gateway potential. Wellington Civic Trust opposes the change in wording proposed. There is the opportunity to “create” something of significance for the whole city here – an opportunity which should not be overlooked or forgotten.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.156	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Amend	Considers that the wording could be improved as the Port is not located at the road or rail entrance to the City. A change to city centre would more accurately reflect this.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02-O2 (Amenity and design) as follows: Development in the Multi-User Ferry Precinct positively contributes to creating a well-functioning urban environment and enhances the entrance to the city <u>centre</u> .
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.52	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Oppose	This submission does not recognise the very visible and important position of the proposed Multi-user Ferry Precinct to people approaching the City from the north and from the sea. The area is a landmark and holds gateway potential. Wellington Civic Trust opposes the change in wording proposed. There is the opportunity to “create” something of significance for the whole city here – an opportunity which should not be overlooked or forgotten.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.157	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Support in part	Considers that it is uncertain and unnecessary to include the words creating in this objective.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-O2 (Amenity and design), with amendments.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.53	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Oppose	This submission does not recognise the very visible and important position of the proposed Multi-user Ferry Precinct to people approaching the City from the north and from the sea. The area is a landmark and holds gateway potential. Wellington Civic Trust opposes the change in wording proposed. There is the opportunity to “create” something of significance for the whole city here – an opportunity which should not be overlooked or forgotten.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.158	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Amend	Considers that it is uncertain and unnecessary to include the words creating in this objective.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02-O2 (Amenity and design) as follows: Development in the Multi-User Ferry Precinct positively contributes to creating a well-functioning urban environment and enhances the entrance to the city.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.54	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / General PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Oppose	This submission does not recognise the very visible and important position of the proposed Multi-user Ferry Precinct to people approaching the City from the north and from the sea. The area is a landmark and holds gateway potential. Wellington Civic Trust opposes the change in wording proposed. There is the opportunity to "create" something of significance for the whole city here – an opportunity which should not be overlooked or forgotten.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.135	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-O2	Support	Supports the objective to ensure development in the Precinct contributes to a well-functioning urban environment.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-O2 (Amenity and design) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.159	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P1	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain PORTZ-P1 (Port activities) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.136	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P1	Support	Supports policy direction to enable port activities which have a function or operational need to be located within this Zone. KiwiRail further support policy to avoid the establishment of incompatible activities that may compromise or conflict with existing or permitted operational port activities.	Retain PORTZ-P1 (Port activities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.160	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P2	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain PORTZ-P2 (Management areas and activities) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.137	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P2	Support	Supports identification of different areas within the Special Purpose Port Zone, including the railyard and ferry terminal.	Retain PORTZ-P2 (Management areas and activities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.161	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P3	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain PORTZ-P3 (Access and connections) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.138	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P3	Support	Supports maintaining and providing for safe and efficient access and connections with other transport modes, as well as the recognition of the significance of KiwiRail infrastructure.	Retain PORTZ-P3 (Access and connections) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.162	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P4	Support in part	Considers that the word manage gives no guidance to decision makers and would be better substituted by Avoid, remedy or mitigate.	Retain PORTZ-P4 (Adverse effects), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.163	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P4	Amend	Considers that the word manage gives no guidance to decision makers and would be better substituted by Avoid, remedy or mitigate.	Amend PORTZ-P4 (Adverse effects) as follows: Manage <u>Avoid, remedy or mitigate</u> adverse use and development related effects in the Port Zone associated with noise and light emission and the bulk, scale and location of buildings and structures.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.55	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P4	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust considers that the wording for managing adverse effects is appropriate for this policy.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.139	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P4	Support	Supports the objective to manage adverse effects from use and development within the Port Zone.	Retain PORTZ-P4 (Adverse effects) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.164	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P5	Support in part	Considers that this policy could be read in two ways in that there could be an expectation that the Port needs to remedy or mitigate adverse effects which should be the responsibility of the proponent of the new sensitive activity. In addition it is the location and design of the sensitive activity that can assist in avoiding adverse reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain PORTZ-P5 (Sensitive activities), with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.56	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P5	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust acknowledges that design is a way of managing reverse sensitivity effects and supports the small change sought. We oppose the specific policy requirement for sensitive activities to be the only place to address affects. There are a number of plan provisions which set standards that the Port must meet as part of managing interfaces.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.165	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P5	Amend	Considers that this policy could be read in two ways in that there could be an expectation that the Port needs to remedy or mitigate adverse effects which should be the responsibility of the proponent of the new sensitive activity. In addition it is the location and design of the sensitive activity that can assist in avoiding adverse reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend PORTZ-P5 (Sensitive activities) as follows: Ensure that any new sensitive activities seeking to establish adjacent to the Port Zone are appropriately located <u>or designed</u> to avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects and/or potential conflict with lawfully established activities within this Zone, and where avoidance of is not possible, that any adverse effects are appropriately remedied or mitigated <u>by the sensitive activity</u> .
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.57	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P5	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust acknowledges that design is a way of managing reverse sensitivity effects and supports the small change sought. We oppose the specific policy requirement for sensitive activities to be the only place to address affects. There are a number of plan provisions which set standards that the Port must meet as part of managing interfaces.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.140	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-P5	Support	Supports the avoid, remedy, mitigate policy framework to ensure new noise sensitive activities do not give rise to reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities.	Retain PORTZ-P5 (Sensitive activities) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.39	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P1	Support	PORTZ-PREC01-P1 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-P1 (Use and development of the Inner Harbour Port Precinct) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.166	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P1	Support in part	Considers that there should be recognition in this policy that that the precinct directly abuts the remainder of the Commercial Port.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-P1 (Use and development of the Inner Harbour Port Precinct), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.167	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P1	Amend	Considers that there should be recognition in this policy that that the precinct directly abuts the remainder of the Commercial Port.	Amend PORTZ-PREC01-P1 (Use and development of the Inner Harbour Port Precinct) as follows: ... 3. Enabling new development and a range of activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct that are adaptable, integrated, and compatible with surrounding land uses and activities <u>including the adjacent Commercial Port Area</u> .
Wellington Civic Trust	388.40	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P2	Support	PORTZ-PREC01-P2 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-P2 (Managing effects) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.119	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
CentrePort Limited	402.168	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P2	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-P2 (Managing effects) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.41	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P3	Support	PORTZ-PREC01-P3 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-P3 (Access, connections and open space) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.169	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P3	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-P3 (Access, connections and open space) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.42	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P4	Support	PORTZ-PREC01-P4 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.120	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P4	Amend	Considers appropriate the recognition of Taranaki Whānui cultural values in the design of public spaces.	Seeks to amend PORTZ-PREC01-P4 to provide for the capture and integration of Taranaki Whānui cultural narratives and design opportunities. [Inferred decision requested].
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.41	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P4	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and the proposed zoning of the prison land. This is an important part of Wellington's current green space, which Wellington Civic Trust has had a long interest and involvement in, and the overlays and zoning are appropriate.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.170	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P4	Support in part	Considers that there are wording improvements necessary to clause 3 by adding the Coastal Marine Area and the remainder of the Commercial Port Area as further matters that responds to site context.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.171	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P4	Amend	Considers that there are wording improvements necessary to clause 3 by adding the Coastal Marine Area and the remainder of the Commercial Port Area as further matters that responds to site context.	Amend PORTZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) as follows: ... 3. Responding to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to: a. A heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area; and b. Sites and areas of significance to Māori; <u>and</u> c. <u>The Coastal Marine Area.</u> <u>and</u> d. <u>The remainder of the Port Zone.</u>
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.58	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P4	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these additional matters	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.43	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P1	Support	PORTZ-PREC02-P1 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P1 (Multi-User Ferry Precinct redevelopment) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.172	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P1	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P1 (Multi-User Ferry Precinct redevelopment) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.141	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P1	Support	Supports providing for a staged redevelopment of the Precinct while enabling existing established activities and new regional significant infrastructure.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P1 (Multi-User Ferry Precinct redevelopment) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.44	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P2	Support	PORTZ-PREC02-P2 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P2 (Managing effects) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.173	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P2	Support in part	Considers that Clause 3 b is unnecessary as there are no heritage items within or in proximity of the precinct.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P2 (Managing effects), with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.174	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P2	Amend	Considers that Clause 3 b is unnecessary as there are no heritage items within or in proximity of the precinct.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02-P2 (Managing effects) as follows: ... 3. The activity does not compromise cultural, spiritual and/or historical values and interests and associations of importance to mana whenua, particularly where the site is located adjoining: a. Sites and areas of significance to Māori; and b. A heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.142	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P2	Support	Supports the management of effects of development within the Precinct, including the effects of development on the safe and efficient operation of operational port activities and opportunities for intensification or expansions of passenger port facilities. KiwiRail support the management of effects of development on the surface of water and values and interests of importance to Tangata Whenua.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P2 (Managing effects) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.45	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P3	Support	PORTZ-PREC02-P3 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P3 (Access and connections) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.175	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P3	Support in part	Considers that the wording of the policy appears to only favour Passenger Transport and Walking/cycling. Enhancing accessibility for passenger/freight vehicles and rail are a key consideration.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P3 (Access and connections), with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.176	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P3	Amend	Considers that the wording of the policy appears to only favour Passenger Transport and Walking/cycling. Enhancing accessibility for passenger/freight vehicles and rail are a key consideration.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02-P3 (Access and connections) as follows: Ensure that the use, development, and operation of the Multi-User Ferry Precinct provides attractive, safe, efficient, and convenient connections to existing and planned transport rail and road networks <u>by while also:</u> ...
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.59	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P3	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these additional transport matters being recognised for this particular precinct. We would support recognition of integrated road, rail, and sea networks.	Allow
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.54	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P3	Oppose	Waka Kotahi opposes the amendment sought as all modes of transport, for example walking and cycling, should be considered in providing safe and effective access and connections.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.143	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P3	Support	Supports maintaining and providing for safe and efficient access and connections with other transport modes.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P3 (Access and connections) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.46	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P4	Support in part	PORTZ-PREC02-P4 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P4 (Quality and amenity) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.47	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P4	Amend	Considers that PORTZ-PREC02-P4 should be amended to recognise the presence of the Kaiwharawhara Stream and estuary, an area understood to be an area of DoC esplanade reserve, and also the coastal marine area.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02-P4 (Quality and amenity) as follows: ... 3. Responding to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to: a. A heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area; and b. Sites and areas of significance to Māori; <u>and</u> c. <u>The coastal marine area, the Kaiwharara Stream and estuary, and public land.</u>
CentrePort Limited	402.177	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P4	Support in part	Support in part. Considers that Clause 2 should be amended as there are no adjoining sites and public spaces to the Precinct, and Clause 3a is not required as there is no heritage items within or adjoining the precinct.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P4 (Quality and Amenity), with amendments.
CentrePort Limited	402.178	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P4	Amend	Considers that Clause 2 should be amended as there are no adjoining sites and public spaces to the Precinct.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02-P4 (Quality and Amenity) as follows: ... 2. Ensuring the bulk, scale and location of built form is appropriate to the context, and is integrated with other development on the site, <u>and adjacent areas sites and surrounding public spaces;</u>
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.60	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P4	Oppose	The CentrePort submission appears to overlook the fact that the Precinct adjoins the coastal marine area which is a public space, and areas of road and rail, which are also public space. We understand there are also public spaces on the Kaiwharawhara reclamation itself, including DoC-owned esplanade reserves.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.179	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P4	Amend	Considers that Clause 3a is not required as there is no heritage items within or adjoining the precinct.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02-P4 (Quality and Amenity) as follows: ... 3. Responding to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to: a. A heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area; and b. Sites and areas of significance to Māori;
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.144	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P4	Support	Supports policy that requires development within the Precinct to contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P4 (Quality and Amenity) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.48	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P5	Support	PORTZ-PREC02-P5 is supported.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P5 (Cultural, historical and ecological values) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.180	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P5	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P5 (Cultural, historical and ecological values) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.145	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-P5	Support	Supports having regard to the significance of the Kaiwharawhara area including the cultural and ecological significance of the area and the relationship between Mana Whenua and the area.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-P5 (Cultural, historical and ecological values) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.181	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R1	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-R1 (Operational port activities) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.146	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R1	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of operational port activities which includes rail activities, subject to height controls, within the Special Purpose Port Zone.	Retain PORTZ-R1 (Operational port activities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.182	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R2	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-R2 (All Other Activities) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.299	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R3	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain PORTZ-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.300	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R3	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend PORTZ-R3 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
CentrePort Limited	402.183	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R3	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-R3 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.147	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R3	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of maintenance, repair, demolition, removal of buildings; and the construction, alteration and addition to buildings and structures, within the Special Purpose Port Zone.	Retain PORTZ-R3 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.184	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R4	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-R4 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures Permitted) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.148	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R4	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of maintenance, repair, demolition, removal of buildings; and the construction, alteration and addition to buildings and structures, within the Special Purpose Port Zone.	Retain PORTZ-R4 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.185	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R5	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-R5 (Construction and alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.149	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-R5	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of maintenance, repair, demolition, removal of buildings; and the construction, alteration and addition to buildings and structures, within the Special Purpose Port Zone.	Retain PORTZ-R5 (Construction and alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.186	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R1	Oppose	Opposes permitted limitation of 500m2 for commercial activities as it is inappropriate in this precinct that adjoins the Central City and is identified as an area for future mixed use.	Delete PORTZ-PREC01-R1 (Commercial Activities) in its entirety, or amend floorspace limitation to 2000m2.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.61	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R1	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes these submissions which seek to increase to delete or amend the size limitation for commercial and office activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct. The Trust considers that the "allowance" is ample as an interim measure until there is a Master Plan for the area.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.187	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R1	Amend	Opposes permitted limitation of 500m2 for commercial activities as it is inappropriate in this precinct that adjoins the Central City and is identified as an area for future mixed use.	Seeks that PORTZ-PREC01-R1 (Commercial Activities) is deleted its entirety, or otherwise seeks amendment to amend floorspace limitation to 2000m2.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.62	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R1	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes these submissions which seek to increase to delete or amend the size limitation for commercial and office activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct. The Trust considers that the "allowance" is ample as an interim measure until there is a Master Plan for the area.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.188	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R2	Oppose	Opposes permitted limitation of 2000m2 for office activities as it is inappropriate in this precinct that adjoins the Central City and is identified as an area for future mixed use. It is also at significant variance from the Operative District Plan That enabled office activities.	Delete PORTZ-PREC01-R2 (Office Activities) in its entirety, or amend floorspace limitation to 10000m2.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.63	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R1	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes these submissions which seek to increase to delete or amend the size limitation for commercial and office activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct. The Trust considers that the "allowance" is ample as an interim measure until there is a Master Plan for the area.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.189	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R2	Amend	Opposes permitted limitation of 2000m2 for office activities as it is inappropriate in this precinct that adjoins the Central City and is identified as an area for future mixed use. It is also at significant variance from the Operative District Plan That enabled office activities.	Seeks that PORTZ-PREC01-R2 (Office Activities) is deleted its entirety, or otherwise seeks amendment to amend floorspace limitation to 10000m2.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.64	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R2	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes these submissions which seek to increase to delete or amend the size limitation for commercial and office activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct. The Trust considers that the "allowance" is ample as an interim measure until there is a Master Plan for the area.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.190	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R2	Oppose	Considers that PORTZ-PREC01-R2 should be clarified for the avoidance of doubt that the rule is not intended in itself to define what constitutes a significant development or trigger the requirement for a Master Plan or a Plan Change is required.	Clarify the intent of PORTZ-PREC01-R2 (Office Activities) that the rule is not intended in itself to define what constitutes a significant development or trigger the requirement for a Master Plan or a Plan Change.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.65	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R2	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes these submissions which seek to increase to delete or amend the size limitation for commercial and office activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct. The Trust considers that the "allowance" is ample as an interim measure until there is a Master Plan for the area.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.191	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R3	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-R3 (All other Activities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.192	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R4	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-R4 (Existing passenger port facilities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.193	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R5	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-R5 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.301	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R6	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-R6 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.302	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R6	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend PORTZ-PREC01-R6 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
CentrePort Limited	402.194	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R6	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-R6 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.195	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R7	Oppose	Opposes the rule as any buildings and structures not related to existing passenger port facilities or operational port activities are a discretionary activity. There is no scale reference for this rule for example a coffee kiosk would require a consent and be subject to public notification. The rule should either be deleted or alternatively allow such buildings up to 200 m2 as a permitted activity.	Delete PORTZ-PREC01-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures and alterations and additions to buildings and structures not related to existing passenger port facilities or operational port activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct) in its entirety, or amend rule to allow such buildings up to 200 m2 as a permitted activity.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.66	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R7	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes submissions which seek to increase to delete or amend the size limitation for commercial and office activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct. The Trust considers that the "allowance" is ample as an interim measure until there is a Master Plan for the area. For the same reasons, Wellington Civic Trust oppose this submission. There are already buildings within the area that can provide for necessary facilities such as the example in the submission, or consent applications can be made.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.196	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R7	Oppose	Considers that the public notification statement is not necessary as the Act provides the circumstances where public notification is required.	Seeks that the public notification statement is deleted.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.68	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R7	Oppose	The Inner Harbour Port Precinct and its future use and development are aspects of considerable interest to the people of Wellington. Mandatory public notification of applications is appropriate and consistent with the adjoining Waterfront Zone.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.197	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	Opposes the rule as any buildings and structures not related to existing passenger port facilities or operational port activities are a discretionary activity. There is no scale reference for this rule for example a coffee kiosk would require a consent and be subject to public notification. The rule should either be deleted or alternatively allow such buildings up to 200 m2 as a permitted activity.	Seeks that PORTZ-PREC01-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures and alterations and additions to buildings and structures not related to existing passenger port facilities or operational port activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct) is deleted in its entirety, or otherwise amended to allow such buildings up to 200 m2 as a permitted activity.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.67	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R7	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes submissions which seek to increase to delete or amend the size limitation for commercial and office activities in the Inner Harbour Port Precinct. The Trust considers that the "allowance" is ample as an interim measure until there is a Master Plan for the area. For the same reasons, Wellington Civic Trust oppose this submission. There are already buildings within the area that can provide for necessary facilities such as the example in the submission, or consent applications can be made.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.49	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R8	Support in part	PORTZ-PREC01-R8 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-R8 (Outdoor storage areas) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.50	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-R8	Amend	Considers that PORTZ-PREC01-R8 should be amended so that storage areas are also screened from the coastal marine area.	Amend PORTZ-PREC01-R8 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: ... a. The storage area is screened by a fence of at least 1.8m high or landscaping from any adjoining road, coastal marine areas or site.
CentrePort Limited	FS30.2	Part 3 / Area Specific Matters / Zones / Special Purposes / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC-01-R8	Oppose	Considers that amendment sought to screen storage areas adjoining the CMA is impractical in a port environment.	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.198	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R1	Oppose	Considers that an arbitrary permitted limitation of 500m2 for commercial activities is unnecessary.	Delete PORTZ-PREC02-R1 (Commercial activities) in its entirety, or amend floorspace limitation to 2000m2.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.69	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R1	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes the suggestion that the allowable permitted activity area for commercial activity should be increased. The precinct has a particular purpose and there should not be significant commercial development beyond that purpose in this important area	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.199	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R1	Amend	Considers that an arbitrary permitted limitation of 500m2 for commercial activities is unnecessary.	Seeks that PORTZ-PREC02-R1 (Commercial activities) is deleted its entirety, or otherwise seeks amendment to amend floorspace limitation to 2000m2.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.70	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R1	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes the suggestion that the allowable permitted activity area for commercial activity should be increased. The precinct has a particular purpose and there should not be significant commercial development beyond that purpose in this important area	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.150	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R1	Support	Supports the provision for commercial activities subject to a 500m2 maximum net lettable floor space within the Special Purpose Port Zone.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.200	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R2	Support	Support the intent of this rule, subject to resolving PORTZ-PREC02-R1.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R2 (All other activities) as notified, subject to relief sought in relation to PORTZ-PREC02-R1 (Commercial activities).
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.71	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R2	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust opposes the suggestion that the allowable permitted activity area for commercial activity should be increased. The precinct has a particular purpose and there should not be significant commercial development beyond that purpose in this important area	Disallow
CentrePort Limited	402.201	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R3	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R3 (Existing passenger port facilities) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.151	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R3	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of passenger port facilities; maintenance and repair of structures; and demolition or removal of buildings and structures, within the Multi-User Ferry Precinct.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R3 (Existing passenger port facilities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.202	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R4	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R4 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.152	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R4	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of passenger port facilities; maintenance and repair of structures; and demolition or removal of buildings and structures, within the Multi-User Ferry Precinct.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R4 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.303	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R5	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.304	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R5	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
CentrePort Limited	402.203	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R5	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.153	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R5	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of passenger port facilities; maintenance and repair of structures; and demolition or removal of buildings and structures, within the Multi-User Ferry Precinct.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.204	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R6	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R6 (Construction of buildings and structures, alterations and additions to buildings and structures for passenger port facilities) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.154	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R6	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of construction of buildings and structures, alterations and additions to buildings and structures for passenger port facilities.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R6 (Construction of buildings and structures, alterations and additions to buildings and structures for passenger port facilities) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.205	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R7	Support	Support the intent of this rule.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures, alterations and additions to buildings and structures not related to passenger port facilities or operational port activities) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.51	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R8	Support in part	PORTZ-PREC02-R8 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R8 (Outdoor storage areas) with amendment.

Special Purpose Zone - Quarry Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.52	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R8	Amend	Considers that PORTZ-PREC02-R8 should be amended so that storage areas are also screened from the coastal marine area.	Amend PORTZ-PREC02-R8 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: ... a. The storage area is screened by a fence of at least 1.8m high or landscaping from any adjoining road, coastal marine areas or site.
CentrePort Limited	FS30.3	Part 3 / Area Specific Matters / Zones / Special Purposes / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC-02-R8	Oppose	Considers that amendment sought to screen storage areas adjoining the CMA is impractical in a port environment.	Disallow
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.155	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-R8	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of outdoor storage subject to screening.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-R8 (Outdoor Storage Areas) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.206	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-S1	Support	Support the intent of this standard.	Retain PORTZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.156	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-S1	Support	Supports the maximum height limit of 27m for buildings and structures.	Retain PORTZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.207	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-S1	Support	Support the intent of this standard.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.157	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-S1	Support	Supports the unrestricted height limit for cranes, elevators, cargo and passenger handling equipment, and walkways. KiwiRail further support the 19m maximum height limit for all other buildings and structures.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.208	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-S2	Support	Support the intent of this standard.	Retain PORTZ-PREC01-S2 (Verandahs) as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.209	Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC02-S1	Support	Support the intent of this standard.	Retain PORTZ-PREC02-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structure) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.160	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Amend	Considers that in the Special Purpose Quarry Zone chapter text, the precinct for Kiwi Point is referred to as the "Kiwi Point Precinct" whereas the name is "Kiwipoint Quarry Precinct" in the District Plan Maps.	Seeks to amend all references of "Kiwi Point Precinct" to "Kiwipoint Quarry Precinct".
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.70	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Support	Supports the zoning of the Horokiwi Quarry from General Rural in the Operative District Plan to Special Purpose Quarry Zone. Horokiwi has considered the implications of such a zoning and notwithstanding the existing use rights that apply to the existing quarry site (which includes those area of land identified in the Existing Use Certificate which includes unused areas of the greater site) it supports the rezoning of the site on the basis it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognises the existing and long-established quarry activity. Provide policy support and consenting framework recognising the importance, benefit and role of the quarry activity, and provides a more efficient policy and rule framework. Provide structure to the assessment of any future resource consents on the site that are behind the scope of the Existing Use Certificate. Reflects the approach in the National Planning Standards for having the provisions in one chapter. Gives effect to the RPS Objective 31 to provide mineral resources within close proximity of the demand, and Policy 60 to give particular regard to the benefits of utilising mineral resources within the region. 	Retain the Special Purpose Quarry zoning of the Horokiwi Quarry site, with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.71	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Support in part	Supports the application of the Special Purpose Quarry Zone to the site, and seeks the application of the zoning to adjoining sites owned by Horokiwi. The proposed zoning recognises the existing quarry activities and provides an efficient and effective policy and rule framework in which to consider the effects. Related to the zoning, Horokiwi supports the PDP provisions which recognise the expansion of existing quarries.	Retain Special Purpose Quarry Zone, with amendments.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.72	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Amend	Supports that the Horokiwi site is zoned Special Purpose Quarry Zone, however two sites are not included, and amendments are sought to rezone two areas (being Pt Sec 17 Harbour District and Pt Sect 18 Harbour District from General Rural zone to Special Purpose Quarry zone, and part of Pt Sec 16 Harbour District from Open Space zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone). This would provide for the full utilisation of the quarry site and provide a more efficient consenting regime. Pt Sec 16 Harbour District is owned by Horokiwi Quarries Ltd, is included within the existing use certificate, and part of the site features the existing sediment pond. Public access within the site is restricted and the site has no passive or active recreational assets or activities. The land is not subject to a reserves management plan and other than its historical zoning, there appears no basis or justification for an Open Space Zoning in the PDP. A consistent zoning would therefore be logical and efficient. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Rezone Pt Sec 16 Harbour District from Open Space Zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone. [Refer to original submission for figures and attachments showing the area sought to be rezoned].
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.73	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Amend	Supports that the Horokiwi site is zoned Special Purpose Quarry Zone, however two sites are not included, and amendments are sought to rezone two areas (being Pt Sec 17 Harbour District and Pt Sect 18 Harbour District from General Rural zone to Special Purpose Quarry zone, and part of Pt Sec 16 Harbour District from Open Space zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone). This would provide for the full utilisation of the quarry site and provide a more efficient consenting regime. Pt Sec 18 is owned by Horokiwi Quarries Ltd and is included within the existing use certificate. Pt Sec 17 Harbour District is not in the existing use certificate, but is owned by Horokiwi and is positioned between the existing quarry site and Pt Sect 18. A consistent zoning would therefore be logical and efficient. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Rezone Pt Sec 18 Harbour District and Pt Sec 17 Harbour District from General Rural Zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone. [Refer to original submission for figures and attachments showing the areas sought to be rezoned].
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.74	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Support	Supports the introductory text to the Quarry Zone on the basis it provides clarity as to the nature and uniqueness of the existing activities and the reasoning for the special purpose zone.	Retain the Special Purpose Quarry Zone Introduction as notified.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.23	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Not specified	Considers that it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provisions do not unreasonably curtail the expansion or establishment of quarries.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.34	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Oppose	A number of submission points made by the Aggregate & Quarry Association (please see multiple points in their submission relating to the same theme) argue that "it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction."Elsewhere, they also say: "... the District Plan must not unreasonably curtail expansion of existing quarries and establishment of new quarries..." WCCERG disagree, on the basis of primary and secondary greenhouse gas emissions from quarrying, which are no longer tenable; and the opportunity to re-use existing materials (instead of sending them to landfill, as is currently the case).	Disallow / Seeks that instead of allowing new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use, WCC requires no expansion of any kind of mining or quarrying activities, and a second policy stating that these activities be phased out by (for example), 2030.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.24	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Not specified	Considers that it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provisions do not preclude the potential development of new quarries in areas outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Limited	FS28.5	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Support	Given the importance of quarries to the city and region, Horokiwi Quarries Ltd would support recognition and quarry provisions outside the Special Purpose Quarry zone.	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.35	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Oppose	A number of submission points made by the Aggregate & Quarry Association (please see multiple points in their submission relating to the same theme) argue that "it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction." Elsewhere, they also say: "... the District Plan must not unreasonably curtail expansion of existing quarries and establishment of new quarries..." WCCERG disagree, on the basis of primary and secondary greenhouse gas emissions from quarrying, which are no longer tenable; and the opportunity to re-use existing materials (instead of sending them to landfill, as is currently the case).	Disallow / Seeks that instead of allowing new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use, WCC requires no expansion of any kind of mining or quarrying activities, and a second policy stating that these activities be phased out by (for example), 2030.
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.25	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / General QUARZ	Support	Supports the Special Purpose Quarry Zone as it stands for Wellington's existing quarries.	Retain the 'Special Purpose - Quarry Zone' Chapter as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.75	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-O1	Support	Supports recognition of the purpose and role of quarries.	Retain QUARZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.76	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-O2	Support in part	Supports recognition of the management of the adverse effects of quarry activities but seeks amendment to require management where practicable.	Retain QUARZ-O2 (Adverse effects), with amendment.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.77	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-O2	Amend	Supports recognition of the management of the adverse effects of quarry activities but seeks amendment to require management where practicable. The Horokiwi quarry is long established and has been operating on its site for nearly 50 years. In that time, residential development on its boundaries has intensified and while Horokiwi endeavours to manage the adverse effects, it is constrained by the nature of the quarry activity and long-term operational constraints.	Amend QUARZ-O2 (Adverse effects) as follows: <u>Where practicable, a</u> Adverse effects generated by quarrying activities onto adjacent residential sites are appropriately managed.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.78	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-O3	Support	Supports recognition of rehabilitation noting the existing quarry activity has existing use rights and no current consenting rehabilitation requirements.	Retain QUARZ-O3 (Site rehabilitation) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.79	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-P1	Support	Supports recognition of the benefits of quarries, and their functional and operational needs.	Retain QUARZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.80	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-P2	Support	Supports the strong policy directive relating to non-quarrying activities within the zone.	Retain QUARZ-P2 (Other activities) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.81	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-P3	Support	Supports recognition of the need to maintain, where practicable reasonable amenity for adjoining residential zones. The reference to 'where practicable' is supported as specific to Horokiwi, it recognises the residential development that has occurred in the lifetime of the quarry and that the ability maintain reasonable amenity is constrained.	Retain QUARZ-P3 (Zone interfaces) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.82	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-P4	Support	Supports that should the Horokiwi site be expanded and require resource consent, it anticipates rehabilitation will be required.	Retain QUARZ-P4 (Site rehabilitation) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.83	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-R1	Support	Supports the permitted activity rule for rural activities.	Retain QUARZ-R1 (Rural activities) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.84	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-R2	Support	Supports the permitted activity rule for conservation activities.	Retain QUARZ-R2 (Conservation activities) as notified.

Special Purpose Zone - Stadium Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.85	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-R3	Support	Supports the controlled activity rule for quarrying activities. The non-notification clause is also supported. Noting the Horokiwi Quarry is operating under existing use rights.	Retain QUARZ-R3 (Quarrying activities) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.86	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-R4	Support	Supports the default discretionary activity rule. Noting the Horokiwi Quarry is operating under existing use rights.	Retain QUARZ-R4 (All other activities) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.87	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-R5	Support	Supports the permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair of buildings and structures. Noting the Horokiwi Quarry is operating under existing use rights.	Retain QUARZ-R5 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.88	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-R6	Support	Supports the permitted activity rule for demolition or removal of buildings and structures. Noting the Horokiwi Quarry is operating under existing use rights.	Retain QUARZ-R6 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.305	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-R6	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain QUARZ-R6 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.306	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-R6	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend QUARZ-R6 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.89	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-R7	Support	Supports the rule for construction of buildings and structures and alteration and addition to buildings and structures. Noting the Horokiwi Quarry is operating under existing use rights.	Retain QUARZ-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures and alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.90	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-S1	Support	Supports the standard for a site rehabilitation plan should consent be required at some stage in the future under Rule QUARZ-R3. Noting the Horokiwi Quarry is operating under existing use rights.	Retain QUARZ-S1 (Site Rehabilitation Plan) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.91	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-S2	Support	Supports the height in relation to boundary standard, should consent be required at some stage in the future under Rule QUARZ-R3. Noting the Horokiwi Quarry is operating under existing use rights.	Retain QUARZ-S2 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) as notified.
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.92	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-S3	Support	Supports the height in relation to boundary standard, should consent be required at some stage in the future under Rule QUARZ-R3. Noting the Horokiwi Quarry is operating under existing use rights.	Retain QUARZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.442	Special Purpose Zones / Quarry Zone / QUARZ-PREC01-S7	Support	Standard QUARZ-PREC01-S7 is supported as requires access is only via an authorised crossing from State Highway 1.	Retain Standard QUARZ-PREC01-S7 (Access) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.443	Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-P2	Support	Policy STADZ-P2 is supported as it promotes pedestrian and cycling access and accessibility for all ages and mobility.	Retain Policy STADZ-P2 (Other activities) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.444	Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-P3	Support	Policy STADZ-P3 is supported as it promotes pedestrian and cycling access and accessibility for all ages and mobility.	Retain Policy STADZ-P3 (Access and connections) as notified.
Waka Kotahi	370.445	Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-P5	Support	Policy STADZ-P5 is supported as it promotes pedestrian and cycling access and accessibility for all ages and mobility.	Retain Policy STADZ-P5 (Urban Form, quality and amenity) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.161	Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-P6	Amend	Considers that STADZ-P6 (Cultural, historical and ecological values) refers to "ecological values" in the policy title, however there are no ecological values within the highly modified Stadium Zone.	Amend STADZ-P6 (Cultural, historical and ecological values) as follows: Cultural and historical values
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.121	Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-P6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain STADZ-P6 (Cultural, historical and ecological values) with amendments.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.122	Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-P6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to amend STADZ-P6 (Cultural, historical and ecological values) as amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City".

Special Purpose Zone - Tertiary Education Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.62	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-P6	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui ā Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui ā Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui ā Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.123	Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-P6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to amend STADZ-P6 (Cultural, historical and ecological values) to provide triggers for active partnership or engagement with Taranaki Whānui in respect of design opportunities with Taranaki Whānui specific associations.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.307	Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-R5	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain STADZ-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.308	Special Purpose Zones / Stadium Zone / STADZ-R5	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend STADZ-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.11	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / General TEDZ	Support in part	Considers that the Tertiary Education zone should be extended to include the McLean Flats site at 320A The Terrace (outlined in black in Figure 2 on original submission) and the substation site adjoining the Gordon Wilson Flats site on the northern side (outlined in blue in Figure 2 on original submission). Both sites will be utilised for university purposes in accordance with the CDP.	Seeks extension to the Tertiary Education zone to apply to the McLean Flats site and the substation site adjoining the Gordon Wilson Flats site. [Refer to original submission for map]
Massey University	253.22	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / General TEDZ	Support in part	Supports in part the introduction of a specific tertiary education zone provided the relief sought in this submission are addressed.	Retain the Tertiary Education Zone with amendments sought in the submission.
Massey University	253.23	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O1	Support in part	Seeks relief to provide clarify to Objective TEDZ-O1.	Retain Objective TEDZ-O1 (Purpose) with amendment.
Massey University	253.24	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O1	Amend	Seeks relief to provide clarify to Objective TEDZ-O1.	Amend Objective TEDZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: Victoria University's Kelburn Campus and Massey University's Mt Cook Campus operate efficiently and effectively and are recognised regionally, nationally and internationally <u>as</u> significant educational facilities supported by a range of primary and ancillary activities.
Massey University	253.25	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O2	Support in part	Supports the objective as the university has invested and established relationships with their iwi partners in Wellington and nationwide.	Retain TEDZ-O2 (Mana Whenua) with amendment.
Massey University	253.26	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O2	Amend	While Massey acknowledges Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira it does not wish for the objective to rule out other Mana Whenua and seeks to recognise the varying interests of all mana whenua within the area.	Amend Objective TEDZ-O2 (Mana Whenua) as follows: Taranaki Whānui, <u>Te Āti Awa</u> , and Ngāti Toa Rangatira are acknowledged as the mana whenua of Te Whanganui ā Tara (Wellington) and their cultural associations to these sites and the land are recognised in planning and developing the Tertiary Education Zone.
Massey University	253.27	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O2	Amend	While Massey acknowledges Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira it does not wish for the objective to rule out other Mana Whenua and seeks to recognise the varying interests of all mana whenua within the area.	Amend Objective TEDZ-O2 (Mana Whenua) as follows: Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira are acknowledged as the cultural association the mana whenua of Te Whanganui ā Tara (Wellington) and their cultural associations have to these sites and the land are recognised in future planning and development of the Tertiary Education Zone.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.124	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that TEDZ-O2 (Mana Whenua) is amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City".

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.63	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O2	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.92	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O2	Support in part	Supports objective TEDZ-O2 and reference to mana whenua.	Retain TEDZ-O2 (Mana whenua) with amendment below.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.93	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O2	Amend	Considers that TEDZ-O2 should requiring partnership with mana whenua rather than engagement.	Amend TEDZ-O2 (Mana whenua) to require partnership rather than engagement with mana whenua.
Massey University	253.28	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O3	Support in part	Considers objective TEDZ-O3 in its current form implies coordination is required between Massey University and Victoria University for their future development. Wants to ensure that there shall be no coordination expected between Massey University and Victoria University as they operate as separate entities. Relief is sought to provide clarity to distinct the development expectations on the respective universities.	Retain TEDZ-O3 (Amenity and design) with amendment.
Massey University	253.29	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O3	Amend	Considers objective TEDZ-O3 in its current form implies coordination is required between Massey University and Victoria University for their future development. Wants to ensure that there shall be no coordination expected between Massey University and Victoria University as they operate as separate entities. Relief is sought to provide clarity to distinct the development expectations on the respective universities.	Amend TEDZ-O3 (Amenity and design) as follows: Changes in land use and the built form of Victoria university's Kelburn campus and Massey University's Mt Cook campus' occur in a coordinated and integrated manner <u>respectively for each individual campus</u> , contribute to a well-functioning urban environment and recognise the functional and operational needs of <u>each of the individual</u> the university campus.
Massey University	253.30	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-O4 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.510	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-O4	Support	Support the policy as it currently stands because of the need to assist Wellingtons tertiary education sector into a transition of new learning styles (ie: Online learning). The student housing crisis is also addressed in point 4, with important emphasis placed on providing for a range of accommodation types that would include a range of prices and locations, acknowledging the need for cheaper higher quality living environments due to increased time spent in accommodation and increased cost of living.	Retain TEDZ-O4 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.
Massey University	253.31	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Massey University	253.32	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P2	Support in part	Considers that an amendment is needed to let Massey University to allow other entities to utilize their established premises when a space is underutilized.	Retain Policy TEDZ-P2 (Incompatible activities) with amendment.
Massey University	253.33	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P2	Amend	Considers that an amendment is needed to let Massey University to allow other entities to utilize their established premises when a space is underutilized.	Amend Policy TEDZ-P2 (Incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow other activities within the Tertiary Education Zone where they: 1. are compatible with the purpose of the Zone; and 2. will not have adverse effects on the vitality and amenity of the Zone; <u>and</u> 3. <u>are facilitated by the tertiary education provider.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Massey University	253.34	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P3	Support in part	Considers that often facilities within the zone are designed to be functional so as to meet their educational purpose, meaning that there are little opportunities for design modifications. Considers that managing design collaboration with their iwi partners via non-statutory documents such as the Massey's Te Tiriti o Waitangi objectives means that the plan as notified results in duplication.	Retain Policy TEDZ-P3 (Mana Whenua) with amendment.
Massey University	253.35	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P3	Amend	Considers that often facilities within the zone are designed to be functional so as to meet their educational purpose, meaning that there are little opportunities for design modifications. Considers that managing design collaboration with their iwi partners via non-statutory documents such as the Massey's Te Tiriti o Waitangi objectives means that the plan as notified results in duplication.	Amend Policy TEDZ-P3 (Mana Whenua) as follows: Recognise and enable mana whenua association in the Tertiary Education Zone by: 1. ensuring that use and development in the Zone recognises and has regard to historical and contemporary relationship between mana whenua and these sites and universities; <u>and</u> 2. managing new development adjoining scheduled sites of significance to Māori; and 3. collaborating on the design and incorporation of traditional cultural elements into public space within the zone.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.125	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that TEDZ-P3 (Mana Whenua) is amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City".
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.64	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P3	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.94	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P3	Support in part	Supports Policy TEDZ-P3 and reference to mana whenua.	Retain TEDZ-P3 (Mana whenua) with amendment.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.95	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P3	Support in part	Considers that TEDZ-P3 should requiring partnership with mana whenua rather than engagement.	Amend TEDZ-P3 (Mana whenua) to require partnership rather than engagement with mana whenua.
Massey University	253.36	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-P4 (Providing for future needs) as notified.
Massey University	253.37	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-P5 (Sense of place) as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.126	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that TEDZ-P5 (Sense of place) is amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City".
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.65	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P5	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Massey University	253.38	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P6	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-P6 (Quality design outcomes and amenity) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.446	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P6	Support	Policy TEDZ-P6 is supported as it promotes pedestrian and cycling access and accessibility for all ages and mobility.	Retain Policy TEDZ-P6 (Quality design outcomes and amenity) as notified.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.511	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P6	Support	Support as the policy clearly and effectively encompasses all key considerations for future development within the Centre Zone. In particular the need for maintaining the amenity of culturally significant sites, creation of green space, climate change resilience, and incorporating current and future public transport	Retain TEDZ-P6 (Quality design outcomes and amenity) as notified.
Massey University	253.39	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P7	Support in part	Considers that Massey University has no agreement with any natural hazard and emergency services providers to serve as a resilience anchor during a natural hazard event, nor is the scope of this role/requirement defined. Considers that Policy TEDZ-P7(2) has not been justified through Wellington City Council's Section 32 reporting for the Tertiary Education Zone in the Wellington City Proposed District Plan. Consequently, the inclusion of Policy TEDZ-P7(2) has not been justified and imposes a requirement on Massey University that have not been agreed to.	Retain Policy TEDZ-P7 (Resilience) with amendment.
Massey University	253.40	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P7	Amend	Considers that Massey University has no agreement with any natural hazard and emergency services providers to serve as a resilience anchor during a natural hazard event, nor is the scope of this role/requirement defined. Considers that Policy TEDZ-P7(2) has not been justified through Wellington City Council's Section 32 reporting for the Tertiary Education Zone in the Wellington City Proposed District Plan. Consequently, the inclusion of Policy TEDZ-P7(2) has not been justified and imposes a requirement on Massey University that have not been agreed to.	Amend Policy TEDZ-P7 (Resilience) as follows: Encourage new development within Victoria University's Kelburn campus and Massey University's t Cook campus that 1- is sustainable, resilient and adaptable to change in use over time, and 2- supports the universities' role and function as resilience anchors during and after natural hazard events.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.512	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P7	Support	Support this policy due to its clear and concise expression of support for improving Wellington City's tertiary education facilities whilst emphasising some of the most important considerations of any new development within the CBD that being their long term sustainability, resilience and capacity as a multi use building. In addition the policy also addresses the important role these facilities play in improving the resilience of surrounding areas to climate change induced natural hazards, an issue of increasing relevance and importance.	Retain TEDZ-P7 (Resilience) as notified.
Massey University	253.41	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-P8 (National war memorial) as notified.
Massey University	253.42	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R1 (Tertiary education facility) as notified.
Massey University	253.43	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R2 (Activities relating to the function of the National War Memorial including ceremonial activities) as notified.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.12	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R3	Support in part	The term 'cannot be achieved' implies the standard must be complied with unless it is impossible to do so. Instead, the wording should reflect the intent of the provision, which is to introduce a more onerous activity status when permitted activity standards are not met. Amending the language to 'is not achieved' reflects language used in district plans elsewhere in the country and provides greater consenting flexibility for when permitted activity standards are not met.	Amend TEDZ-R3 (All other activities) as follows: [...] Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of the requirements of [...] cannot be is not achieved.
Massey University	253.44	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R3 (All other activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.513	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R3	Amend	Considers the rule provides an outline for requirements for activities outside of other established outlines however as it currently stands it fails to include the important long term sustainability and resilience considerations outlined within policies, 6 and 7. As such we suggest including these within the listed policies outlined within the matters of discretion.	Amend TEDZ-R3 (all other activities) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. Any relevant matters in TEDZ-P1, TEDZ-P2, TEDZ-P3, TEDZ-P4 , <u>TEDZ-P6, TEDZ-P7</u> and TEDZ-P8; 2. The provision of an Event Management Plan, including details of traffic and noise generation from the proposed activity and how any effects of these will be managed; and
Massey University	253.45	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R4 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.13	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R5	Not specified	The term 'cannot be achieved' implies the standard must be complied with unless it is impossible to do so. Instead, the wording should reflect the intent of the provision, which is to introduce a more onerous activity status when permitted activity standards are not met. Amending the language to 'is not achieved' reflects language used in district plans elsewhere in the country and provides greater consenting flexibility for when permitted activity standards are not met.	Amend TEDZ-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows: [...] a. compliance with any requirements in TEDZ-R5.1.a cannot be achieved <u>is not achieved</u> .
Oliver Sangster	112.13	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R5	Amend	Considers that amendment to TEDZ-R5 is needed consistent with submission points to permit demolition of the Gordon Wilson Flats.	Amend TEDZ-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: The demolition or removal is not of Gordon Wilson Flats at 320 the Terrace"
Massey University	253.46	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R5.1 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Massey University	253.47	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R5.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.309	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R5	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain TEDZ-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.310	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R5	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend TEDZ-R5 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.514	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R5	Amend	Considers the second part of the rule in regards to controlled demolition activities does not effectively consider the potential significant local and wider environmental impacts of demolition activities within Wellington City. Suggest the addition of further consideration points that acknowledges these risks and the need for their minimisation.	Amend TEDZ-R5.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) ... Matters of control are: 1. The preparation and implementation of a demolition management plan; 2. Management of demolition effects on local amenity values; and 3. Recording of the building prior to demolition. <u>4. Establishment of a management plan for runoff of potential on site exotoxins and other environmental hazards.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.14	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R6	Oppose	<p>Opposes changing the activity status for additions and alterations to buildings and structures in the Tertiary Zone from Controlled to Discretionary Restricted.</p> <p>Considers that changing the activity status would significantly expand the matters for assessment which are already sufficiently broad and that the Controlled activity status provides sufficient discretion to the Council to ensure neighbours are not adversely affected without exposing the University to unnecessarily onerous consenting requirements. There is a risk that this will cause unnecessary delay and cost, impacting the University's ability to grow.</p>	<p>Amend TEDZ-R6.2 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Controlled</u></p>
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.15	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R6	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the definition of 'public spaces' in the PDP is broad and includes anywhere within the University that is accessible by a pedestrian. 'Public spaces' should be replaced with 'legal road or are located 10m away from a legal road boundary.'</p> <p>This would strike a reasonable balance between retaining Council oversight of additions and alterations that could affect the streetscape but will not impact activities well within the respective campuses.</p>	<p>Amend TEDZ-R6.1 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Additions and alterations to Buildings and Structures</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The proposed additions or alterations:</p> <p>i. Do not alter the appearance of the building or structure; or</p> <p>ii. Are not visible from public spaces <u>a legal road or are located 10m away from a legal road boundary</u>; and</p> <p>iii. Compliance with TEDZ-S1, TEDZ-S2, TEDZ-S3; and TEDZ-S4 is achieved.</p>
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.16	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R6	Support in part	<p>In the event that the activity status for TEDZ-6.2 remains restricted discretionary (i.e. is not changed to controlled); the University seeks that limited notification be precluded where the proposal otherwise complies with the relevant requirements under TEDZ-S1, TEDZS2, TEDZ-S3 and TEDZ-S4.</p> <p>The University considers it is appropriate to engage with the Council on matters of design (as is currently the situation under the Wellington Operative District Plan) but does not consider that development in the TEDZ that otherwise meets development standards warrants wider public involvement.</p>	<p>Amend notification clauses under TEDZ-R6.2 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule TEDZ-R6.2 is precluded from being publicly notified, <u>and will be precluded from being limited notified where compliance with TEDZ-S1, TEDZ-S2, TEDZ-S3; and TEDZ-S4 is achieved.</u></p>
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.17	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R6	Support in part	<p>The term 'cannot be achieved' implies the standard must be complied with unless it is impossible to do so. Instead, the wording should reflect the intent of the provision, which is to introduce a more onerous activity status when permitted activity standards are not met.</p> <p>Amending the language to 'is not achieved' reflects language used in district plans elsewhere in the country and provides greater consenting flexibility for when permitted activity standards are not met.</p>	<p>Amend TEDZ-R6 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of the requirements of [...] cannot be is not <u>is not</u> achieved.</p>
Massey University	253.48	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R6 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Massey University	253.49	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R6	Amend	<p>Considers that the majority of Massey buildings are already visible from public spaces and if this standard were to remain as worded, all works on the Massey University Campus would be unable to comply.</p> <p>Furthermore, Massey considers Rule TEDZ-R6(1)(ii) can be sufficiently covered by Rule TEDZ-R6(2).</p>	<p>Amend Rule TEDZ-R6.1 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Additions and alterations to buildings and structures</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The proposed additions or alterations:</p> <p>i. Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; or</p> <p>ii. Are not visible from public spaces; and</p> <p>iii. Compliance with TEDZ-S1, TEDZ-S2, TEDZ-S3 and TEDZ-S4 is achieved.</p>
Massey University	253.50	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R6.2 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as notified.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.18	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R7	Oppose	<p>Opposes changing the activity status for the construction of new buildings and structures in the Tertiary Zone from Controlled to Discretionary Restricted.</p> <p>Considers that changing the activity status would significantly expand the matters for assessment which are already sufficiently broad and that the Controlled activity status provides sufficient discretion to the Council to ensure neighbours are not adversely affected without exposing the University to unnecessarily onerous consenting requirements. There is a risk that this will cause unnecessary delay and cost, impacting the University's ability to grow.</p>	<p>Amend TEDZ-R7.2 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Controlled</u></p>
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.19	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R7	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the definition of 'public spaces' in the PDP is broad and includes anywhere within the University that is accessible by a pedestrian. 'Public spaces' should be replaced with 'legal road or are located 10m away from a legal road boundary.'</p> <p>This would strike a reasonable balance between retaining Council oversight of additions and alterations that could affect the streetscape but will not impact activities well within the respective campuses.</p>	<p>Amend TEDZ-R7.1 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Additions and alterations to Buildings and Structures</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The proposed additions or alterations:</p> <p>i. Do not alter the appearance of the building or structure; or</p> <p>ii. <u>Are not visible from public spaces a legal road or are located 10m away from a legal road boundary; and</u></p> <p>iii. Compliance with TEDZ-S1, TEDZ-S2, TEDZ-S3; and TEDZ-S4 is achieved.</p>
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.20	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R7	Support in part	<p>Considers that in the event that the activity status for TEDZ-7.2 remains restricted discretionary (i.e. is not changed to controlled); the University seeks that limited notification be precluded where the proposal otherwise complies with the relevant requirements under TEDZ-S1, TEDZ-S2, TEDZ-S3 and TEDZ-S4.</p> <p>The University considers it is appropriate to engage with the Council on matters of design (as is currently the situation under the Wellington Operative District Plan) but does not consider that development in the TEDZ that otherwise meets development standards warrants wider public involvement.</p>	<p>Amend notification clauses under TEDZ-R7.2 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule TEDZ-R7.2 is precluded from being publicly notified, <u>and will be precluded from being limited notified where compliance with TEDZ-S1, TEDZ-S2, TEDZ-S3; and TEDZ-S4 is achieved.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.21	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R7	Support in part	The term 'cannot be achieved' implies the standard must be complied with unless it is impossible to do so. Instead, the wording should reflect the intent of the provision, which is to introduce a more onerous activity status when permitted activity standards are not met. Amending the language to 'is not achieved' reflects language used in district plans elsewhere in the country and provides greater consenting flexibility for when permitted activity standards are not met.	Amend TEDZ-R7 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: [...] Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of the requirements of [...] cannot be is not achieved.
Massey University	253.51	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R7	Support in part	Supports the entire rule with amendments	Retain Rule TEDZ-R7 Construction of new buildings and structures) with amendments.
Massey University	253.52	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R7	Amend	Considers most Massey buildings are already visible from public spaces and a 100m ² footprint is too small to construct any form of structure required for the operation of a tertiary education facility.	Amend Rule TEDZ-R7.1 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: Construction of new buildings and structures 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The new building or structure: i. Is not visible from a public space; and ii. W will have a gross floor area of less than <u>or equal to</u> 1000 m ² ; and b. Compliance with TEDZ-S1, TEDZ-S2, TEDZ-S3 and TEDZ-S4 is achieved.
Massey University	253.53	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R7	Amend	Considers that any potential adverse effects relating to visibility from a public space and large building sizes can be sufficiently covered by Rule TEDZ-R7(2).	Amend Rule TEDZ-R7.1 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: Construction of new buildings and structures 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The new building or structure: i. Is not visible from a public space; and ii. W will have a gross floor area of less than <u>or equal to</u> 1000 m ² ; and b. Compliance with TEDZ-S1, TEDZ-S2, TEDZ-S3 and TEDZ-S4 is achieved.
Massey University	253.54	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R7	Amend	Considers that that further clarification is needed to Rule TEDZ-R7(2)(4) as a matter of discretion so as to make it clear that these views from roads and/or open space is limited to directly adjoining public areas. This is because the Massey University Site is visible from a wide range of vantages around Wellington, which would result in this matter of discretion being relatively wide reaching. Further, this could result in unintended consequences.	Amend Rule TEDZ-R7.2 (Construction of new buildings and structures) to read as follows: Construction of new buildings and structures 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of TEDZ-R7.1 cannot be achieved: Matters of discretion are: 1. Any relevant matters in TEDZ-P3, TEDZ-P4, TEDZ-P5, TEDZ-P6, TEDZ-P7 and TEDZ-P8; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide; and 4. The extent to which any service elements (e.g. roof plant, exhaust and intake units, and roof equipment) that could be viewed from the <u>directly adjoining</u> road or open space zone can be screened or integrated as part of the façade or roof of the building.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.22	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R8	Support in part	The term 'cannot be achieved' implies the standard must be complied with unless it is impossible to do so. Instead, the wording should reflect the intent of the provision, which is to introduce a more onerous activity status when permitted activity standards are not met. Amending the language to 'is not achieved' reflects language used in district plans elsewhere in the country and provides greater consenting flexibility for when permitted activity standards are not met.	Amend TEDZ-R8 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: [...] Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of the requirements of [...] cannot be is not achieved.
Massey University	253.55	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R8.1 (Outdoor storage areas) as notified.

Special Purpose Zone - Waterfront Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Massey University	253.56	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-R8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-R8.2 (Outdoor storage areas) as notified.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.23	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-S1	Support in part	Considers that Height Control Area 4 (area shaded blue on PDP figure on original submission) should be extended to include the McLean Flats site at 320A The Terrace. The site is now owned by the University and will be utilised for university purposes.	Seeks extend Height Control Area 4 to include the McLean Flats site. [Refer to original submission for map]
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.24	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-S1	Support in part	Considers that Height Control Area 4 should be amended to accommodate the proposed Te Huanui building which is anticipated to be between 8 to 12 metres above the maximum in Height Control Area 4. The Te Huanui project is expected to increase the level of amenity to the southern end of The Terrace and should be accommodated within the Height Control Areas of the Tertiary Education zone to reduce future consenting complexity.	Seeks amendment to apply TEDZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) Height Control Area 2 to those parts of the site that are 20 metres or more away from a residential zone.
Massey University	253.57	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-S1.2 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) as notified.
Massey University	253.58	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-S1.3 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) as notified.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.25	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-S2	Support in part	The University supports the changes made to the PDP where the Council has identified zone boundaries around the Tertiary Education zone and the corresponding recession planes. However, the University seeks to remove '320 The Terrace' as a specific location from the height standards. The site at 320 The Terrace is included within the Tertiary Education zone not the High Density Residential zone and therefore no specific boundary control should apply.	Amend TEDZ-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: Location [...] Boundary adjoining any site within the HRZ, including 320 The Terrace
Massey University	253.59	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-S2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-S2.1 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Massey University	253.60	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-S2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-S2.2 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.26	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-S3	Oppose in part	The University opposes the proposed building setbacks because it seeks that 320 The Terrace is included in the Tertiary Education zone and considers that a 5 metre setback distance is appropriate for any boundary with any residential zone	Amend TEDZ-S3 (Building setbacks) as follows: 1. [...] 2. in relation to 320 The Terrace a 5m setback shall apply to the boundaries with the High Density Residentially zoned areas, except for:- 3. the boundary adjoining 302 The Terrace where a 1m setback shall apply; and- 4. the boundary of 224 The Terrace where a 10m yard shall apply.
Massey University	253.61	Special Purpose Zones / Tertiary Education Zone / TEDZ-S3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain TEDZ-S3.1 (Building setbacks) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.74	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	Considers that that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain the provisions applicable to "residential activities" in the Waterfront Zone as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.53	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support in part	The Waterfront Zone at the former Lambton Harbour Area is supported in concept, but some specific issues temper support.	Retain the Waterfront Zone chapter, with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.54	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Amend	Considers that the introduction of the Waterfront Area chapter should be amended to clearly state the principles of collective ownership and engagement from the Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001. The Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 was intended to be Stage One of a three-stage process. Stage two was to prepare detailed plans for each of the sub-areas, and Stage three was an implementation and monitoring stage. The current Framework is thus no more than a framework, as has been pointed out by the Environment Court. While it is important, it lacks clarity and detail. In the absence of Stages two and three, the principles of collective ownership and engagement from the Framework need to be incorporated more clearly in the Zone introduction.	Amend the Introduction of the Waterfront Zone chapter to state the following principles from the Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 after paragraph #4: ... - <u>The waterfront is predominantly a public area.</u> - <u>The public should be consulted – either through the stage two process or through a statutory planning process – about any proposed new buildings and any significant changes to existing buildings.</u> - <u>Ground floors of buildings will be predominantly accessible to the public.</u>
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.1	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	The Fale Malae Trust strongly supports specific recognition in the Introduction to the WFZ of the waterfront being predominantly a public area, and inclusion of a strong direction that public consultation is expected for significant developments. The Trust notes that paragraph seven of the Introduction already supports these matters, but is open to alternative wording or the direct incorporation of principles from the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust also strongly supports the recognition of mana whenua connections to the waterfront area in the Introduction.	Amend / Allow submission point 388.54 with alternative wording if this is considered necessary.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.55	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Amend	Considers that the introduction of the Waterfront Area chapter should be amended to clarify the circumstances in which public notification will occur. Paragraph 7 of the Introduction says that all “significant” new development are publicly notified, but it is noted that there is no indication of what might be considered “significant”. There is concern over the cumulative effects of numerous small building additions with permitted activity status in the current plan provisions, which could significantly change the nature of this important public area. Clarification should state whether public notification is intended for any new building, structure or activity which requires a resource consent in or outside the Waterfront Public Open Space.	Amend the Introduction of the Waterfront Zone chapter to clarify the circumstances in which public notification will occur.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.56	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Oppose in part	Considers that provisional zoning in the Waterfront Zone chapter is not adequate. Some areas in the Waterfront Zone do not appear to be specifically excluded from further encroachment by buildings and private residential use and could lose their connectivity function.	The Waterfront Zone chapter is partially opposed and an amendment is sought.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.57	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Amend	Considers that some areas in the Waterfront Zone do not appear to be specifically excluded from further encroachment by buildings and private residential use and could lose their connectivity function. The mapping of the Waterfront Zone shows three types of areas – Public open spaces, Queens Wharf buildings and Areas of change. A large part of the Zone area is outside all of these three. Such areas are either the footprints of existing buildings, or are often multi-purpose access and connection areas, public “shared areas” where slow-moving vehicles, pedestrians and those using micro-mobility devices (including bikes) co-exist. These are also part of the public open space network. The purpose of these areas should be made very clear in the description of the Zone.	Amend the Introduction of the Waterfront Zone chapter to clarify the purpose of the areas which are not within the three identified areas, including where areas are not building footprints or open space access and connection areas.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.58	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Amend	Considers that some areas in the Waterfront Zone do not appear to be specifically excluded from further encroachment by buildings and private residential use and could lose their connectivity function. The mapping of the Waterfront Zone shows three types of areas – Public open spaces, Queens Wharf buildings and Areas of change. A large part of the Zone area is outside all of these three. Such areas are either the footprints of existing buildings, or are often multi-purpose access and connection areas, public “shared areas” where slow-moving vehicles, pedestrians and those using micro-mobility devices (including bikes) co-exist. These are also part of the public open space network. The purpose of these areas should be made very clear in the description of the Zone.	Seeks to ensure that the rules do not allow for cumulative effects by filling up these publicly-accessible spaces.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.210	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	Supports Waterfront zoning. CentrePort owns the triangle of land between Lady Elizabeth Lane and Waterloo and Interislander wharves. Previously this land was included as being part of the Coastal Marine Area. It is an integral part of the future development of both of these wharves which are specifically recognised through Policy 51 (Heritage demolition) and Policy 149 (Lambton Harbour Area) of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. While CentrePort supports this Zoning, this is on the basis that any redevelopment proposal for this area will be assessed for its compatibility with urban form and other matters, rather than an acceptance that the zero height limit indicates that no built structures can or should occur. [Refer to original submission for map extent]	Retain Waterfront zoning at the triangle of land between Lady Elizabeth Lane and Waterloo and Interislander wharves [Refer to original submission for map extent].
Fabric Property Limited	425.86	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support in part	Supports the objectives and policies for the Waterfront Zone generally, and specifically supports the development of buildings to maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone (WFZ-P5).	Retain objectives in Special Purpose Waterfront Zone as notified.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.2	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	The Fale Malae Trust generally supports the proposed objectives and policies for the WFZ (subject to the further submission points below), including the specific recognition of buildings that maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, are appropriate. (In particular WFZ-P5).	Allow / Allow submission points 425.86.
Fabric Property Limited	425.87	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support in part	Supports the objectives and policies for the Waterfront Zone generally, and specifically supports the development of buildings to maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone (WFZ-P5).	Retain policies in Special Purpose Waterfront Zone as notified.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.3	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	The Fale Malae Trust generally supports the proposed objectives and policies for the WFZ (subject to the further submission points below), including the specific recognition of buildings that maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, are appropriate. (In particular WFZ-P5).	Allow / Allow submission point 425.87
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.75	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / New WFZ	Amend	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and land use activity rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones are amended. The zone frameworks would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (MUZ-R13, CCZ-R16 and WFZ-R11). Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural	Amend the land use activity rule framework for the Waterfront Zone to include a new permitted activity rule applying to "supported residential care activities" as follows, if the definition of "supported residential care activity" is retained: <u>WFZ-RX Supported residential care activities</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 residents; and</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
				well-being and for their health and safety. The subject zones include suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the residential zones.	<p><u>1. The activity is located above ground floor level.</u></p> <p><u>Cross-reference – also refer to NOISE-R5 and NOISE-S4 for noise-sensitive controls near the Port Zone.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with the requirements of WFZ-RX.1.a cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity may adversely impact on the amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule WFZ-RX.2.a is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>3. Activity status: Non-complying</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with the requirements of WFZ-RX.1.b cannot be achieved.</u></p>
Wellington Civic Trust	388.59	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O1	Support in part	WFZ-O1 is partially supported and clarification is sought.	Retain Objective WFZ-O1 (Purpose) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.60	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O1	Amend	Considers that WFZ-O1 should be amended to clarify part of this objective. It is considered that part of the objective is vague and does not help provide a vision for the zone, particularly the part that states "the unique and special components and elements".	<p>Amend Objective WFZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows:</p> <p>Activities and development in the Waterfront Zone contribute to Wellington's identity and sense of place, with public spaces, buildings and other structures that reflect the unique <u>location and existing character of</u> and special components and elements that make up the waterfront.</p>
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.127	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O2	Amend	Considers that only Taranaki Whānui can be referred in relation to Ahi Kā.	Seeks that WFZ-O2 (Ahi Kā) is amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City."
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.66	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O2	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.128	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O2	Amend	Considers that only Taranaki Whānui can be referred in relation to Ahi Kā.	Seeks that WFZ-O2 (Ahi Kā) is amended to remove any other references to iwi. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.67	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O2	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
VicLabour	414.47	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O2	Support	Supportive of ahi ka provisions	Retain WFZ-O2 (Ahi kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.4	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O2	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-O2 in acknowledging the cultural associations and development interests of mana whenua in the Waterfront Zone.	Allow / Allow submission point 414.47
Wellington Civic Trust	388.61	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O3	Support in part	WFZ-O3 is partially supported and clarification is sought.	Retain Objective WFZ-O3 (Protection of public open spaces) with amendment.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.5	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O3	Support	<p>The need for a clarifying amendment to WFZ-O3 is supported. The current direction to protect and maintain the mapped public open space for temporary and recreation activities could be interpreted to not support new buildings or structures that would enhance and benefit the waterfront. New high-quality buildings may be appropriate in the waterfront's public open spaces, particularly when replacing existing buildings of lesser quality. WFZ-O3 should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The proposed strong direction in WFZ-O3 would restrict appropriate development and does not align with other Waterfront Zone provisions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFZ-O1 which recognises the waterfront is made up of a combination of elements. - WFZ-P7 which recognises that some types of new buildings are appropriate in public open space and can improve public use and enjoyment. - WFZ-R15 which recognises that different types of new buildings in public open space can be assessed as different activity statuses. <p>The submission that WFZ-O3 should allow temporary and recreation activities 'only' is not supported as this may discourage or prevent types of beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for consideration and public consultation.</p>	Amend / Seeks that WFZ-O3 is amended to ensure scope is provided for new or replacement buildings and structures that may be appropriate in the public open spaces of the waterfront.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.62	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-O3	Amend	Considers that WFZ-O3 should be amended as it is poorly worded and hard to understand.	Amend Objective WFZ-O3 (Protection of public open spaces) as follows: The Waterfront's public open spaces <u>identified on the planning maps</u> mapped as specific controls are protected and maintained for temporary activities and recreational activity only.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.6	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-03	Support	<p>The need for a clarifying amendment to WFZ-03 is supported. The current direction to protect and maintain the mapped public open space for temporary and recreation activities could be interpreted to not support new buildings or structures that would enhance and benefit the waterfront. New high-quality buildings may be appropriate in the waterfront's public open spaces, particularly when replacing existing buildings of lesser quality. WFZ-03 should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The proposed strong direction in WFZ-03 would restrict appropriate development and does not align with other Waterfront Zone provisions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFZ-O1 which recognises the waterfront is made up of a combination of elements. - WFZ-P7 which recognises that some types of new buildings are appropriate in public open space and can improve public use and enjoyment. - WFZ-R15 which recognises that different types of new buildings in public open space can be assessed as different activity statuses. <p>The submission that WFZ-03 should allow temporary and recreation activities 'only' is not supported as this may discourage or prevent types of beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for consideration and public consultation.</p>	Amend / Seeks that WFZ-03 is amended to ensure scope is provided for new or replacement buildings and structures that may be appropriate in the public open spaces of the waterfront.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.63	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-05	Support in part	WFZ-05 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective WFZ-05 (Connections to Te Whanganui a Tara, public transport and the City Centre) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.64	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-05	Amend	Considers that WFZ-05 should be amended to emphasise connectivity throughout the Waterfront Zone. There is concern that connectivity is not provided for or protected by a description or policy provision and yet it is vital to the future of the waterfront. It is sought that that the heading and text of this Objective includes this connectivity throughout the zone and not just from the harbour, to the City Centre and to public transport.	<p>Amend Objective WFZ-05 (Connections to Te Whanganui a Tara, public transport and the City Centre) as follows:</p> <p>Connections to Te Whanganui a Tara, public transport and the City Centre <u>and throughout the Zone.</u></p> <p>Active transport and micro-mobility connections between the edge of Te Whanganui a Tara, public transport and the City Centre are maintained or enhanced <u>and connectivity is provided throughout the Zone.</u></p>
Wellington Civic Trust	388.65	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-07	Support in part	WFZ-07 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective WFZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.66	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-07	Amend	Considers that connectivity within the Zone's open spaces (whether labelled as public open space or not) should be considered when assessing any developments or activities. Connectivity has been a fundamental part of the development of the waterfront area. It is also noted that some of the items listed in 2. do not seem to interface with the Waterfront Zone.	<p>Amend Objective WFZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as follows:</p> <p>Adverse effects of activities and development in the Waterfront Zone are managed effectively both:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Within the zone, including on its role, and function <u>and connectivity</u>; and <p>...</p>
Wellington Civic Trust	388.67	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-07	Amend	<p>Considers that WFZ-02 may mention interfaces that do not exist, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Mapped public open spaces; d. Identified pedestrian streets; e. Residential zoned areas; f. Open space zoned areas; <p>Correction as appropriate is sought.</p>	Amend Objective WFZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) to ensure the validity of items c, d, e and f in WFZ-07.2.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.76	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P1	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain WFZ-P1.8 (Enabled activities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.77	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P1	Amend	<p>Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and land use activity rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones are amended. The zone frameworks would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (MUZ-R13, CCZ-R16 and WFZ-R11).</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. The subject zones include suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the residential zones.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows, if the definition of "supported residential care activity" is retained:</p> <p>WFZ-P1 Enabled activities</p> <p>Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the role and function of the Waterfront Zone and enhance the Zone's vitality, vibrancy and amenity during the day and night, including:</p> <p>8. Residential activities <u>and supported residential care activities</u> above ground floor.</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.337	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P1	Support	Supports the policy as it permits the delivery of new emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate new stations in the WFZ.	Retain WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.68	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P1	Support in part	WFZ-P1 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.7	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P1	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZ-P2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Seeks that WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) is amended as follow:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Enable a range... including:</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. Visitor accommodation; and</p> <p>8. Residential activities above ground floor; <u>and</u></p> <p>9. <u>demolition of buildings as part of the development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront.</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.69	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P1	Amend	<p>Considers that WFZ-P1 should be amended to remove public transport activities and to enable visitor accommodation only above ground floor. Connections to public transport, including ticketing facilities and stops adjacent to on-street public transport are supported. In the past, this area has been proposed to have a connected light rail or similar system passing through it. That remains a future possibility, but it is not one that should be a permitted activity, as included under this policy.</p> <p>Most activities listed in the definition of "Public Transport Activities" are unsuited for the location of Wellington's waterfront, due to its scarce resources. These activities should be listed under WFZ-P2.</p> <p>Ground floor use of the Waterfront Zoned area for visitor accommodation is opposed. This activity should be treated on the same basis as residential, and permitted at above ground floor only.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the role and function of the Waterfront Zone and enhance the Zone's vitality, vibrancy and amenity during the day and night, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commercial activities; 2. Community facilities; 3. Recreation activities; 4. Emergency service facilities; 5. Marae activities; 6. Public transport activities; 7. Visitor accommodation above ground floor; and 8. Residential activities above ground floor.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.8	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P1	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZ-P2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Seeks that WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) is amended as follow:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Enable a range... including:</p> <p>...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Visitor accommodation; 8. Residential activities above ground floor; and <u>9. demolition of buildings as part of the development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront.</u>
Wellington Civic Trust	388.70	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P2	Support in part	WFZ-P2 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-P2 (Managed activities) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.9	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P2	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZ-P2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Seeks that WFZ-P2 (Managed Activities) is amended as follows:</p> <p>☒</p> <p>Managed activities</p> <p>Manage the location and scale of activities which could result in cumulative adverse effects on the vitality, vibrancy and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Industrial activities; 2. Construction of apartments and visitor accommodation; 3. New and expanded buildings; 4. New and modified public space; and 5. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of unutilised vacant land; <u>6. Significant buildings in mapped public open space; and</u> <u>7. The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures.</u>
Wellington Civic Trust	388.71	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P2	Amend	<p>Considers that WFZ-P2 should be amended to include public transport activities as managed activities in the Waterfront Zone. Most activities listed in the definition of "Public Transport Activities" are unsuited for the location of Wellington's waterfront, due to its scarce resources. These activities include:</p> <p>"a. train stations; b. bus stations/exchanges; c. rapid transit stops; d. ferry terminals; and e. ancillary ticketing and passenger facilities, charging/fuelling stations, storage and maintenance depots, offices and retail."</p> <p>These activities should be listed under managed activities.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-P2 (Managed activities) as follows:</p> <p>Manage the location and scale of activities which could result in cumulative adverse effects on the vitality, vibrancy and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Industrial activities; 2. Construction of apartments and visitor accommodation; 3. New and expanded buildings; 4. New and modified public space; and 5. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of unutilised vacant land; <u>and</u> <u>6. Public transport activities.</u>
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.10	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P2	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZ-P2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Seeks that WFZ-P2 (Managed Activities) is amended as follows:</p> <p>☒</p> <p>Managed activities</p> <p>Manage the location and scale of activities which could result in cumulative adverse effects on the vitality, vibrancy and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Industrial activities; 2. Construction of apartments and visitor accommodation; 3. New and expanded buildings; 4. New and modified public space; and 5. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of unutilised vacant land; <u>6. Significant buildings in mapped public open space; and</u> <u>7. The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures.</u>

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

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.14	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P5	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-P5 and the direction to provide a balance of buildings and open space.</p> <p>The Trust also supports the clarifying amendment sought by the Wellington Civic Trust. The wording proposed in the PDP of 'building site coverage' doesn't make it clear that 35% coverage is intended to apply across the Waterfront Zone as a whole, not to individual building 'sites'. This intention is more clearly expressed in WFZ-S6. The Trust suggests a reference to 'building footprint' would be an alternative way of providing clarity.</p>	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed, with minor amendment, or wording to similar effect sought by 388.77.
Fabric Property Limited	425.88	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P5	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Waterfront Zone generally, and specifically supports the development of buildings to maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone (WFZ-P5).	Retain WFZ-P5 (Sense of place) as notified.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.15	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P5	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-P5 and the direction to provide a balance of buildings and open space.</p> <p>The Trust also supports the clarifying amendment sought by the Wellington Civic Trust. The wording proposed in the PDP of 'building site coverage' doesn't make it clear that 35% coverage is intended to apply across the Waterfront Zone as a whole, not to individual building 'sites'. This intention is more clearly expressed in WFZ-S6. The Trust suggests a reference to 'building footprint' would be an alternative way of providing clarity.</p> <p>Allow submission 425.88, with the minor amendment, or wording to similar effect, sought by 388.77.</p>	<p>Amend / Seeks that WFZ-P5 (Sense of place) is amended as follows:</p> <p>1. A balance of buildings and open space with no more than 35% building site coverage over the whole Waterfront Zone to form a sense of openness and transition between the dense city centre environment and the expansiveness of Te Whanganui a Tara;</p> <p>...</p>
Wellington Civic Trust	388.78	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason provided other than decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain WFZ-P7 (Protection of public open space) as notified.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.16	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P7	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-P7 and the recognition that buildings in public open space can improve the space for public use and enjoyment.</p> <p>The Trust is concerned that the requirement that buildings do not 'dominate or cumulatively diminish' the public open space is a highly subjective criteria. The quality requirements applying to buildings in WFZ-P6 are more objective, including references to buildings being 'complementary and of an appropriate scale'. These or similar requirements would be more appropriate in WFZ-P7. The Wellington Waterfront Framework also makes reference to new buildings being 'in scale'</p> <p>A further appropriate change would be for WFZ-P7 to support buildings that replace existing buildings and improve public open space areas.</p>	Allow / Allow the submission point with the amendment sought.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.79	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P9	Support	[No specific reason provided other than decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain WFZ-P9 (Sustainable long term use) as notified.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.17	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P9	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports the direction in WFZ-P9 for long term sustainable use and redevelopment, and for providing for flexible ground floor use.	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.80	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P10	Support	[No specific reason provided other than decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain WFZ-P10 (Ahi kā) as notified.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.18	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P10	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-P10 and recognising and providing for cultural associations and development interests of mana whenua in the Waterfront Zone.	Allow
VicLabour	414.48	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-P10	Support	Supportive of ahi ka provisions	<p>Retain WFZ-P10 (Ahi kā) as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.89	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R1	Support	Supports commercial activities being permitted as part of the range of activities anticipated in the Waterfront Zone.	Retain WFZ-R1 (Commercial Activities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.338	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R4	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the establishment of emergency service facilities within the WFZ	Retain WFZ-R4 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.81	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R6	Oppose	WFZ-R6 is opposed. Public transport activities should be removed from permitted activities so that they default to Discretionary status.	Delete WFZ-R6 (Public transport activities) in its entirety.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.82	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R7	Oppose in part	WFZ-R7 is partially opposed and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R7 (Visitor accommodation) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.83	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R7	Amend	Considers that WFZ-R7 should be amended so that it applies to Visitor accommodation on the same basis as residential activities throughout the zone.	Amend WFZ-R7 (Visitor accommodation) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The activity is located above ground floor level. Cross-reference – also refer to NOISE-R5 and NOISE-S4 for noise-sensitive controls near the Port Zone.</u>
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.78	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R8	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain WFZ-R8 (Residential activities) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.84	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R10	Support	WFZ-R10 is supported as it provides limited permitted car parking activity status, and the default to non-complying in this area. The car parking for people with mobility issues is particularly supported.	Retain WFZ-R10 (Car parking activities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.339	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R12	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the WFZ is a permitted activity.	Retain WFZ-R12 (Maintenance and repair of buildings, structures, and public open space) as notified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.90	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R12	Support	Considers that it is appropriate for the maintenance and repair of buildings to be permitted in the Waterfront Zone.	Retain WFZ-R12 (Maintenance and repair of buildings) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.340	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the WFZ is a permitted activity.	Retain WFZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.311	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain WFZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.312	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend WFZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.85	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Support in part	WFZ-R13 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.86	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Amend	Oppose the provision that buildings in the Waterfront Zone may be demolished to provide private outdoor living space. That is inconsistent with the rules applying to residential activities and contrary to the description of the purpose of the area as for public use and future generations.	Modify WFZ-R13 1.a.ii (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows": "ii. Enables the creation of public space or for private outdoor living space ; or
Fabric Property Limited	425.91	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Support	Supports the permitted activity status for demolition of a building for the purposes of avoiding threats to life and property, and for the purposes of constructing a new building.	Retain WFZ-R13.1 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.19	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports proposed rule WFZ-R13.1 which provides for demolition of buildings as a permitted activity where the demolition is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building that has an approved resource consent or resource consent is being sought concurrently under WFZ-R14 or WFZ-R15.</p> <p>The flexibility sought by Fabric Property Limited for demolition under WFZ-R13.2, that does not meet the permitted activity requirements, is also supported. The permitted activity requirement for resource consents for new buildings to already be in existence, or applications to be 'concurrent', is stringent and does not recognise the staged nature of many developments. Restricted discretionary status, with regard being had to the status of redevelopment plans for the demolition site, strikes the appropriate balance.</p> <p>The non-notification direction is supported.</p> <p>If restricted-discretionary status for demolition that does not comply with permitted activity requirements is not supported, discretionary activity status is sought.</p>	Allow
Fabric Property Limited	425.92	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that there is a risk that the non-complying activity status for activities that do not comply with WFZ-R13 may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a site to enable well-planned development.</p> <p>A restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-R13.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Activity Status: Non-complying <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p>...</p>
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.20	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports proposed rule WFZ-R13.1 which provides for demolition of buildings as a permitted activity where the demolition is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building that has an approved resource consent or resource consent is being sought concurrently under WFZ-R14 or WFZ-R15.</p> <p>The flexibility sought by Fabric Property Limited for demolition under WFZ-R13.2, that does not meet the permitted activity requirements, is also supported. The permitted activity requirement for resource consents for new buildings to already be in existence, or applications to be 'concurrent', is stringent and does not recognise the staged nature of many developments. Restricted discretionary status, with regard being had to the status of redevelopment plans for the demolition site, strikes the appropriate balance.</p> <p>The non-notification direction is supported.</p> <p>If restricted-discretionary status for demolition that does not comply with permitted activity requirements is not supported, discretionary activity status is sought.</p>	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.3	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks that demolition of buildings in the Waterfront Zone that is not permitted should be restricted discretionary. This is unreasonable, given the expectation of permitted activities (which includes concurrent resource consent application being made for a replacement building. The idea that this would constrain staged developments is highly unlikely. No list of matters for restricted discretion is given, so the submission is incomplete.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.93	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Support	<p>Considers that there is a risk that the non-complying activity status for activities that do not comply with WFZ-R13 may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a site to enable well-planned development.</p> <p>Supports the preclusion of public and limited notification for demolition.</p> <p>A restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.</p>	Retain notification clauses under WFZ-R13.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.21	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports proposed rule WFZ-R13.1 which provides for demolition of buildings as a permitted activity where the demolition is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building that has an approved resource consent or resource consent is being sought concurrently under WFZ-R14 or WFZ-R15.</p> <p>The flexibility sought by Fabric Property Limited for demolition under WFZ-R13.2, that does not meet the permitted activity requirements, is also supported. The permitted activity requirement for resource consents for new buildings to already be in existence, or applications to be 'concurrent', is stringent and does not recognise the staged nature of many developments. Restricted discretionary status, with regard being had to the status of redevelopment plans for the demolition site, strikes the appropriate balance.</p> <p>The non-notification direction is supported.</p> <p>If restricted-discretionary status for demolition that does not comply with permitted activity requirements is not supported, discretionary activity status is sought.</p>	Allow
Fabric Property Limited	425.94	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Amend	Seeks for a discretionary activity status, which would be consistent with MCZ-R19 in the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Seeks that if WFZ-R13.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) is not amended to be a Restricted Discretionary activity, the activity status is changed to Restricted Discretionary.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.22	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports proposed rule WFZ-R13.1 which provides for demolition of buildings as a permitted activity where the demolition is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building that has an approved resource consent or resource consent is being sought concurrently under WFZ-R14 or WFZ-R15.</p> <p>The flexibility sought by Fabric Property Limited for demolition under WFZ-R13.2, that does not meet the permitted activity requirements, is also supported. The permitted activity requirement for resource consents for new buildings to already be in existence, or applications to be 'concurrent', is stringent and does not recognise the staged nature of many developments. Restricted discretionary status, with regard being had to the status of redevelopment plans for the demolition site, strikes the appropriate balance.</p> <p>The non-notification direction is supported.</p> <p>If restricted-discretionary status for demolition that does not comply with permitted activity requirements is not supported, discretionary activity status is sought.</p>	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.4	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Oppose	The Waterfront Zone has no comparison with the MCZ in terms of activity status, being public realm for the people of Wellington.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.341	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Support	Supports the rule as additions and alterations to buildings and structures within the WFZ is a permitted activity.	Retain WFZ-R14 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.87	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Support in part	WFZ-R14 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R14 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) with amendment.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.23	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.</p>	Allow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.88	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Amend	<p>Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m² per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-R14.1 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>....</p> <p>b. The alterations or additions result in the building or structure being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Less than 30 m² in site coverage; and ii. Less than 4 metres high; and c. The aggregate area of all buildings <u>and structures</u> in the contiguous public open space does not exceed <u>50</u> 200 m² per hectare.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.25	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.</p>	Allow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.90	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Amend	<p>Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m² per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-R14.4 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] and the Wellington Waterfront Framework".</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.26	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.</p>	Allow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.91	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Amend	<p>Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m² per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-R14.5 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] and the Wellington Waterfront Framework".</p>

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.28	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.</p>	Allow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.93	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Amend	<p>Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m² per hectare in 1. of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-R14.5 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The alterations or additions do not extend the footprint of the existing building by more than <u>2.5%</u> of the footprint at 18 July 2022; and</p>
Fabric Property Limited	425.95	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Support in part	Supports WFZ-R14 in part and in particular supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided for additions and alterations that do not exceed a building footprint by more than 5% under WFZ-R14.5.	Retain WFZ-R14.5 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) with respect to the Restricted Discretionary activity status where a building footprint is not extended by more than 5%.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.5	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Oppose	The submission is contrary to a Civic Trust Submission, which seeks a reduction in area under this rule.	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.96	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to WFZ-R14.6 to remove the mandatory public notification clause.</p> <p>It is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis, and in some cases non-notification may be appropriate. While Fabric recognises the high degree of public interest in the Waterfront area, public notification and the associated risk of litigation impose a high potential cost on development. There are means to ensure the effects of an alteration on the public realm are appropriately taken into account without the need for public notification, and retain the Council's discretion to publicly notify applications that are appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-R14.6 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of Rule WFZ-R14.6 must be publicly notified.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.6	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Oppose	The type of development which fits into this category will be encroaching into public space, so must be publicly notified.	Disallow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.342	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support	Supports the rule as the construction of buildings and structures within the WFZ is a permitted activity	Retain WFZ-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.15	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	The submission is contrary to a Civic Trust Submission, which seeks a reduction in permitted size under this rule	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.94	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support in part	WFZ-R15 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures) with amendment.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.29	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p>	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.95	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support in part	Oppose the permitted aggregate area of new buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m ² per hectare in 1. This is too high given the dispersed and noncontinuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.	Retain WFZ-R15.1 (Construction of new buildings and structures)as follows: ... c. The aggregate area of all buildings <u>and structures</u> in the contiguous public open space does not exceed <u>50200</u> m ² per hectare."
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.30	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p>	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.96	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support in part	Oppose the permitted aggregate area of new buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m ² per hectare in 1. This is too high given the dispersed and noncontinuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.	Retain WFZ-R15.2 (Construction of new buildings and structures)as follows: ... "The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] <u>and the Wellington Waterfront Framework</u> "

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.31	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p>	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.97	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support in part	Oppose the permitted aggregate area of new buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m2 per hectare in 1. This is too high given the dispersed and noncontinuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.	Retain WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures)as follows: ... "The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] <u>and the Wellington Waterfront Framework</u> "
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.32	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p>	Allow
Fabric Property Limited	425.97	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	Considers Restricted Discretionary activity status for WFZ-R15.6 would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality outcomes for the public realm.	Opposes the Discretionary activity status for WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures).
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.33	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports activity status changes in WFZ-R15. In particular, non-complying status is not an appropriate status for new buildings and structures in public open space areas that are replacing existing structures.</p> <p>Where a new building replaces, or is smaller than, an existing building that is removed from the public open space area, this should be assessed as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity.</p> <p>Alternatively, the 'Entire Zone' provisions should be amended to also apply to public open space areas. The proposed assessment matters are appropriate and are sufficient to prevent inappropriate development in public open spaces.</p>	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed to change the activity status under the rule so that buildings replacing existing buildings are assessed as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activities.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.7	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	The submission seeks a more relaxed activity status for buildings, which they acknowledge are in the public realm. This is unreasonable and is opposed.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.98	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Amend	Considers Restricted Discretionary activity status for WFZ-R15.6 would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality outcomes for the public realm.	Amend WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: ... Activity Status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary ...
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.34	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports activity status changes in WFZ-R15. In particular, non-complying status is not an appropriate status for new buildings and structures in public open space areas that are replacing existing structures. Where a new building replaces, or is smaller than, an existing building that is removed from the public open space area, this should be assessed as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity. Alternatively, the 'Entire Zone' provisions should be amended to also apply to public open space areas. The proposed assessment matters are appropriate and are sufficient to prevent inappropriate development in public open spaces.	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed to change the activity status under the rule so that buildings replacing existing buildings are assessed as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activities.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.8	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	The submission seeks a more relaxed activity status for buildings, which they acknowledge are in the public realm. This is unreasonable and is opposed.	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.99	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	Considers it is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis, and in some cases non-notification may be appropriate. While Fabric recognises the high degree of public interest in the Waterfront area, public notification and the associated risk of litigation impose a high potential cost on development. There are means to ensure the effects of a development on the public realm are appropriately taken into account without the need for public notification.	Opposes the notification clause under WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures), which requires public notification.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.35	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports activity status changes in WFZ-R15. In particular, non-complying status is not an appropriate status for new buildings and structures in public open space areas that are replacing existing structures. Where a new building replaces, or is smaller than, an existing building that is removed from the public open space area, this should be assessed as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity. Alternatively, the 'Entire Zone' provisions should be amended to also apply to public open space areas. The proposed assessment matters are appropriate and are sufficient to prevent inappropriate development in public open spaces.	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed to change the activity status under the rule so that buildings replacing existing buildings are assessed as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activities.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.9	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	Public notification is essential for all buildings in this zone because of its importance as public space.	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.100	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	Considers it is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis, and in some cases non-notification may be appropriate. While Fabric recognises the high degree of public interest in the Waterfront area, public notification and the associated risk of litigation impose a high potential cost on development. There are means to ensure the effects of a development on the public realm are appropriately taken into account without the need for public notification.	Amend WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: ... Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of WFZ-R15.6 must be publicly notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.36	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports activity status changes in WFZ-R15. In particular, non-complying status is not an appropriate status for new buildings and structures in public open space areas that are replacing existing structures.</p> <p>Where a new building replaces, or is smaller than, an existing building that is removed from the public open space area, this should be assessed as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity.</p> <p>Alternatively, the 'Entire Zone' provisions should be amended to also apply to public open space areas. The proposed assessment matters are appropriate and are sufficient to prevent inappropriate development in public open spaces.</p>	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed to change the activity status under the rule so that buildings replacing existing buildings are assessed as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activities.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.10	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	Public notification is essential for all buildings in this zone because of its importance as public space.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.98	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R16	Support in part	WFZ-R16 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R16 (Development of new public space, or modification of existing public open space) with amendment.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.37	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R16	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations."</p> <p>Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p>	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.99	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R16	Amend	Considers that WFZ-R16 should be amended to reference the Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.	Amend WFZ-R16 (Development of new public space, or modification of existing public open space) to reference the Wellington Waterfront Framework.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.38	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R16	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations."</p> <p>Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p>	Allow
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.343	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R17	Support in part	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting	Supports WFZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.344	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R17	Amend	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting	<p>Amend WFZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities) as follows:</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. The availability and connection <u>of</u> existing or planned three waters infrastructure, <u>including for firefighting purposes</u>; and</p>
Wellington Civic Trust	388.100	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R17	Support in part	WFZ-R17 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.101	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R17	Amend	Considers that WFZ-R17 should be amended to reference the Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.	Amend WFZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities) to reference the Wellington Waterfront Framework.

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

Special Purpose Zone - Wellington Town Belt Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.102	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-S1	Amend	<p>The Meridian Building at 33 Customhouse Quay is located in the Special Purpose Waterfront zone.</p> <p>Supports the building height standard as set out in WFZ-S1 in as far as it enables building heights at least equivalent to the height of the existing building at 55 Lady Elizabeth Lane. The Proposed Plan maps show that the maximum height for the Meridian Building site is 17.7m.</p> <p>Seeks a building height of at least 23.1m for the meridian building site to enable an additional floor to be added. This is consistent with the nearby PWC building and would improve the viability of the works required to the building for earthquake strengthening. It is appropriate to enable minor additional height in this location, while recognising and leveraging the existing built form investment.</p>	Amend WFZ-S1 (Maximum building height outside of Public Open Space and Areas of Change) is amended to enable buildin heights of at least 23.1m for 33 Customhouse Quay
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.12	Part 4 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-S1	Oppose	The additional height sought for a specific building is contrary to the schema for building heights in the Waterfront Zone and contrary to the public interest in this area	Disallow
Fabric Property Limited	425.103	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-S2	Oppose	The Meridian Building at 33 Customhouse Quay is located adjacent to a Minimum Sunlight Access Public Space in relation to Kumutoto Park Fabric seeks deletion of WFZ-S2.	Option 1: Delete WFZ-S2 (Minimum Sunlight Access - Public Space) in its entirety.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.14	Part 4 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-S2	Oppose	Protection of sunlight access is essential for the Waterfront Zone. The request to remove one protected area is unreasonable and contrary to the interest of users and the wider public.	Disallow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.104	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-S6	Support in part	WFZ-S6 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-S6 (Waterfront Zone site coverage) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.105	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-S6	Amend	Considers that WFZ-S6 should be amended to not refer to the Waterfront coverage as a "site". The reference to "site" in relation to coverage may result in difficulty in interpreting this rule. The Zone consists of a number of sites (as defined), whereas the rule, in line with the policy, is intended to apply to the Zone as a whole.	<p>Amend the title of WFZ-S6 (Waterfront Zone site coverage) as follows:</p> <p>Waterfront Zone site coverage</p> <p>1. All development must result in the sum of all buildings in the Waterfront Zone having a site coverage of less than 35% of the whole Waterfront Zone.</p> <p>...</p>
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.22	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / General WTBTZ	Amend	Considers that remnants of the town belt should be protected to enhance green space and historic elements in these areas, particularly if intensification is to proceed. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks provisions to ensure that remnants of the town belt are protected, to enhance green space and historic elements in these areas.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.90	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / General WTBTZ	Support	<p>Supports the intent of the zone. Submitter considers that the green belt is a prominent aspect of Wellington city and provides a strong backdrop to the built environment and a health and wellbeing benefit to residents and visitors to the city.</p> <p>Submitter considers that identifying the area as WTBTZ and the provisions for its protection and use promotes the continuation of its value.</p>	Retain the WTBTZ (Wellington Town Belt Zone) as notified, to ensure the identification and recognition of the Wellington Town Belt in a specific zone.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.8	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / General WTBZ	Support	<p>Supports the submission of Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton - 401, the submitter supports Ms Harper and Mr Pemberton's submission, because it emphasises how important the 'green belt' is to our city.</p> <p>The submitter highlights this submission as reflective of the high value that Wellingtonians place on our Town Belt. That underpins the submitter's request that number 22 Alexandra Road retains the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 401.90]</p>	Allow
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.7	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / General WTBZ	Support	<p>Supports the submission of Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton - 401, we support Ms Harper and Mr Pemberton's submission, because it emphasises how important the 'green belt' is to our city.</p> <p>The submitter highlights this submission as reflective of the high value that Wellingtonians place on our Town Belt. That underpins the submitter's request that number 22 Alexandra Road retains the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 401.90]</p>	Allow
Craig Palmer	492.43	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / New WTBZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the District Plan needs to be the ultimate bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.</p>	<p>Add a new provision in the Wellington Town Belt Zone chapter to evaluate proposed commercial activities within the Town Belt.</p> <p>The rules are to be accorded discretionary activity status with mandatory public notification.</p>
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.33	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / New WTBZ	Support	<p>The submission is supported. As the Wellington Civic Trust understands it, all commercial activities would "default" to fully discretionary under rule WTBZ-R8 and we support that. The plan is however silent on public notification, meaning that the need for notification would be assessed directly under the RMA provisions. Because of the importance of the Town Belt to the public and to future generations, we support the submission that all activities requiring consent (activities and buildings) should be subject to public notification.</p>	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.106	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O1	Support in part	<p>WTBZ-O1 is supported for its purpose. However the purpose of the Zone does match with the principles of the Town Belt Act.</p>	Retain Objective WTBZ-O1 (Purpose) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.107	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O1	Amend	<p>Considers that WTBZ-O1 should be amended to match its purpose with the principles of the Town Belt Act. It is clear that there are omissions in the stated purpose relating to its landscape significance, its historic and cultural heritage values, and its significance to the City as place with natural ecosystems which need protection and enhancement (extending beyond the recognition of vegetation, which is already mentioned).</p> <p>Many of these aspects are woven through the Town Belt's area and its development over time. While they may not be individually important enough to justification through scheduling or overlays they nevertheless need to be recognised in the Plan as well as in the legislation covering the Council's responsibility for this very important area. These aspects should be integrated into the Zone's purpose statement.</p>	<p>Amend Objective WTBZ-O1 (Purpose) to have additional items referring to the Town Belt Zone as having:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large areas of landscape value - Areas, places, associations and structures of cultural heritage significance - Existing ecosystem values, which must be sustained and enhanced
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.91	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O1	Support	<p>Supports WTBZ-O1. Submitter considers that the green belt is a prominent aspect of Wellington city and provides a strong backdrop to the built environment and a health and wellbeing benefit to residents and visitors to the city.</p> <p>Submitter considers that identifying the area as WTBZ and the provisions for its protection and use promotes the continuation of its value.</p>	Retain WTBZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.108	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O2	Support in part	WTBZ-O2 is partially supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective WTBZ-O2 (Managing effects) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.109	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O2	Amend	Considers that WTBZ-O2 is inadequate and should be amended, as it only refers to managing effects at the Zone interface and surrounding area. The Town Belt is an area which experiences significant pressure for use by non-recreational activities, for activities such as public parking, additional through-routes and the location of public services and facilities. There are also significant circumstances where the effects of access and recreational use must be managed within the zoned area itself.	Amend Objective WTBZ-O2 (Managing effects) as follows: Adverse effects of activities and development undertaken in the Wellington Town Belt Zone are managed effectively <u>within the zone</u> and at the zone interface and surrounding area.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.92	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O2	Support	Supports WTBZ-O2. Submitter considers that the green belt is a prominent aspect of Wellington city and provides a strong backdrop to the built environment and a health and wellbeing benefit to residents and visitors to the city. Submitter considers that identifying the area as WTBZ and the provisions for its protection and use promotes the continuation of its value.	Retain WTBZ-O2 (Managing effects) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.39	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ02	Support	Wellington Civic Trust has requested a modification to this objective – and we seek alignment with our submission.	Allow
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.93	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O3	Support	Supports WTBZ-O3. Submitter considers that the green belt is a prominent aspect of Wellington city and provides a strong backdrop to the built environment and a health and wellbeing benefit to residents and visitors to the city. Submitter considers that identifying the area as WTBZ and the provisions for its protection and use promotes the continuation of its value.	Retain WTBZ-O3 (Mana whenua) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.110	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-P2	Support in part	WTBZ-P2 is partially supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain WTBZ-P2 (Managed activities) with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.111	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-P2	Amend	Considers that WTBZ-P2 does not recognise the need to consider internal compatibility between activities within the Zone and should be amended.	Amend WTBZ-P2 (Managed activities) as follows: Only allow other activities to establish in the Wellington Town Belt Zone where it can be demonstrated that they are compatible with the purpose and values of the zone, having particular regard to whether: ... 4. Any adverse residential amenity effects will be minimised. 5. <u>Adverse effects between activities are able to be avoided or limited to an appropriate level</u>
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.129	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-P3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Clarify policy WTBZ-P3 (Mana Whenua)'s role to support WTBZ-O3 (Mana Whenua). [Inferred decision requested]
Wellington Civic Trust	388.112	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Oppose in part	Considers that the construction and alteration (including extensions) of new footpaths and tracks should not be permitted activities. WTBZ-R6 should only allow for allow for maintenance of existing such facilities, but require new such facilities to obtain consents through the default rule.	WTBZ-R6 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to footpaths and tracks) is opposed, and an amendment is sought.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.113	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Amend	Considers that the construction and alteration (including extensions) of new footpaths and tracks should not be permitted activities. WTBZ-R6 should only allow for allow for maintenance of existing such facilities, but require new such facilities to obtain consents through the default rule.	Amend WTBZ-R6 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to footpaths and tracks) as follows: WTBZ-R6: <u>Maintenance of Construction of, and alteration and additions to</u> footpaths and tracks 1. Activity status: Permitted

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Craig Palmer	492.44	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes WTBZ-R6 enabling the construction of, and alterations and additions to, carparking areas and vehicle access as a permitted status activity.</p> <p>Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.</p>	Amend WTBZ-R6 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to footpaths and tracks) to be accorded discretionary activity status and for new footpaths and tracks to require mandatory public notification.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.34	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Support	The submissions are similar to those of the Wellington Civic Trust. We also support mandatory public notification of all consent applications in this zone.	Allow
Craig Palmer	492.45	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Amend	<p>Opposes WTBZ-R6 enabling the construction of, and alterations and additions to, carparking areas and vehicle access as a permitted status activity.</p> <p>Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.</p>	Amend WTBZ-R6 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to footpaths and tracks) to be accorded discretionary activity status and for new footpaths and tracks to require mandatory public notification.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.35	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Support	The submissions are similar to those of the Wellington Civic Trust. We also support mandatory public notification of all consent applications in this zone.	Allow
Wellington Civic Trust	388.114	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Oppose in part	Considers that the construction and alteration (including extensions) of car parking areas and vehicle accesses should not be permitted activities. WTBZ-R7 should only allow for maintenance of existing such facilities, but require new such facilities to obtain consents through the default rule.	WTBZ-R7 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to car parking areas and vehicle access) is opposed, and an amendment is sought.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.115	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Amend	Considers that the construction and alteration (including extensions) of car parking areas and vehicle accesses should not be permitted activities. WTBZ-R7 should only allow for allow for maintenance of existing such facilities, but require new such facilities to obtain consents through the default rule.	<p>Amend WTBZ-R7 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to car parking areas and vehicle access) as follows:</p> <p>WTBZ-R7: Maintenance of Construction of, and alteration and additions to car parking areas and vehicle accesses</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p>
Craig Palmer	492.46	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes WTBZ-R7 enabling the construction of, and alterations and additions to, carparking areas and vehicle access as a permitted status activity.</p> <p>Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.</p>	Amend WTBZ-R7 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to car parking areas and vehicle access) to be accorded discretionary activity status and for new carparking areas and vehicle access points to require mandatory public notification.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.36	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Support	The submissions are similar to those of the Wellington Civic Trust. We also support mandatory public notification of all consent applications in this zone.	Allow

Development Areas - General Points

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Craig Palmer	492.47	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Amend	<p>Opposes WTBZ-R7 enabling the construction of, and alterations and additions to, carparking areas and vehicle access as a permitted status activity.</p> <p>Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.</p>	Amend WTBZ-R7 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to car parking areas and vehicle access) to be accorded discretionary activity status and for new carparking areas and vehicle access points to require mandatory public notification.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.37	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Support	The submissions are similar to those of the Wellington Civic Trust. We also support mandatory public notification of all consent applications in this zone.	Allow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.313	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R9	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain WTBZ-R9 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.314	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R9	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend WTBZ-R9 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Craig Palmer	492.48	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R11	Amend	<p>Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.</p>	Amend WTBZ - R11 (Construction of, and alterations and additions to buildings and structures) to require mandatory public notification.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.116	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-S4	Oppose	WTBZ-S4 is opposed as it sets a permitted 5% building coverage standard. It is unclear how this rule would apply in the Town Belt and deletion is suggested. Most of the "sites" within the zone are very large and the maximum gross floor area standard (30m2) would be the limiting factor. If applied to leased areas, it could result in much larger areas being leased than necessary.	Delete WTBZ-S4 (Maximum building coverage) in its entirety.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.315	Development Area / General point on Development Areas / General point on Development Areas	Support in part	The submitter recognises the efforts to mitigate potential environmental and cultural impacts of greenfield development through development planning, and to provide for SNAs, amenity, open space, bus services and mixed use activities (particularly in Lincolnshire Farms).	Retain Development areas, subject to amendments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.316	Development Area / General point on Development Areas / General point on Development Areas	Amend	<p>The submitter recognises the efforts to mitigate potential environmental and cultural impacts of greenfield development through development planning, and to provide for SNAs, amenity, open space, bus services and mixed use activities (particularly in Lincolnshire Farms).</p> <p>Considers the Development Areas to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1</p>	Seeks to ensure the Development Area provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.317	Development Area / General point on Development Areas / General point on Development Areas	Amend	<p>The submitter recognises the efforts to mitigate potential environmental and cultural impacts of greenfield development through development planning, and to provide for SNAs, amenity, open space, bus services and mixed use activities (particularly in Lincolnshire Farms).</p> <p>Considers the Development Areas to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1</p>	<p>Seeks for WCC to consider whether greenfield development is necessary in the PDP at this stage given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the scale of intensification provided for within the existing urban footprint • whether the proposed greenfield development areas can provide for well-functioning urban environments • the potential environmental and cultural impacts of greenfield development, for example the extensive earthworks required, and whether they can be appropriately mitigated while still providing appropriate amenities and density

Development Areas - Kilbirnie Bus Barns

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.49	Development Area / General point on Development Areas / General point on Development Areas	Support	Supports direction that new greenfield developments be proactively designed to be lower-emissions.	Seeks that greenfield development be undertaken in a truly sustainable manner within carbon budget constraints rather than providing some tick-box environmental measures that may be insufficient.
Waka Kotahi	370.447	Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / General DEV1	Support	The Kilbirnie Bus Barn Development Area is supported. In particular development being consistent with the "Bus Barn - Concept Plan" to achieve the integrated outcomes.	Retain Development Area 1: Kilbirnie Bus Barn Development Area and its provisions as notified.
Bus Barn Ltd	FS95.4	Part 3 /Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / General DEV1	Oppose	The original submission proposed by Waka Kotahi seeks to retain the bus barn provisions as notified. Bus Barn Ltd seeks to modify this provision as outlined in their submission.	Disallow / Retain the Kilbirnie Bus Barn Development, as modified by the Bus Barn Limited submission
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.743	Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / General DEV1	Support in part	Seeks amendments to the rules to make all necessary consequential changes in response to the rezoning of those parcels which are identified for Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone. This rezoning is sought as considers the sites adjoin the metropolitan centres and thereby the adjoining zoning should appropriately be High Density Residential Zone. Considers this zone would also align in the outcomes sought in the overarching submission.	Seeks consequential amendments for all rules to reflect the High Density Residential Development rules.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.744	Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / General DEV1	Amend	Seeks amendments to the rules to make all necessary consequential changes in response to the rezoning of those parcels which are identified for Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone. This rezoning is sought as considers the sites adjoin the metropolitan centres and thereby the adjoining zoning should appropriately be High Density Residential Zone. Considers this zone would also align in the outcomes sought in the overarching submission.	Seeks consequential amendments for all rules to reflect the High Density Residential Development rules.
Bus Barn Limited	320.3	Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / DEV1-R1	Oppose	Considers that the provision within DEV1-R1 that states that alterations or new buildings are required to not be visible from public spaces will mean that any development in this area would fail the permitted activity requirements. The DEV1 site (Kilbirnie Bus Barns site) is bounded by Onepu Road to the west, Ross Street to the east and the sewer reserve to the south that is used as a pedestrian walkway. These public spaces make the whole site visible. As such any development, even one a one storey residential lot would not meet this requirement, and any development of this site will require a consent. This is conflicting with Policy 3 (b) of the NPS-UD.	Opposes DEV-R1 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) in part and seeks amendment.

Development Areas - Lincolnshire Farm

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Bus Barn Limited	320.4	Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / DEV1-R1	Amend	Considers that the provision within DEV1-R1 that states that alterations or new buildings are required to not be visible from public spaces will mean that any development in this area would fail the permitted activity requirements. The DEV1 site (Kilbirnie Bus Barns site) is bounded by Onepu Road to the west, Ross Street to the east and the sewer reserve to the south that is used as a pedestrian walkway. These public spaces make the whole site visible. As such any development, even one a one storey residential lot would not meet this requirement, and any development of this site will require a consent. This is conflicting with Policy 3 (b) of the NPS-UD.	Amend DEV1-R1 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Any alterations or additions to a building or structure that: i. Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; or ii. Relate to a building frontage below verandah level, including entranceways and glazing; or iii. Are not visible from public spaces; and iii iv . Results in the creation of new residential units; and iv v . Comply with standards MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, MCZ-S3, MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5, and MCZ-S6; or b. The construction of any building or structure: i. Is not located on a site with an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; or ii. Is not visible from public space; and ii iii . Will have a gross floor area of less than 100m2; and iii iv . Will result in a total coverage (together with other buildings) of no more than 20 percent of the site; and iv v . Comply with standards MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, MCZ-S3, MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5, and MCZ-S6; and v vi . Does not involve the construction of a new building for residential activities.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.50	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / DEV1-R1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the relief noting that the site is wholly visible from a public place and the proposed rule would consequently limit intensification opportunities for the site which are sought in the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
VicLabour	414.50	Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / DEV1-R1	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]
Fabric Property Limited	425.104	Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / DEV1-R1	Amend	Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide. Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.	Amend DEV1-R1.1.3 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows: ... a. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building. ...
Rod Halliday	25.35	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / General DEV2	Support	Supports the sentence 'location of roads and special features are not intended to be immovable' in DEV2 (Development Area - Lincolnshire Farm).	Retain DEV2 (Lincolnshire Farm) as notified with the wording 'location of roads and special features are not intended to be immovable'.
Rod Halliday	25.36	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / General DEV2	Amend	Considers that the sentence 'location of roads and special features are not intended to be immovable' in DEV2 (Development Area - Lincolnshire Farm) should be highlighted.	Seeks that 'location of roads and special features are not intended to be immovable' in DEV2 (Development Area - Lincolnshire Farm) be highlighted.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Halliday	25.37	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / General DEV2	Support in part	The Lincolnshire Farm Development Plan is generally supported including the introduction of the MDRZ throughout to achieve higher density and increase housing supply.	Not specified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.40	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / General DEV2	Support	Supports the main developments of Upper Stebbings/Glenside West and Lincolnshire Farm and the accompanying zone redesignation for both areas. Considers that provision of housing for a growing population is important, and creating new higher density areas plays a role in this.	Retain DEV2 (Lincolnshire Farm) as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.162	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / General DEV2	Amend	Considers it necessary to add an additional paragraph to the introduction of this chapter to provide for the construction of a new link road between Jamaica Drive and Mark Avenue, as shown in the Development Plan. This is to prevent unnecessary resource consenting impeding the progression of the road once this is ready for construction.	Add the following paragraph to the introduction, between existing paragraphs three and four: <u>The new roading connection between Jamaica Drive and Mark Avenue is essential infrastructure that is required to implement the Development Plan. This connection will ensure that the Lincolnshire Farm neighbourhood centre, school, and community hub will be accessible to the whole community and have a viable catchment; and the residents of Lincolnshire Farm will have public transport, cycling and vehicular access to Takapu Train Station. An alternative transport route to State Highway 1 and Willowbank Road / Middleton Road will add resilience to the road network.</u>
Wellington City Council	266.163	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / General DEV2	Amend	Considers it necessary to add a new objective to support the construction of the link road between Jamaica Drive and Mark Avenue, as shown in the Development Plan, and generally to support access and connection across Lincolnshire and Woodridge areas.	Add a new objective DEV2-05 to the Development Area Lincolnshire Farm chapter as follows: <u>DEV2-05 Access and connection</u> <u>New communities at Lincolnshire Farm are well connected with each other and with the adjoining communities in Grenada North and Woodridge to increase their resilience and accessibility.</u>
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.187	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / General DEV2	Amend	Considers existing transmission lines traverse the northern part of the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area, over areas zoned for Medium Density Residential and Open Space (noting the Development Area layer obscures the transmission lines). On the basis any development within the area complies with the National Grid rules within the Infrastructure Chapter, Transpower has no concerns. Seeks amendment to reference the National Grid transmission lines to highlight their existence to plan users. [see original submission for images supplied]	Amend the introductory text to the Development Area 2 chapter as follows: ... There are limited areas suitable for greenfield development in Wellington City so they must be used efficiently, providing medium density where practical and ensuring that there are a variety of housing types to suit different needs. It is crucial that the area is designed comprehensively so that infrastructure, services and facilities are provided in the most suitable location and are planned to service the entire neighbourhood. <u>Existing transmission lines traverse the site, and any development must be appropriately managed to ensure the National Grid is not compromised.</u> A local centre is intended to act as a focal point and meeting space for the neighbourhood and provide community services including local shops, hospitality venues, and a supermarket. An industrial business area is included to provide local employment opportunities and contribute to the industrial land supply of Wellington City. Bus, cycle, and walking infrastructure should be planned from the outset and integrated into the design of the earthworks and subdivision. Water sensitive design methods will be used which will benefit water quality and reduce impacts from runoff. ...
Waka Kotahi	370.448	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / General DEV2	Support in part	The Lincolnshire Farm Development Area is supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain Development Area 2: Lincolnshire Farm Development Area and seeks amendment

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.449	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / General DEV2	Amend	Considers that the following amendments are required to the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area: a) Access on to the Johnsonville Porirua Motorway (SH1) at the Grenada Drive intersection may require upgrades to ensure no level of service deficiency as identified in the "Lincolnshire Farm Transport Review – June 2021 Tonkin and Taylor Ltd". Further investigation should be made into this. Development should be managed until such time that appropriate mitigation has been determined or funding identified. b) Needs a specific to integrated transport including multi-modal connections needs to be provided for. DEV-O2 and DEV-O3 generally direct development to consider integration but it is not explicit to transportation.	Seeks to amend Development Area 2: Lincolnshire Farm Development Area to include proviso that planned development shall only occur once the infrastructure upgrades, including SH1 and Grenada Drive intersection have been completed. Also seeks to include specific reference to all development within the Lincolnshire Farm area to facilitate multi-modal connections.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.62	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-O1	Support	Supports the Lincolnshire Farm development zone. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.
Wellington City Council	266.164	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-P1	Amend	Considers it necessary to reflect the new objective relating to the link road.	Amend DEV2-P1 (Coordinated Development) as follows: Provide flexibility for development and subdivision in the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area while ensuring that: ... <u>9. A continuous road connection is provided across the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area connecting Jamaica Drive to Mark Avenue and Grenada Drive to Woodridge Drive, in general accordance with the alignment shown on the Development Area Plan;</u> 9-10. The development is supported by sufficient infrastructure that considers the needs across the entire Development Area and land is allocated for installations from network utility operators; 10. <u>11.</u> The development achieves hydraulic neutrality over the entire Development Area; 11. <u>12.</u> Buildings and sensitive activities are not located in overland flow paths, stream corridors or ponding areas; 12. <u>13.</u> Development does not result in the fragmentation of sites in a manner that may compromise the anticipated future urban form of the area; 13. <u>14.</u> Planned minimum areas for industrial, local centre, and community facilities are provided within the overall development area; 14. <u>15.</u> Industrial activities that are adjacent to residential sites, open spaces and other sensitive activities provide for appropriate amenity in those adjacent areas; and 15. <u>16.</u> The natural environment and local biodiversity are protected
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.318	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-P1	Amend	The submitter suggest amendment to align with what is included in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Policies and signal the importance of including public transport and active modes in developments. The Regional Public Transport Plan 2021 states Greater Wellington will work with its regional partners to ensure new developments can accommodate public transport.	Amend DEV2-P1 (Coordinated Development) sub-clause 8 as follows: ... The road and access network provides high connectivity key connections to a well-connected transport network, including roads, public transport links and walking and cycling routes that assist in reducing carbon emissions and traffic congestion and provide a high quality street environment for people
Ministry of Education	400.153	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-P1	Support	Supports DEV2-P1 as is important to recognise and provide for schools which will service the residential catchments and other community/commercial activities.	Retain DEV2-P1 (Coordinated Development) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.154	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-P4	Support	Supports DEV2-P4. The submitter agrees that educational facilities in general are incompatible within the Lincolnshire Farm Industrial Area and therefore supports DEV2-P4 as proposed.	Retain DEV2-P4 (Sensitive activities within the Industrial Area) as notified.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.745	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-P5	Support in part	Seeks amendments to this policy to remove direct reference to the design guide and instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD.	Retain DEV2-P5 (Amenity and Design) and seeks amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.746	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-P5	Amend	Seeks amendments to this policy to remove direct reference to the design guide and instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD.	Amend DEV2-P5 (Amenity and Design) as follows: Amenity and Design Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development in the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area to positively contribute to the creation of a well functioning urban environment by ensuring that it: <u>1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide. Achieves the following urban design outcomes:</u> <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings.</u> <u>d. Responds to the natural environment.</u> 2. Adds visual diversity and interest through the overall street design and the form, landscaping, design, and siting of buildings.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.346	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R3	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the establishment of emergency service facilities within the Lincolnshire Farm area.	Retain DEV2-R3 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.155	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R4	Support	Supports DEV2-R4 as educational facilities are considered a sensitive activity not ancillary to a permitted activity in the Lincolnshire Farm General Industrial Activity Area. The submitter agrees that educational facilities in general are incompatible within the Farm General Industrial Activity Area and as such is generally accepting of the Discretionary activity status for sensitive activities in this zone.	Retain DEV2-R4 (Sensitive activities not ancillary to a permitted activity) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.156	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R21	Support	Supports DEV2-R21 as it provides for educational facilities as a permitted activity.	Retain DEV2-R21 (Educational facilities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.347	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R23	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the establishment of emergency service facilities within the Lincolnshire Farm area.	Retain DEV-R23 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.348	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R26	Support in part	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Supports DEV-R26 (Supported residential care activities), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.349	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R26	Amend	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Amend DEV2-R26 (Supported residential care activities) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site. <u>b. Screening does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities</u>
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.319	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R42	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain DEV2-R42 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures in all activity areas) with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.320	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R42	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend DEV2-R42 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures in all activity areas) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.747	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R44	Support in part	Generally supports this rule although an amendment is sought to the rule title to allow the rule to apply to all buildings not just those associated with no more than three residential units on a site.	Retain DEV2-R44 (Construction, addition or alteration of residential buildings and structures including accessory buildings, but excluding multi-unit housing - Medium Density Residential Activity Area) and seeks amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.748	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R44	Amend	Generally supports this rule although an amendment is sought to the rule title to allow the rule to apply to all buildings not just those associated with no more than three residential units on a site.	Amend DEV2-R44 (Construction, addition or alteration of residential buildings and structures including accessory buildings, but excluding multi-unit housing - Medium Density Residential Activity Area) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of residential buildings and structures including accessory buildings but excluding multi-unit housing – Medium Density Residential Area 1. Activity Status: Permitted where: <u>a. There are no more than three residential unit on a site; and</u> ...
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.749	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R44	Support in part	Amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.	Retain DEV2-R44 (Construction, addition or alteration of residential buildings and structures including accessory buildings, but excluding multi-unit housing - Medium Density Residential Activity Area) and seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.750	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R44	Amend	Amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.	Amend DEV2-R44 (Construction, addition or alteration of residential buildings and structures including accessory buildings, but excluding multi-unit housing - Medium Density Residential Activity Area) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where: Compliance with the requirements of DEV2-R45.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards; and 2. The matters in DEV2-P2 and MRZ-P10
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.751	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R45	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Opposes the inclusion of multi-unit housing as considers this can be managed through DEV2-R44 in accordance with the amendments sought to that rule. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.	Retain DEV2-R45 (Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit development or a retirements village, and additions or alterations to a multi-unit housing or retirement village – Medium Density Residential Activity Area) and seeks amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.752	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R45	Amend	Supports this rule in part, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Opposes the inclusion of multi-unit housing as considers this can be managed through DEV2-R44 in accordance with the amendments sought to that rule. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.	Amend DEV2-R45 (Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit development or a retirements village, and additions or alterations to a multi-unit housing or retirement village – Medium Density Residential Activity Area) as follows: Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit development or a retirements village, and additions or alterations to a multi-unit housing or retirement village – Medium Density Residential Activity Area. 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the follow standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard: i. DEV2-S6; ii. DEV2-S7; iii. DEV2-S8; iv. DEV2-S17; v. DEV2-S18; vi. DEV2-S19; and vii. DEV2-S20; and 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with the requirements in Appendix 12; 3. The matters in DEV2-P1, DEV2-P2, DEV2-P5, MRZ-P6, and MRZ-P10 for multi-unit housing; and 4. The matters in DEV2-P5, and MRZ-P5, and MRZ-P10 for a retirement village. ...
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.753	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R45	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Seeks amendments to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards.	Retain DEV2-R45 (Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit development or a retirements village, and additions or alterations to a multi-unit housing or retirement village – Medium Density Residential Activity Area) and seeks amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.754	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-R45	Amend	Supports this rule in part, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Seeks amendments to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards.	Amend DEV2-R45 (Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit development or a retirements village, and additions or alterations to a multi-unit housing or retirement village – Medium Density Residential Activity Area) as follows: ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule DEV2-R45.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule DEV2-R45.1 that complies with the relevant standards is precluded from public and limited notification.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.350	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S1	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports DEV2-S1 (Maximum height - General Industrial Activity Area), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.351	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S1	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend DEV2-S1 (Maximum height - General Industrial Activity Area) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... <u>x. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.352	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S2	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports DEV2-S2 (Height in relation to boundary - General Industrial Activity Area), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.353	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S2	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend DEV2-S2 (Height in relation to boundary - General Industrial Activity Area) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... <u>x. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.354	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S6	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports DEV2-S6 (Building height - Medium Density Residential Area), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.355	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S6	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend DEV2-S6 (Building height - Medium Density Residential Area) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... 1. Multi-unit housing; and 2. Retirement villages; and <u>3. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.356	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S8	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports DEV2-S8 (Height in relation to boundary - Medium Density Residential Area), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.357	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S8	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend DEV2-S8 (Height in relation to boundary - Medium Density Residential Area) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... i. Multi-unit housing; and ii. Retirement villages; and <u>iii. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Rod Halliday	25.38	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S15	Amend	Considers that 30% permeable surface is too high because the MDRZ allows for 50% site coverage and DEV-S14 (Landscape area – Medium Density Residential Area) requires 20% landscape area of grass or plants.	Seeks that DEV2-S15.1 (Permeable surface area - Medium Density Residential Area) be amended to require a minimum of 20% of net surface area be permeable.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.8	Development Area / Glenside West Development Area / DEV2-S15	Oppose	<p>Oppose submitter seeking to reduce permeable surface from 30% to 20%. This is because residents below the site and downstream will be adversely affected.</p> <p>Housing development on Glenside West slopes should be hydrologically neutral. Because this is almost certainly not achievable, we oppose any high or medium density housing development in this area at all.</p> <p>The Boffa Miskell Upper Stebbings Valley Wellington Landscape and Ecology Analysis report (2018) is very pertinent when considering this development. This report identified Glenside West as having remnant forest of high ecological values, worthy of protection.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 25.38]</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that the submission is disallowed to retain appropriate standard for permeable surfaces that avoids any increase in flooding or risk of slips i.e 30% permeable surface or higher.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full decision requested]</p>
Rod Halliday	25.39	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S16	Amend	Considers that the maximum height of 2m for a standalone fence is too low.	Seeks that DEV2-S16.2.b (Fences and standalone walls - Medium Density Residential Area) be amended to remove reference to walls.
Rod Halliday	25.40	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S16	Amend	Considers that the maximum height for standalone fences and walls needs to specifically exclude retaining walls as they are commonplace and should be part of the measurement.	Seeks that DEV2-S16.2.b (Fences and standalone walls - Medium Density Residential Area) be amended to allow a fence to be 1.5m in height before the 50% visually transparency requirement applies.
Rod Halliday	25.41	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S18	Amend	Considers that communal space minimum area and dimensions would benefit from more clarification, namely a note section or an example. The assumption is that the minimum area is cumulative and that minimum dimensions remain 8m.	Seeks that a clarification note be made to DEV2-S18 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) regarding communal space rules.
Rod Halliday	25.42	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S18	Not specified	Supports minimum areas being cumulative.	Seeks that the minimum area standards in DEV2-S17 (Minimum residential unit size) and DEV2-S18 (Outdoor living space) are cumulative.
Rod Halliday	25.43	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S18	Not specified	Supports minimum dimensions remaining at 8m.	Seeks that the minimum dimension standards in DEV2-S17 (Minimum residential unit size) and DEV2-S18 (Outdoor living space) are retained at 8m.
Rod Halliday	25.44	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S20	Not specified	Considers that DEV2-S20 should be clarified so that it accounts for new roads, reserve areas, right of ways or easement areas (drainage etc). Or hazard area on a site (ponding/flood), SNA's or sites of significance.	Seeks that DEV2-S20 (Minimum density) is amended to specify that roads, reserve areas, right of ways or easement areas (drainage etc), or hazard areas on a site (ponding/flood), SNA's or sites of significance are excluded when calculating density.
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.9	Development Area / Glenside West Development Area / DEV2-S20	Oppose	<p>Oppose submitter seeking to reduce permeable surface from 30% to 20%. This is because residents below the site and downstream will be adversely affected.</p> <p>Housing development on Glenside West slopes should be hydrologically neutral. Because this is almost certainly not achievable, we oppose any high or medium density housing development in this area at all.</p> <p>The Boffa Miskell Upper Stebbings Valley Wellington Landscape and Ecology Analysis report (2018) is very pertinent when considering this development. This report identified Glenside West as having remnant forest of high ecological values, worthy of protection.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 25.44]</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledgement by Council that the Government's Policy Statement on Urban Development does not apply to areas such as Glenside West. - That any development in Glenside West takes place with a minimum of earthworks and that natural gullies are not filled in. - That the grey unbuilt area in Glenside West is unsuitable land for housing and that the whole area shown in mustard/yellow (Fig 1) is limited to Large Lot Residential. - Roading and housing doesn't extend into gullies, ephemeral streams, intermittent and perennial streams and is kept away from the ridgetop. - Furthermore no housing is built above the current Glenside-Churton park suburb boundary in order that the ridgeline is offered at least some degree of visual protection. - Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) on this site must be preserved and not impacted by development, if any development is to take place
Rod Halliday	25.45	Development Area / Development Area Lincolnshire Farm / DEV2-S20	Amend	Considers that DEV2-S20 (Minimum density) lacks clarity and should be amended.	Seeks that DEV2-S20 (Minimum Density) is amended to add more detail on how minimum density is calculated.

Development Areas - Upper Stebbings and Glenside West

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Edwin Crampton	21.1	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	<p>Considers that Greyfriars Crescent is the most logical connection point to make, as it was designed to provide for such a connection when the Redwood block was subdivided in the 1970's.</p> <p>As the development of Churton Park has proceeded, it is expected by the Churton Park community that Upper Stebbings has a road connection to Tawa.</p>	Seeks that a road connection be provided to join Upper Stebbings with Greyfriars Crescent, Tawa.
John L Morrison	28.2	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	<p>Considers that the DEV3 chapter does not include an acceptable connection between Tawa and Upper Stebbings.</p> <p>Every opportunity should be taken to increase the resilience of the whole city. a road connection between Upper Stebbings and Greyfriars Crescent will quite clearly increase overall city resilience by providing an additional secure access route to and from the north.</p> <p>A connection is required between Churton Park and Tawa to achieve compact urban form. Otherwise the development becomes an isolated group of houses.</p> <p>The PDP states that the Development Area has easy access to SH1, the NIMT railway, as well as the town centres and facilities at Tawa and Johnsonville. This misleading statement in</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that a road connection be provided to join Upper Stebbings with Greyfriars Crescent, Tawa.
John L Morrison	28.3	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	<p>Considers that language in the Introduction of DEV3 is misleading, as Upper Stebbings and Glenside West do not have easy access to the NIMT railway or the Tawa Town Centre.</p> <p>Easy access to NIMT railway or Tawa Town Centre would only be available if a connection is provided to Greyfriars Crescent Tawa.</p>	Clarify language in the introduction of DEV3 (Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West) relating to easy access between the development area and the railway spine and town centres.
Richard H. Taylor	35.1	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	<p>Considers that language in the Introduction of DEV3 is misleading, as Upper Stebbings and Glenside West do not have easy access to the NIMT railway or the Tawa Town Centre.</p> <p>Only if there is a connection road via Greyfriars Crescent to Tawa will the railway and Tawa town centre access be available.</p>	Clarify language in the introduction of DEV3 (Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West) relating to easy access between the development area and the railway spine and town centres. [Inferred decision requested]
Richard H. Taylor	35.2	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	<p>Considers that a road connection between Greyfriars Crescent and Upper Stebbings would be of regional and national importance.</p> <p>According to WREMO in the event of a major disaster road and rail links out of Wellington city could be made impassable for some time, with the only way home for people being on foot. In such a situation the route for walkers (or cyclists) would be Middleton Road between Churton Park and Tawa. However Middleton Road is vulnerable and likely to be impassable.</p> <p>A connection at Greyfriars Crescent would provide another alternative in a disaster situation, providing a route for emergency vehicles in the response and recovery phase.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that a road connection be provided to join Upper Stebbings with Greyfriars Crescent, Tawa.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard H. Taylor	35.3	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	<p>Considers that the DEV3 chapter does not include an acceptable connection between Tawa and Upper Stebbings. As the proposal currently stands, Upper Stebbings Valley would become an isolated group of residences cut off from Churton Park by the transmission lines exclusion area and without access to the north east.</p> <p>A road connection between Upper Stebbings and Tawa would have many benefits:</p> <p>In the immediate future, a bus route from Porirua (including Kenepuru Hospital) through western Tawa, Stebbings Valley and Churton Park to Johnsonville could be established.</p> <p>In the move towards carbon neutrality, cycling (especially with electric bikes) is likely to become more popular. The suggested connection would provide a safer route for cyclists traveling to or from Wellington along Middleton Road.</p> <p>A connecting road would also encourage the use of Tawa's facilities including the library, pool, schools, and shopping centre. Linkages between the two communities will be significantly enhanced.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that a road connection be provided to join Upper Stebbings with Greyfriers Crescent, Tawa.
Barry Ellis	47.3	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	Considers that the Council should provide the relevant data that justifies filling in gullies and building over natural streams and springs. Natural disasters of Nelson and Abbots Ford should not be forgotten.	Seeks that data be provided in DEV3 (Development Area: Upper Stebbings and Glenside West) to justify filling in gullies.
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.8	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation.As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.	Disallow
Barry Ellis	47.4	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Not specified	Considers the WCC is using a flawed survey.	Not Specified
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.9	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation.As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Margaret Ellis	48.3	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	Opposes Glenside West being a development area, as the current proposal has 122 dwellings and 3 cul-de-sacs in Glenside West. Large lot residential would be a more suitable use considering the topography of the land, which has steep gullies and ephemeral streams flowing through it, making the land unsuitable for intensive cut and L.L.R. would be more suited to the rural nature of Glenside.	Rejects Glenside West being classified as a Development Area.
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.10	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-04	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.	Disallow
Oliver Sangster	112.14	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Support in part	Generally supportive of Upper Stebbings/Glenside West structure plan provisions being incorporated into the district plan as a Development Area overlay.	Retain Upper Stebbings/Glenside West Development Area as notified.
Oliver Sangster	112.15	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Support	Supports provision for medium density housing, and walking tracks with the Upper Stebbings/Glenside West Development Area.	Retain Upper Stebbings/Glenside West Development Area as notified.
Oliver Sangster	112.16	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Not specified	Considers that the Porirua Stream is an environment that is sensitive to urban development. [Inferred reasons]	Seeks that any development in the Upper Stebbings/Glenside West Development Area be done in a way that sensitive to the environment (particularly with regard to the stream/gully network which feeds into Porirua Stream and ultimately Porirua Harbour)
Oliver Sangster	112.17	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Support	Considers that alternative density options that people might propose that would promote more low density development (e.g. 'lifestyle blocks') in the Upper Stebbings/Glenside West Development Areas as it is one of the last remaining viable greenfield development areas in the city. Considers that carving this area up into lifestyle blocks will make well planned future development of this area difficult.	Retain housing densities in the Upper Stebbings/Glenside West Development Area as notified.
John Tiley	142.21	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Not specified	Considers that while the map of the Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West is grey and bounded red, as unbuilt, the future intentions attached to the area, revealed by the label "FUZ", suggest residential construction in the future. A coherent plan should not contain any such discrepancy.	Clarity is sought over where residential development can occur in the FUZ (Future Urban Zone) in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West development. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Brian Sheppard	169.4	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	<p>Considers that a connection between Upper Stebbings and Tawa would be of benefit to the adjacent communities as well as the whole Wellington Region. A road connection is required to achieve the WCC objective of compact urban form and for the Development Area to have easy access to SH1, the NIMT railway as well as the town centres and facilities at Tawa and Johnsonville.</p> <p>Tawa and Stebbings Valley are only about 200m apart but, without connection, the separation becomes several kilometres. In addition, the transmission lines exclusion separates Upper Stebbings from Churton Park, creating an isolated island community.</p> <p>Churton Park is unusual amongst the northern suburbs, in having no direct public transport access to the north. A road connection would enable a new bus route to be created that would provide a much-needed bus service from Johnsonville to Porirua which would serve Churton Park and the western side of Tawa.</p> <p>The north end of Stebbings Valley is a long way from the facilities in Johnsonville. A connection to Tawa would bring services much closer and provide a much needed boost to Tawa businesses and organisations.</p> <p>This connection would provide a resilient alternative route for people leaving the City for their homes further north.</p> <p>It has been suggested that, with a connection such this, vehicles bound for the motorway would add to traffic congestion in Tawa. Commuters from Upper Stebbings are more likely, however, to access the motorway from the closer junction at Churton Park. During the day, it is more likely that vehicles using the connection will primarily be heading to and from facilities in Tawa.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that a road connection is provided to join Upper Stebbings and Tawa.
Niki Yosha	178.1	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	<p>Opposes the development of Marshall Ridge in Glenside West.</p> <p>Considers that WCC has failed to take its own advice and the advice of council contracted engineering firm Abcon. In 2019, a number of meetings were held where assurances were made that no residential development would happen on the Glenside Valley Hills.</p> <p>Considers that the development is a direct contradiction to the analysis regarding underdeveloped ridgelines in the July 2018 Upper Stebbings Valley, Wellington, Phase One: Landscape and Ecology Analysis Report.</p> <p>There is resident concern about the effects of light pollution caused by the development. Transport is poorly planned with excessive distances to the bus for Glenside West and very little vision for traffic coming out of Glenside West onto Westchester Drive.</p> <p>Considers that consultation with the affected community was poor. The potential impact on Porirua Stream has not involved consultation with Ngāti Toa Rangitira or Porirua City Council. The piping or covering of the stream running from Marshall Ridge will severely impact the species sustained by the stream and will completely wipe out the koura, tuna and glow worm populations.</p> <p>Considers that with the recent history of slips in the area, filling in more gullies and closing over natural water paths is not a sustainable move.</p> <p>Considers that the developer in question for this block does not have a good history of stormwater management.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Seeks that WCC rejects the proposed development of Glenside West, specifically on Marshall Ridge.</p> <p>Or, if development proceeds, amend plans to greatly reduce the number of planned dwellings and to ensure that no house built encroaches in the visual amenity of those living along Rowells and Middleton Roads.</p> <p>Additionally, ensure that no gullies are filled, and no streams piped or covered in order to protect current wildlife populations and native bush stands.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Churton Park Community Association	189.21	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Not specified	Considers that while the map of the Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West is grey and bounded red, as unbuilt, the future intentions attached to the area, revealed by the label "FUZ", suggest residential construction in the future. A coherent plan should not contain any such discrepancy.	Clarity is sought over where residential development can occur in the FUZ in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West development. [Inferred decision requested].
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.51	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks further clarity on how this relief may impact opportunities for residential intensification to commence in the area in accordance with the primary submission.	Disallow
Wellington City Youth Council	201.41	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Support	Supports the main developments of Upper Stebbings/Glenside West and Lincolnshire Farm and the accompanying zone redesignation for both areas. Considers that provision of housing for a growing population is important, and creating new higher density areas plays a role in this.	Retain DEV3 (Upper Stebbings development) as notified.
Tawa Community Board	294.18	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Support	Support the proposed plan for Upper Stebbings Valley, in particular the protection given to ecology.	Retain DEV3 chapter (Upper Stebbings and Glenside West) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.188	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Support	Considers that existing Transmission lines traverse the northern part of the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area, over areas zoned "Unbuilt areas" (noting the Development Area layer obscures the transmission lines). On the basis any development within the area complies with the National Grid rules within the Infrastructure Chapter, Transpower has no concerns. The reference to the National Grid transmission lines is supported. [see original submission for images supplied]	Retain the introductory text to the Development Area 3 Chapter as notified.
Claire Bibby	329.2	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	Considers that Archaeological Field Surveys should be carried out for any future development in Glenside West. As stated in the 'Historic Heritage Study for the Upper Stebbings and Marshall Ridge Structure Plan' by Elizabeth Cox (2018, p.3): If future development of this area is to occur, every effort should be made to first document the numerous possible very early settler 19th century house sites in the area. Therefore, it could be useful to commission an Archaeological Field Survey to traverse the area in order to identify any such remaining 19th century house sites along the Middleton/Willowbank Roads corridor, along with any associated old gardens, trees and shelter belts, sawpits, and associated farming and other material.	Seeks that an Archaeological Field survey be required for any development in the Glenside West Development Area.
Richard Herbert	360.5	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Support in part	Supports DEV3, as it is directed towards providing for development of this new greenfield development area, safeguarding natural resources and green spaces and recognising that this area also adjoins the Outer Green Belt, with areas within the Ridge Lines and Hilltops Overlay zone of the existing District Plan.	Retain DEV3 (Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area) with amendment.
Richard Herbert	360.6	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	Considers that the Development Area of Upper Stebbings and Glenside West should retain the areas designated within the Ridge Lines and Hilltops Overlay zone of the existing District Plan.	Seeks that the areas designated within the Ridge Lines and Hilltops Overlay zone be retained in DEV3 (Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area).
Waka Kotahi	370.450	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Support in part	The Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area is supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain Development Area 3: Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area and seeks amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Waka Kotahi	370.451	Special Purpose Zones / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	Considers that the following amendments are required to the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area: a) The Tonkin Taylor "Transport Assessment Upper Stebbings" identifies a Level of Service F is anticipated at the intersection between Westchester Drive/ Middleton Road / Westchester Drive East, prior to the approach on to state highway 1. As such, development should be managed until such time that appropriate mitigation has been determined or funding identified. b) Provisions are required to enable integrated transport options including multi-modal connections. DEV3-O2 and DEV3-O3 generally direct development to consider integration but it is not explicit to transportation.	Seeks to amend Development Area 3: Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area to include proviso that planned development shall only occur once the infrastructure upgrades, including SH1 and Westchester Drive intersection have been completed. Also seeks to include specific reference to all development within the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West area to facilitate multi-modal connections.
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.5	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose in part	The Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area is opposed in its current form, as it is considered misleading. The two areas should not be combined as if they were the same site. It is confusing what development is proposed for Upper Stebbings and what is proposed for 395 Middleton Road, Glenside West.	The Upper Stebbing and Glenside West Development Area is opposed and an amendment is sought.
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.6	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	The Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area is opposed in its current form, as it is considered misleading. The two areas should not be combined as if they were the same site. It is confusing what development is proposed for Upper Stebbings and what is proposed for 395 Middleton Road, Glenside West.	Seeks that information in DEV3 - Upper Stebbing and Glenside West Development Area be separated between Glenside West (395 Middleton Road) and Upper Stebbings.
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.7	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose in part	The Introduction to the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area is opposed as it is considered misleading. The sentence "The areas have been identified for urban development since the 1970s." is not true for Glenside West and is misleading to people reading the District Plan. Glenside West was only bought by the developer less than 15 years ago and was never planned for development prior as it was farmed by the Broderick family for 100 years and the Warren family from 1968. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	The Introduction of DEV3 - Upper Stebbing and Glenside West Development Area is opposed and an amendment is sought.
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.4	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.	Disallow
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.8	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Amend	The Introduction to the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area is opposed as it is considered misleading. The sentence "The areas have been identified for urban development since the 1970s." is not true for Glenside West and is misleading to people reading the District Plan. Glenside West was only bought by the developer less than 15 years ago and was never planned for development prior as it was farmed by the Broderick family for 100 years and the Warren family from 1968. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the Introduction of DEV3 - Upper Stebbing and Glenside West Development Area as follows: The Upper Stebbings and Glenside West developments are some of the final stages of urban - development in the northern suburbs. <u>Stebbing Valley was identified for Urban Development after it was sold to a developer in 1979 but Glenside West was only recently decided for development and notified to the public in 2021. The areas have been identified for urban development since the 1970s.</u>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.9	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	<p>Opposes the removal of Glenside West District Plan Change 33 – Ridgelines and Hilltops (Visual Amenity) with an activity status of Discretionary. Glenside West was never identified for development under the Northern Growth Management Framework (NGMF) consulted in 2001-2003.</p> <p>The area was subject to District Plan Change 33, Ridgeline and Hilltops Visual Amenity, 2009 (DPS 33) with an activity status of Discretionary and the Council should abide by the protection of ridgelines and hilltops in Glenside West.</p> <p>Northern Reserves Management Plan, 2008 recognised the ridgeline as a critical reserve, contributing to landscape coherence and amenity, offering extremely important views, with slopes providing vital linkages and coherence across the landscape. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay incorporated into the Operative District Plan (via Plan Change 33) be retained for Glenside West, with an activity status of Discretionary.
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.5	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.23	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	<p>Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 374.9].</p>	Allow
Donna Sherlock	384.3	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	<p>Submitter considers that the land is too steep to support 120-150 dwellings.</p> <p>Submitter does not think the water for this catchment can be managed sensitively without harm downstream, with erosion and sediment and flooding.</p>	Not specified.
John Tiley	142.22	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / New DEV3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that a new objective is provided regarding preservation of significant ridgelines, most particularly Marshalls Ridge.
Andy Foster	FS86.31	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / New DEV3	Oppose	<p>Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.22].</p>	Allow
Churton Park Community Association	189.22	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / New DEV3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that a new objective is provided regarding preservation of significant ridgelines, most particularly Marshalls Ridge.
Andy Foster	FS86.41	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / New DEV3	Oppose	<p>Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 189.22].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.63	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O1	Support	Supports the Upper Stebbings/Glenside West development zone. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.37	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O1	Oppose	Opposes DEV3-O1 (Purpose). Considers that Glenside West is not well-connected, and the area is not connected to any public transport or local parks.	Opposes DEV3-O1 (Purpose) and seeks an amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.157	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O1	Support in part	Supports DEV3-O1 in part.	Retain DEV3-O1 (Purpose) with amendment.
Ministry of Education	400.158	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O1	Amend	Seeks DEV3-O1 be amended to explicitly recognise and provide for educational activities to in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area. Moreover, the submitter considers that their relief sought provides a more concise alternative to the proposed objective.	Amend DEV3-O1 (Purpose) as follows: Purpose Upper Stebbings and Glenside West are well-connected neighbourhoods that accommodate new residential growth supported by <u>educational facilities</u> , community and open space activities.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.38	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O2	Oppose	Considers that while an ISPP is underway and simplicity required where possible, clarity is needed around adherence and the core understanding of Te Kaupapa - rationales for the PDP and protections afforded by it.	Opposes DEV3-O2 (Activities and development) and seeks amendment.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.39	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O2	Amend	Considers that while an ISPP is underway and simplicity required where possible, clarity is needed around adherence and the core understanding of Te Kaupapa - rationales for the PDP and protections afforded by it.	Amend DEV3-O2 (Activities and development) as follows: Activities and development Activities are carried out in an <u>a responsible</u> , integrated and coordinated way- <u>in adherence to the objectives, policies rules and standards of the District Plan entire</u> .
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.40	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O2	Amend	Considers that while an ISPP is underway and simplicity required where possible, clarity is needed around adherence and the core understanding of Te Kaupapa - rationales for the PDP and protections afforded by it.	Seeks that DEV3-O2 (Activities and development) is amended to strengthen wording to stipulate the need to adhere to Te Kaupapa of the Draft District Plan.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.41	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O3	Oppose	Considers that the development of 395 Middleton Road is not "Well functioning" because it does not comply with points d, f & g in the definition of "Well functioning urban environment" within the PDP. There is no link road from the development site to Churton Park, Glenside or Tawa has been planned. Development area is an isolated area on steep, hilly terrain. The access road from Westchester Drive is flood prone. West Glenside at 395 Middleton Road will not be Climate Change Sustainable and Natural Hazard Resilient. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes DEV3-O3 (Amenity and Design).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.11	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / General DEV3	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth. There is no reason to limit these areas to low density, especially with such a small pocket of space proposed for development and the NPS-UD seeking density.	Disallow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.42	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O4	Amend	<p>Considers that protecting Marshall's Ridge would be consistent with the intent of the ODP Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay, introduced by plan change 33.</p> <p>Excluding Marshall's Ridge from protections afforded to other connected hilltops and ridgelines make s no sense in the face of the above i.e., Introduction, DEV-04; DEV3-P4. Where the connective network of geographical features have been specified as needing protection and incorporation into a network for open spaces and reserves. Opening it up instead for housing development which will irreversibly reduce the visual amenity of the area, have a huge reverse sensibility effect and remove it from the network of accessible public open spaces.</p>	Seeks that DEV3-O4 (Natural environment) is amended to include absolute protection of Marshall's ridge and the steeper ridges and spurs descending into Stebbings Valley and Middleton Road.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.43	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O4	Amend	<p>Seeks that DEV-O4 is amended to include SNA's in West Glenside, namely two larger areas of bush remnants either side of 395 Middleton Road, and two smaller areas as per SNA maps and planning maps showing FUZ of 395 Middleton Road. These SNA's risk encroachment upon and destruction if not specifically protected given the planned development of the site, shows an urban road being built across an area marked SNA.</p>	Seeks that DEV3-O4 (Natural environment) is amended to include protection of Significant Natural Areas in West Glenside, namely two larger areas of bush remnants either side of 395 Middleton Road, and two smaller areas as per the Significant Natural Area maps and planning maps showing the Future Urban Zone of 395 Middleton Road.
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.12	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-O4	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth. There is no reason to limit these areas to low density, especially with such a small pocket of space proposed for development and the NPS-UD seeking density.	Disallow
John Tiley	142.23	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P1	Amend	<p>Considers that DEV3-P1.2.b. indicates that the focus is solely on facilitating construction and that the well-being and integrity of the 'No Build Area' is being considered unworthy.</p> <p>Considers that a 'No Build Area' means exactly that, without compromise.</p>	Seeks that DEV3-P1 (Activities) is amended to provide a clear statement that a 'No Build Area' means no building without compromise.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Churton Park Community Association	189.23	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P1	Amend	Considers that DEV3-P1.2.b. indicates that the focus is solely on facilitating construction and that the well-being and integrity of the 'No Build Area' is being considered unworthy. Considers that a 'No Build Area' means exactly that, without compromise.	Seeks that DEV3-P1 (Activities) is amended to provide a clear statement that a 'No Build Area' means no building without compromise.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.44	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P1	Amend	Considers that the policy is too softly worded suggesting 'non-build spaces' are available predominantly for facilitating construction or residential facilitation. This could mean escarpment/battens, ditches, construction material storage - gravel pits, asphalt piles, or driveways, parking spaces.	Seeks amendment to DEV3-P1 (Activities) to clarify that construction of residential buildings is contained entirely within Build Areas, and not in non-build areas.
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.13	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P1	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth. There is no reason to limit these areas to low density, especially with such a small pocket of space proposed for development and the NPS-UD seeking density.	Disallow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.45	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P1	Amend	Considers that the policy is too softly worded suggesting 'non-build spaces' are available predominantly for facilitating construction or residential facilitation. This could mean escarpment/battens, ditches, construction material storage - gravel pits, asphalt piles, or driveways, parking spaces.	Seeks that DEV3-P1 (Activities) is amended to give non-build areas protections.
John Tiley	142.24	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P2	Amend	Considers that DEV3-P2 to DEV3-P5 (excluding DEV3-P4, item 6) focus entirely on development without regard for adverse effects.	Seeks that DEV3-P2 (Residential activities) is amended to not just focus on development but show regard for the adverse effects of development. [Inferred decision requested].
Churton Park Community Association	189.24	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P2	Amend	Considers that DEV3-P2 to DEV3-P5 (excluding DEV3-P4, item 6) focus entirely on development without regard for adverse effects.	Seeks that DEV3-P2 (Residential activities) is amended to not just focus on development but show regard for the adverse effects of development. [Inferred decision requested].
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.46	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P2	Oppose	Opposes DEV3-P2 on the basis that the wording is weak and this could signal a minimal need to adhere and poor legal footing for WCC post consent process to act on breaches.	Opposes DEV3-P2 (Residential activities) and seeks amendments.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.47	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P2	Amend	Considers that the terms encourage and intent are weak and should be replaced by REQUIRE and REQUIREMENT respectively to signal the need for strict adherence to policies, principles and guidelines within the PDP. Such weak language could signal a minimal need to adhere and poor legal footing for the WCC post consent process to act on breaches. A developer could claim a breach occurred due to the WCC's own limited encouragement and/or the developers own good but misguided intent.	Amend DEV3-P2 (Residential Activities) as follows: Residential activities Encourage Require residential activities within the build areas indicated on the Development Plans in the Planning Maps that: ... Fulfil the intent requirement of the Subdivision Design Guide and Residential Design Guide.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.48	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P2	Amend	<p>Considers that the policy should be amended to require low impact design guidelines for the Development Area of 395 Middleton Road, Glenside West.</p> <p>The houses in the area will be visible to a large geographical area in an area known for it's rural green open space character.</p> <p>Low impact guidelines regarding colour, form and light and noise pollution need to be clearly specified.</p> <p>Due to the geography of the area - the steep valley sides and 'as the crow flies' closeness to neighbours in Glenside, noise pollution occurs readily and must be specifically incorporated into design to minimise.</p> <p>Light pollution will be a new issue in a "dark sky area".</p> <p>The latter and the SNA's nearby have promoted biodiversity and improving ecological health. This will be drastically altered by a 150 housing development and 'all night' street lights. Ecological</p> <p>Light Pollution will be introduced to the area and must be strongly mitigated against.</p> <p>Guidelines also need to require hydraulic neutrality with comprehensive storm water infrastructure to mitigate against hard surfaces in an area prone to heavy rainfall impacts and with Porirua Stream and Te Awarua-o-Porirua directly impacted by 'downstream effects'.</p> <p>The area is also prone to high wind impacts. Considered planting of native species will be required to protect housing and associated activities from the high wind impacts associated with the area and the altitude and exposure</p>	Amend DEV3-P2 (Residential Activities) to include residential build guidelines to specify low impact design requirements, around colour, form, visual impact, noise and light pollution (in relation to West Glenside, 395 Middleton Road specifically).
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.14	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P2	Oppose	<p>The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth. There is no reason to limit these areas to low density, especially with such a small pocket of space proposed for development and the NPS-UD seeking density.</p>	Disallow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.49	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P2	Amend	<p>Considers that the policy should be amended to require hydraulic neutrality with comprehensive storm water infrastructure to mitigate against hard surfaces in an area prone to heavy rainfall impacts and with Porirua Stream and Te Awarua-o-Porirua directly impacted by 'downstream effects'.</p>	Amend DEV3-P2 (Residential Activities) to require hydraulic neutrality with comprehensive storm water infrastructure.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.15	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P2	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth. There is no reason to limit these areas to low density, especially with such a small pocket of space proposed for development and the NPS-UD seeking density.	Disallow
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.50	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P2	Amend	Considers that the policy should be amended as the area is prone to high wind impacts and considered planting of native species will be required to protect housing and associated activities from high wind impacts associated with the area and the altitude and exposure.	Amend DEV3-P2 (Residential Activities) to include high wind protection.
John Tiley	142.25	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P3	Amend	Considers that DEV3-P2 to DEV3-P5 (excluding DEV3-P4, item 6) focus entirely on development without regard for adverse effects.	Seeks that DEV3-P2 (Potentially compatible activities) is amended to not just focus on development but show regard for the adverse effects of development. [Inferred decision requested].
Churton Park Community Association	189.25	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P3	Amend	Considers that DEV3-P2 to DEV3-P5 (excluding DEV3-P4, item 6) focus entirely on development without regard for adverse effects.	Seeks that DEV3-P2 (Potentially compatible activities) is amended to not just focus on development but show regard for the adverse effects of development. [Inferred decision requested].
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.51	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P3	Amend	Amend the policy statement to specify the protection of natural contours, water courses, landforms, SNA's and non build areas. Specifically stating that activity can occur if protections occur, not instead of or over the top off. Wording is too weak around "appropriately managed" adverse effects - particularly because protection of SNA's and waterways is not mentioned in relation to this sentence. This is particularly important in relation to earthworks, described as 'moderate' (with no clear definition of the term), and breaches around these and environmental damage from such notified.	Seeks an amendment to DEV3-P3 (Potentially compatible activities) to indicate that activities can occur only if protections are in place.
John Tiley	142.26	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Support in part	Supports DEV3-P4, Part 6 as notified.	Retain DEV3-P4 (Coordinated activities), part 6 as notified.
John Tiley	142.27	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Amend	Considers that DEV3-P2 to DEV3-P5 (excluding DEV3-P4, item 6) focus entirely on development without regard for adverse effects.	Seeks that DEV3-P4 (Coordinated activities), part 6 is amended to not just focus on development but show regard for the adverse effects of development.
John Tiley	142.28	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Amend	Considers that only referencing Upper Stebbings valley ridgetop in DEV3-P4.6., excludes the Stebbings Valley ridgelines, including Marshalls Ridge, to the detriment of the surrounding communities.	Amend DEV3-P4.6. (Coordinated development) to include the Stebbings Valley ridgelines, including Marshalls Ridge (not restricted to just Upper Stebbings Valley ridgelines).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.32	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.28].	Allow
Churton Park Community Association	189.26	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Support in part	Supports DEV3-P4, Part 6 as notified.	Retain DEV3-P4 (Coordinated activities), part 6 as notified.
Churton Park Community Association	189.27	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Amend	Considers that DEV3-P2 to DEV3-P5 (excluding DEV3-P4, item 6) focus entirely on development without regard for adverse effects.	Seeks that DEV3-P4 (Coordinated activities), part 6 is amended to not just focus on development but show regard for the adverse effects of development.
Churton Park Community Association	189.28	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Amend	Considers that only referencing Upper Stebbings valley ridgetop in DEV3-P4.6., excludes the Stebbings Valley ridgelines, including Marshalls Ridge, to the detriment of the surrounding communities.	Amend DEV3-P4.6. (Coordinated development) to include the Stebbings Valley ridgelines, including Marshalls Ridge (not restricted to just Upper Stebbings Valley ridgelines).
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.358	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Support	Supports the policy which seeks to ensure the Development Area is supported by sufficient infrastructure which considers the needs across the entire Development Area, particularly given that a large proportion of the Area does not form currently part of the Council's reticulated network.	Retain DEV3-P4 (Coordinated development) as notified.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.52	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Amend	Considers that protecting Marshall's Ridge would be consistent with the intent of the ODP Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay, introduced by plan change 33. Excluding Marshall's Ridge from protections afforded to other connected hilltops and ridgelines makes no sense in the face of the above i.e., Introduction, DEV-04; DEV3-P4. Where the connective network of geographical features have been specified as needing protection and incorporation into a network for open spaces and reserves. Opening it up instead for housing development which will irreversibly reduce the visual amenity of the area, have a huge reverse sensibility effect and remove it from the network of accessible public open spaces.	Seeks that DEV3-P4 (Co-ordinated development) is amended to provide absolute protection of Marshall's Ridge.
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.16	Part 3 / Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. Hydraulic neutrality is also required unless a detention structure provides this attenuation. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth. There is no reason to limit these areas to low density, especially with such a small pocket of space proposed for development and the NPS-UD seeking density.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.53	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Oppose	West Glenside, 395 Middleton Road is not well connected, not accessible to public transport, not within walking distance of a community hub, local park or public transport.	Opposes DEV3-P4 (Coordinated Development) and seeks amendment.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.54	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Amend	Considers that including Marshall Ridge under DEV3-P4.6 will extend the connected network of natural open spaces with public accessibility promoted and secured via tracks for walking and cycling (current dirt road already in place, no further earthworks needed) as per other ridgelines and the outer green belt.	Seeks amendment to DEV3-P4 (Coordinated development) to include Marshall Ridge as consideration under DEV3-P4.6.
Richard Herbert	360.7	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P4	Support	DEV3-P4 is supported, as it provides hydraulic neutrality objectives.	Retain DEV3-P4 (Coordinated development) as notified.
John Tiley	142.29	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P5	Amend	Considers that DEV3-P2 to DEV3-P5 (excluding DEV3-P4, item 6) focus entirely on development without regard for adverse effects.	Seeks that DEV3-P5 (Amenity and design) is amended to not just focus on development but show regard for the adverse effects of development. [Inferred decision requested].
Churton Park Community Association	189.29	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P5	Amend	Considers that DEV3-P2 to DEV3-P5 (excluding DEV3-P4, item 6) focus entirely on development without regard for adverse effects.	Seeks that DEV3-P5 (Amenity and design) is amended to not just focus on development but show regard for the adverse effects of development. [Inferred decision requested].
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.755	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P5	Support in part	Seek amendments to this policy to remove direct reference to the design guide and instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD	Retain DEV3-P5 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.756	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-P5	Amend	Seek amendments to this policy to remove direct reference to the design guide and instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD	Amend DEV3-P5 (Amenity and design) as follows: Amenity and Design Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development in the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area to positively contribute to the creation of a well functioning urban environment by ensuring that it: 1. <u>Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide</u> Achieves the following urban design outcomes: <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings.</u> <u>d. Responds to the natural environment.</u> 2. Adds visual diversity and interest through the overall street design and the form, landscaping, design, and siting of buildings.
Ministry of Education	400.159	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R6	Support	Support DEV3-R6 as it provides for educational facilities as a permitted activity.	Retain DEV3-R6 (Educational Facilities) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.359	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R7	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the establishment of emergency service facilities within the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West area.	Retain DEV3-R7 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.321	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R26	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain DEV3-R26 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures in all activity areas) with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.322	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R26	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend DEV3-R26 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures in all activity areas) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.757	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R27	Support in part	Generally supports this rule although an amendment is sought to the rule title to allow the rule to apply to all buildings not just those associated with no more than three residential units on a site. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.	Retain DEV3-R27 (Construction, addition or alteration of residential buildings and structures including accessory buildings, but excluding multi-unit housing - Built Area) and seeks amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.758	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R27	Amend	Generally supports this rule although an amendment is sought to the rule title to allow the rule to apply to all buildings not just those associated with no more than three residential units on a site. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.	Amend DEV3-R27 (Construction, addition or alteration of residential buildings and structures including accessory buildings, but excluding multi-unit housing - Built Area) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of residential buildings and structures including accessory buildings but excluding multi-unit housing - Built Areas 1. Activity Status: Permitted where: a. <u>There are no more than three residential unit on a site; and</u> b. Compliance is achieved with: i. DEV3-S1; ii. DEV3-S2; iii. DEV3-S3; iv. DEV3-S4; v. DEV3-S5 only in relation to the rear yard boundary setback; vi. DEV3-S6; vii. DEV3-S7; viii. DEV3-S8; ix. DEV3-S9; x. DEV3-S10; and xi. DEV3-S11 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where: a. Compliance with the requirements of DEV3-R27.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standards; and 2. The matters in DEV3-P2 and GRZ-P8 <u>MRZ-P8</u>
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.759	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R28	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Opposes the inclusion of multi-unit housing as it is considered this can be managed through DEV3-R27 in accordance with the amendments sought to that rule. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.	Retain DEV3-R28 (Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village, and additions or alterations to multi-unit housing or a retirement village - Built Areas) and seeks amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.760	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R28	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Opposes the inclusion of multi-unit housing as it is considered this can be managed through DEV3-R27 in accordance with the amendments sought to that rule. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.	Amend DEV3-R28 (Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village, and additions or alterations to multi-unit housing or a retirement village - Built Areas) as follows: Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit development or a retirements village, and additions or alterations to a multi-unit housing or retirement village – Built Areas 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the follow standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard: a. DEV3-S1; b. DEV3-S2; c. DEV3-S3; d. DEV3-S4; e. DEV3-S5; f. DEV3-S12; g. DEV3-S13; h. DEV3-S14; and i. DEV3-S15; and 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with the requirements in Appendix 13; 3. The matters in DEV3-P2, 4, 4, MRZ-P6, and MRZ-P10 for multi-unit housing; and 4. The matters in DEV3-P2, DEV3-P5, and MRZ-P5, and MRZ-P10 for a retirement village. ...
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.761	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R28	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Seeks amendments to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards.	Retain DEV3-R28 (Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village, and additions or alterations to multi-unit housing or a retirement village - Built Areas) and seeks amendments.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.762	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-R28	Amend	Supports this rule in part, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Seeks amendments to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards.	Amend DEV3-R28 (Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village, and additions or alterations to multi-unit housing or a retirement village - Built Areas) as follows: Construction of buildings, accessory buildings or structures for multi-unit development or a retirements village, and additions or alterations to a multi-unit housing or retirement village – Built Areas ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule DEV3-R28.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule DEV3-R28.1 that complies with the relevant standards is precluded from public and limited notification.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.360	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-S1	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports DEV3-S1 (Building height), with amendment.

Designations

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.361	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-S1	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend DEV3-S1 (Building height) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... a. Fences or standalone walls; <u>and</u> b. <u>Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.362	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-S3	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Supports DEV3-S3 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.363	Development Area / Development Area Upper Stebbings and Glenside West / DEV3-S3	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	Amend DEV3-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... b. Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site; <u>and</u> c. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; <u>and</u> d. <u>Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.72	Designations / General point on Designations / General point on Designations	Amend	Considers appropriate that amendments to the planning provisions to include provisions for infrastructure to be permitted within the Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ). Considers that permitted infrastructure will assist in servicing future development. Seeks that this can be by proposed designation or appropriate zoning to provide for a reservoir. The Submitters land has been identified for residential development for at least 25 years. Considers that planning restrictions (overlays) over parts of the land do not assist in providing a framework for appropriate subdivision and land use for the subject property. Considers that it is not an effective use of the land resource to provide for a few rural residential properties on and area of land (over 15ha) that has been zoned for residential development. [see original submission]	Seeks that provisions for a designation are included for infrastructure within the Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ) to provide for a reservoir. [inferred decision requested]
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.38	Part 3 / Designations / General point on Designations / General point on Designations	Oppose	It is not appropriate to include provisions for a designation for infrastructure within the Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ) to provide for a reservoir. Designations are for requiring authorities, which this submitter is not. Furthermore, the requiring authority needs to go through a process which considers alternatives. The submitter provides no evidence that there is need for a reservoir, particularly when many councils such as Kāpiti, now require rain water tanks as a suitable water storage mechanism.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.62	Part 3 / Designations / General point on Designations / General point on Designations	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.72]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.130	Designations / General point on Designations / General point on Designations	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Designations chapter is amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City."
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.68	Part 3 / Designations / General point on Designations / General point on Designations	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.131	Designations / General point on Designations / General point on Designations	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that references to Wellington Tenth Trust are removed.
Guardians of the Bays	452.93	Designations / General point on Designations / General point on Designations	Amend	Considers the use the Designation unique identifier at the beginning of each new designation would greatly improve reading and navigating the District Plan.	Seeks to use the Designation unique identifier at the beginning of each new designation.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.158	Designations / KiwiRail Holdings Limited / KRH1	Support in part	Supports the KRH – KiwiRail Holdings Limited designations text which accurately specify 'railway purposes' as the designation purpose and 'primary' for the designation hierarchy for both KRH-1 and KRH-2.	Retain KRH1 (Wellington Railway Lines), with amendments.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.159	Designations / KiwiRail Holdings Limited / KRH1	Amend	Considers minor amendment to the wording of Conditions 1 to improve readability of the condition is appropriate.	Amend KRH1 (Wellington Railway Lines) as follows: The following conditions shall apply to the designation containing the Wellington Railway Station (designation KRH1) in the Wellington District Plan: 1. Nothing in this designation authorises the demolition or partial demolition of the following parts of the Wellington Railway Station building heritage features : - the 3 streets facades including the Thorndon Quay addition; - the main concourse; - the roofline (excluding without air-conditioning units); and - the plaques at the office entrance. which are heritage features. Any such proposal shall require KiwiRail to either obtain any necessary resource consent or to seek the alteration of this designation by the removal of this condition. For the avoidance of doubt, this condition does not cover repairs or maintenance, or additions or alterations, or any other activity requiring an outline plan under section 176A.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.160	Designations / KiwiRail Holdings Limited / KRH2	Support	Supports the KRH – KiwiRail Holdings Limited designations text which accurately specify 'railway purposes' as the designation purpose and 'primary' for the designation hierarchy for both KRH-1 and KRH-2.	Retain KRH2 (Radio Station – Te Kopahao, Hawkins Hill) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.79	Designations / Minister of Corrections / MCOR1	Support	These designations have been rolled over from the Operative District Plan, and are an appropriate planning mechanism for managing these custodial corrections facilities. Noting however that Wellington Prison is no longer operational and designation MCOR1 will be uplifted at the time that the property ownership transfer has been confirmed.	Retain designation MCOR1 (Wellington Prison - Mt Crawford) as notified.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.80	Designations / Minister of Corrections / MCOR2	Support	These designations have been rolled over from the Operative District Plan, and are an appropriate planning mechanism for managing these custodial corrections facilities. Noting however that Wellington Prison is no longer operational and designation MCOR1 will be uplifted at the time that the property ownership transfer has been confirmed.	Retain designation MCOR2 (Arohata Prison - Tawa) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.132	Designations / Minister for Courts / MCOU Conditions 2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the within conditions under 'Cultural' are amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City."
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.69	Part 3 / Designations / Minister for Courts / MCOU Conditions 2	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.133	Designations / Minister for Courts / MCOU Conditions 2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that references to Wellington Tenth Trust are removed.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.43	Designations / Minister of Defence / MDEF1	Support	Considers that the details provided under Designation Reference MDEF1 are accurate and this designation has been subject to the usual requiring authority roll over process.	Retain MDEF1 (Point Jeringham Saluting Battery Site) as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.44	Designations / Minister of Defence / MDEF2	Support	Considers that the details provided under Designation Reference MDEF2 are accurate and this designation has been subject to the usual requiring authority roll over process.	Retain MDEF2 (HMNZS Olphet Defence Establishment) as notified.
Ministry of Education	400.160	Designations / Minister of Education / General MEDU	Not specified	Submitter considers that the designation boundaries and details within the Schedule of Designations and designation details within the submitter's confirmation of designations (dated 15 June 2022) for the submitter's 73 sites within the Wellington District currently designated by the Minister of Education for education purposes, have generally been adopted into the Plan.	Not specified.
Ministry of Education	400.161	Designations / Minister of Education / MEDU Conditions 1	Amend	Seeks that the advice note of 'Education Purposes' under Conditions 1: Minister of Education Conditions be updated to the most recent version that has been used in more recent Designations across the country [see original submission for full reason].	"Educational Purposes" for the purposes of [this/these] designation[s] shall, in the absence of specific conditions to the contrary: ... iii. Enable the provision of community education (e.g.: night classes for adults) outside school hours in school facilities, <u>and which will not be restricted to the primary syllabus taught to school age children during school hours.</u>
Waka Kotahi	370.452	Designations / Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency / General NZTA	Support	Supports the Waka Kotahi Designation and conditions as drafted.	Retain NZTA - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Designation as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.189	Designations / Transpower New Zealand Limited / TPR1	Support	Supports the rollover of the Central Park Substation designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR1 (Central Park Substation) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.190	Designations / Transpower New Zealand Limited / TPR2	Support	Supports the rollover of the Wilton Substation designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR2 (Wilton Substation) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.191	Designations / Transpower New Zealand Limited / TPR3	Support	Supports the rollover of the Takapu Road Substation designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR3 (Takapu Road Substation) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.192	Designations / Transpower New Zealand Limited / TPR4	Support	Supports the rollover of the Oteranga Bay Terminal Station designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR4 (Oteranga Bay Terminal Station) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.193	Designations / Transpower New Zealand Limited / TPR5	Support	Supports the rollover of the Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR5 (Te Hikowhenua Shore Electrode Station) as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.194	Designations / Transpower New Zealand Limited / TPR6	Support	Supports the rollover of the Kaiwharawhara Supply Point Substation designation. Considers the substation is a key National Grid asset and requires protection by designation.	Retain designation TPR6 (Kaiwharawhara Supply Point Substation) as notified.
Friends of Owhiro Stream (FOOS)	403.1	Designations / Wellington City Council / WCC8	Amend	<p>Considers the ecological importance of the Upper Carey's Gully above the existing landfill operation to the health and restoration of the Owhiro stream network.</p> <p>The Upper Carey's Gully is also an important ecological corridor between Zealandia to the north and significant areas of ecological reserves to the south. This upper gully is recognised as a significant ecological area (SNA) which is clearly incompatible with any future expansion of the landfill up the valley. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p> <p>The protection of this unique upper valley ecosystem, above the existing landfill, is consistent with the WCC commitment to reducing carbon emissions and protecting the natural environment of Wellington City.</p>	Seeks that the extent of the WCC8 Designation be amended to the operational footprint of the landfill, including: Stages 1, 2 and 3; The proposed Southern Landfill extension - Piggy back option (SLEPO); Associated working areas and Areas required for remediation of legacy issues relating to stages 1, 2 and 3. of the landfill.
Paul Blaschke	FS129.1	Part 3 / Designations / Wellington City Council / WCC8	Support	Upper Carey's Gully has some of the best (if not the best) quality freshwater habitats in Wellington City and their destruction for the originally proposed Southern Landfill one of the worst environmental losses for the city that could be imagined. Although the new landfill proposals are much less destructive, rezoning of the upper gully as suggested by FOOS would make loss of any more habitat than now proposed less likely and also help ensure commitment to reducing carbon emissions and waste generation, as suggested by FOOS.	Allow
Owhiro Bay Residents Association	477.2	Designations / Wellington City Council / WCC8	Amend	<p>Considers that the Carey's Gully Landfill Designation (WCC- 61) as Refuse Disposal and other works should be reduced to the footprint required for the current landfill plus 'Piggyback' extension and associated facilities.</p> <p>Considers there are enviromental values as indicated on the plan and possible in the future that indicate a reduction in size of the designation is needed.</p> <p>Considers reducing the extent of the designation would align with committments by Council.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reasons]</p>	Amend extent of designation to be reduced for WCC8 (Careys Gully Landfill) to the area only of the current landfills and planned SLEPO works.
Wellington City Council	266.165	Designations / Wellington City Council / WCC9	Amend	WCC Designations – WCC9 Christeson Lane Service Lane is to be amended because the service lane beyond the formed part of Christeson Lane was not implemented under the Operative District Plan designation, and there are no plans in the foreseeable future to actively pursue the implementation of the service lane.	Amend site identifier of WCC9 Christeson Lane Service Lane to reflect updated mapped extent.
Wellington City Council	266.166	Designations / Wellington City Council / WCC10	Amend	Considers the designation over this land should be removed as WCC have no plans to either acquire 11 Manners Street nor to use it for a service lane.	Amend Site Identifier in WCC10 (Bond Street Service Lane) as follows: Part Lot 10 DP 1886; Part Lot 22 DP 1886; Lot 4 DP 63430
Wellington City Council	266.167	Designations / Wellington City Council / WCC12	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend designation WCC12 (Green Street and Wilson Service Lane) as follows: Green Street and Wilson Street Service Lane
Bruce Crothers	319.17	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / General WIAL	Amend	Considers that there should be stronger noise restrictions for aircraft and stricter limits on the number of flights unless they are electrically powered and much quieter.	Seeks stronger noise restrictions for aircrafts, including limits on the number of flights allowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.239	Part 3 / Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / General WIAL	Oppose	The Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review. This submission should therefore be struck out.	Disallow
Bruce Crothers	319.18	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / General WIAL	Amend	Seeks a reduction in the hours that aircrafts can fly into and out of Wellington in order to reduce carbon footprint.	Seeks restrictions in aircraft flight hours.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.240	Part 3 / Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / General WIAL	Oppose	The Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review. This submission should therefore be struck out.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.134	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / General WIAL	Amend	Considers that the WIAL chapter should be amended to have the Designations' unique identifier at the beginning of each new designation, as this would greatly improve readability and navigation of the PDP.	Amend the 'Wellington International Airport Limited' Designations chapter to have each designation's unique identifier at the beginning of each designation.
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.546	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / General WIAL	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that duplications of provisions regarding aircraft noise management requirements set out in the main site and east side area designations are deleted.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.161	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / General WIAL	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.547	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / General WIAL	Amend	Considers that the PDP provisions for the Airport Zone replicate the Designation provisions. This is considered inefficient and ineffective.	Amend the provisions of the Airport Chapter to not duplicate those of the Airport Designation. [Inferred decision requested].
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.162	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / General WIAL	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.168	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL1	Amend	Considers this condition currently prohibits development over 8 m, which is inconsistent with the MDRS height of 11 m. The height limit should be increased to 11 m. Considers the use of the word prohibited should be removed – given the RMA meaning of this.	Amend Condition 1 of the WIAL-1 Designation as follows: 1. Take-off and Approach Surfaces a. Specifications (...) b. Conditions i. With the exception of the properties identified in Figure 1 below, new objects or extensions of objects that penetrate the Take-off and Approach Surfaces and shall not exceed a height of 11m 8m above existing ground level, shall be prohibited except where the new object or extension is shielded by an existing immovable object, or the penetration is a temporary short term penetration (e.g. construction machinery or equipment) and that penetration has been approved by Wellington International Airport Limited. ii. With respect to the properties shown in Figure 1 below, new objects or extensions of objects that penetrate the take-off and approach surfaces and exceed the height limits specified in Figure 1 shall be prohibited, shall not exceed 11m , except where the new object or extension is shielded by an existing immovable object or the penetration is a temporary short term penetration (e.g. construction machinery or equipment) of these surfaces and that penetration has been approved by Wellington International Airport Limited.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.177	Part 3 / Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL1	Support	Considers that providing a maximum height of 11 m brings it in line with the MDRS.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.108	Part 3 / Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments as the changes will enable greater opportunities for residential intensification.	Allow
Yvonne Weeber	340.135	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL1	Amend	Considers that Figure 1 - The grey area of the plan needs to refer to a height area as there are "no higher than existing roof line". All the houses have been removed from the east side of Bridge Street next to the airport.	Amend Figure 1 - 'Designation WIAL1 Properties affected by specific height restrictions' in WIAL1 (Wellington Airport Obstacle Limitation Surfaces) to have a height indicated for the grey area (east side of bridge street next to the airport runway).
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.763	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL1	Support in part	Seeks amendments to conditions 1 of Designation WIAL 1 in order to provide greater clarity and information to assist with calculating OLS and associated maximum building heights. Considers the lack of clarity and certainty around height restrictions within Designation WIAL 1 place unnecessary cost and uncertainty on landowners and may inhibit full development potential on a site.	Seeks to include additional diagrams and detail in condition 1 of Designation WIAL 1 to provide more detail and clarity on height restrictions.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.764	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL1	Amend	Seeks amendments to conditions 1 of Designation WIAL 1 in order to provide greater clarity and information to assist with calculating OLS and associated maximum building heights. Considers the lack of clarity and certainty around height restrictions within Designation WIAL 1 place unnecessary cost and uncertainty on landowners and may inhibit full development potential on a site.	Seeks to include additional diagrams and detail in condition 1 of Designation WIAL 1 to provide more detail and clarity on height restrictions.
Guardians of the Bays	452.94	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL1	Amend	Considers Figure 1 – The grey area of the plan needs to refer to a height as the houses that were there have been removed and the standard “no higher than existing roof line’ no longer makes sense.	Seeks that Figure 1 of the Wellington International Airport Designation is amended to specify a height for the grey area (east side of bridge street next to the airport runway).
Yvonne Weeber	340.136	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL2	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guardians of the Bays	452.95	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL2	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on WIAL2. Please refer to the original submission.	Not specified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.137	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL3	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.96	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL3	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on WIAL3. Please refer to the original submission.	Not specified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.138	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL4	Support	The designation of the Main Site Area (WIAL4) is supported.	Retain WIAL4 (Wellington Airport Main Site Area) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.97	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL4	Support	Supports WIAL4 (Wellington Airport Main Site Area).	Retain WIAL4 (Wellington Airport Main Site Area) as notified.
Yvonne Weeber	340.139	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL5	Support	The designation of the East Site Area (WIAL5) is supported.	Retain WIAL5 (Wellington Airport East Side Area) as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.98	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL5	Support	Supports WIAL5 (Wellington Airport East Side Area).	Retain WIAL5 (Wellington Airport East Side Area) as notified.
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.9	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL Conditions 5	Oppose	Considers that the condition is inconsistent with the East Side Precinct direction overview which states that car parking is limited to temporary relocation only.	Opposes WIAL Conditions 5 (Airport Purposes Designation - East Side Area) and seeks amendment.
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.10	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL Conditions 5	Amend	Considers that the condition is inconsistent with the East Side Precinct direction overview which states that car parking is limited to temporary relocation only.	Amend WIAL Conditions 5 (Airport Purposes Designation - East Side Area) as follows: The designation shall cover the area shown in Attachment 1 ("the ESA Designation"). Subject to the conditions set out below, land within the ESA Designation may be used for activities for the operation of Wellington International Airport ("the Airport"), limited to the following: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary Car parking, roads, accessways, pedestrian ways, stormwater and wastewater infrastructure, sustainable infrastructure, utility activities and security fencing; • All demolition (if required), construction and earthworks activities, including associated structures; • Landscaping, planting, tracks and trails; • Ancillary activities, buildings and structures related to the above; and • Servicing, testing and maintenance activities related to the above.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.241	Part 3 / Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL Conditions 5	Oppose	The Main Site and East Side Area Designations are not subject to amendment as part of the Proposed Plan review. This submission should therefore be struck out.	Disallow

Appendices

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.11	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL Conditions 5	Support	Support clause 32 (Noise Compliance Monitoring). Considers that with the movement of the Noise "Compliance Line" further East than the original Air Noise Boundary across the Golf Course and the need to ensure tight Noise Compliance for nearby residents, that provision for an additional noise monitor in the defined area is justified.	Retain clause 32 of CONDITIONS 5 of the Wellington International Airport Limited designation as notified.
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.12	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL Conditions 5	Support	Supports clause 40 (Noise Mitigation Measures). Considers that noise experienced by nearby residents will commence from the beginning of construction work which is the largest earthworks, retaining and tarmac provision in the East since the original Airport construction in the 1950's. From the commencement of Code C aircraft operations were originally set down to trigger the Mitigation Measures but the current wording now includes mitigation measures prior to the commencement of construction work which we support.	Retain clause 40 of CONDITIONS 5 of the Wellington International Airport Limited designation as notified.
Strathmore Park Residents Association Inc	371.13	Designations / Wellington International Airport Limited / WIAL Conditions 5	Support	Support clause 47 (Lapse). Note that the ESA lapse period was earlier requested to be 15 years. In view of the uncertainty of the impact of COVID-19, Climate Change, public reaction to long haul wide bodied jet travel, move toward quieter and/or electric engine aircraft development and the impact of earthworks & construction on WIAL's Carbonisation objectives (ref. Clause 48) we support the shorter lapse period of 10 years which will also be in line with the statutory District Plan review period.	Retain clause 47 of CONDITIONS 5 of the Wellington International Airport Limited designation as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.323	Designations / Greater Wellington Regional Council / General WRC	Support	Support the retention of the designations.	Retain the WRC (Greater Wellington Regional Council) Designation chapter as notified.
Rod Halliday	25.46	Designations / Greater Wellington Regional Council / WRC2	Support	Supports the purpose of the WRC2 designation (Seton Nossiter flood detention area) as a flood detention area.	Retain WRC2.
Rod Halliday	25.47	Designations / Greater Wellington Regional Council / WRC2	Amend	Considers that the WRC2 designation (Seton Nossiter flood detention area) is designed to hold a 1 in 100 year event as per the on-site information boards. [Refer to original submission for on-site information board attachment].	Seeks that the WRC2 designation (Seton Nossiter flood detention area) is updated with wording to reflect the designation is designed to hold a 1 in 100 year event as per the on-site information boards.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.324	Designations / Greater Wellington Regional Council / WRC2	Support in part	The submitter notes that the development and residential intensification proposed upstream and downstream of Seton Nossiter Dam will affect its level of service. While we acknowledge the hydraulic neutrality provisions in the Three Waters chapter, any new development will still affect the dam.	Retain Designation WRC2 (Seton Nossiter flood detention area) as notified.
Rod Halliday	25.48	Designations / Greater Wellington Regional Council / WRC6	Amend	Considers that the designation is incorrectly mapped in the operative District Plan and the PDP carries this error over.	Seeks that the WRC6 designation (Stebbing's Valley Flood Detention Dam) is re-modelled and re-mapped based on the easement or correct 92m contour, and that this takes into account the changes to ground levels as a result of approved earthworks.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.325	Designations / Greater Wellington Regional Council / WRC6	Support in part	The submitter notes that the development and residential intensification proposed upstream and downstream of Stebbings Valley Dam will affect its level of service. While we acknowledge the hydraulic neutrality provisions in the Three Waters chapter, any new development will still affect the dam and associated infrastructure.	Retain Designation WRC6 (Stebbing's Valley Flood Detention Dam) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.36	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support in part	Supports APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes and considers these advice notes are a useful source of advice and further information for various aspects of heritage.	Retain APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes with amendments.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.37	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Amend	Considers that it is common practice (and is a requirement for archaeological authorities under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act) that tangata whenua are notified in the event of any discovery which may be of Māori origin.	Amend the end of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga and Accidental Discovery section in APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes to include the following: ... The Police will also need to be notified if any koiwi/human remains are revealed and if any artifacts/taonga tūturu are found the Ministry for Culture and Heritage must be notified. <u>Where the discovery is of Māori origin the relevant iwi representatives will need to be notified.</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.12	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support	The submitter seeks for APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes to include the following: Where the discovery is of Māori origin the relevant iwi representatives will need to be notified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because relevant iwi representatives should be notified when discoveries are of Māori origin. It is important for discovery processes are to be outlined in the plan and for awareness to be spread about the issue.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.169	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Amend	Considers in the 'ICOMOS NZ Charter and other policy documents and guidelines' section of APP1 (Historic Heritage Advice Notes), the final sentence is long and confusing and required clarification.	Amend APP1 (Historic Heritage Advice Notes) as follows: ICOMOS NZ Charter and other policy documents and guidelines (...) These documents provide important references in identifying and protecting heritage, and in the resource consent process including for the assessment of environmental effects. <u>These documents provide important references in identifying and protecting heritage. They also contribute to the assessment of environmental effects within resource consent processes.</u>
Wellington City Council	266.170	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Amend	Considers in the 'Conservation plans' section of APP1, a conservation plan is incorrectly defined as a method, which is inconsistent with its true meaning. The definition should be rephrased to match the definition in the "ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value".	Append APP1 (Historic and Heritage Advice Notes) as follows: (...) Conservation Plans A conservation plan is a method of managing the cultural significance of a place of cultural heritage value. <u>A Conservation Plan is an objective report which documents the history, fabric, and cultural heritage value of a place, assesses its cultural heritage significance, describes the condition of the place, outlines conservation policies for managing the place, and makes recommendations for the conservation of the place.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.50	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support	Revised description of the purpose of a conservation plan is preferable to the wording as notified.	Allow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.35	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.82	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP1 Historic Heritage Advice Notes	Support	Support the mention of the ICOMOS Charter and HNZPT Sustainable Management series here.	Retain reference to ICOMOS Charter in APP1 as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.115	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support in part	<p>Considers the Plan includes the defined term 'biodiversity offsetting' so the Appendix should use consistent language. Considers the reference to Policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) may be incorrect and the management hierarchy is actually set out in Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas).</p> <p>Considers that the policy framework and APP2 (Biodiversity offsetting) (should apply biodiversity offsetting to residual adverse effects that are more than minor. Some amendments are appropriate to align APP2 to the approach adopted in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan.</p>	Retain APP2 - Biodiversity Offsetting with amendment.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.13	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Oppose	Transpower support the proposed framework of principles for the use of biodiversity offsets, which is in line with the guidance document "Biodiversity Offsetting under the Resource Management Act"	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	228.116	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Amend	<p>Considers the Plan includes the defined term 'biodiversity offsetting' so the Appendix should use consistent language. Considers the reference to Policy ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) may be incorrect and the management hierarchy is actually set out in Policy ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas). The policy framework and APP2 (Biodiversity offsetting) (should apply biodiversity offsetting to residual adverse effects that are more than minor. Some amendments are appropriate to align APP2 to the approach adopted in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan.</p>	<p>Amend APP2 - Biodiversity Offsetting, in the following (or similar) way:</p> <p>The following sets out a framework of principles for the use of biodiversity <u>offsetting</u> offsets. Principles must be complied with for an action to qualify as a biodiversity offset. These principles will be used when assessing the adequacy of proposals for the design and implementation of offsetting as part of resource consent applications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adherence to the effects management hierarchy: The proposed biodiversity offset will be assessed in accordance with the management hierarchy set out in ECO-P1, ECO-P2. It should only be contemplated after the management hierarchy steps in ECO-P1, ECO-P2 have been demonstrated to have been sequentially exhausted. Any proposal for a biodiversity offset will demonstrate how it addresses the <u>more than minor</u> residual adverse effects of the activity. Limits to offsetting: Many biodiversity values cannot be offset and if they are adversely affected then they will be permanently lost. These situations include where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Residual adverse effects cannot be offset because of the irreplaceability or vulnerability of the indigenous biodiversity affected or there is no appropriate offset site; There are no technically feasible or socially acceptable options or <u>no appropriate site, knowledge, proven methods, expertise or mechanism available to design and implement an adequate biodiversity offset options</u> by which to secure gains within acceptable timeframes; and Effects on indigenous biodiversity are uncertain, unknown or little understood, but potential effects are significantly adverse. ...
Meridian Energy Limited	228.117	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Amend	Considers clarification of the expression 'trading up' is required.	Clarify the expression 'trading up' in APP2 - Biodiversity Offsetting.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.36	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 2 Biodiversity Offsetting as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.397	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support in part	<p>Supports the provisions of APP2, except as set out below.</p> <p>Support the mandatory requirement that any offset proposal must comply with the principles in APP2</p>	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.398	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support in part	Limits to offsetting: we generally support this principle. This is a crucial principle, given the risks and uncertainties associated with offsetting. As such, it is very important that this principle is as clear as possible. The wording must avoid any argument that offsetting is available, even where there is irreplaceable or vulnerable biodiversity affected.	Amend APP2 (Biodiversity offsetting): 2. Limits to offsetting: biodiversity offsetting is not available, and the activity causing the residual adverse effects must be avoided where: Many biodiversity values cannot be offset and if they are adversely affected then they will be permanently lost. These situations include where: a. The biodiversity affected by the residual adverse effects is irreplaceable or vulnerable; b. Residual adverse effects cannot be offset because of the irreplaceability or vulnerability of the indigenous biodiversity affected or there is no appropriate offset site; c. There are no technically feasible or socially acceptable options by which to secure gains within acceptable timeframes; and d. Effects on indigenous biodiversity are uncertain, unknown or little understood, but potential effects are significantly adverse.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.169	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Oppose	Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.116, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.399	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support in part	Long-term outcomes: we query the last clause of this principle: 'including through the use of adaptive management where necessary'. This is an unusual addition to this principle, and in our view it may increase the uncertainty inherent in offsetting, that an overall ecologically positive outcome will be achieved. As such, we oppose the inclusion of these words.	Amend APP2 (Biodiversity offsetting): 7. Long-term outcomes: The biodiversity offset must be managed to secure outcomes of the activity that last at least as long as the impacts, and preferably in perpetuity, including through the use of adaptive management where necessary.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.170	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Oppose	Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.116, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.400	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support in part	Supports in principle, but a requirement to "minimise" delay between loss and gains is unclear and inadequate to ensure good indigenous biodiversity outcomes. There will be a plethora of views about when time lags have been "minimised" or minimised enough. Ecologically, the longer the time lag between the loss and gains the less likely the outcome will be positive to achieve a net gain. In addition, delay increases risk that the offset will not be provided at all. Ideally an offset would be initiated before the loss occurs so that it gets a 'head start'. Sometimes, however, this may not be feasible, for example if the offset site would be impacted by the activity it is offsetting. The Otago Regional Policy Statement provides one way of overcoming these issues but avoiding the uncertainty of a principle requiring minimisation. It requires that the offset be time delay is the least necessary to deliver the best possible biodiversity outcome, or at most the term of the resource consent. This approach has merit but misses that some resource consents will not have a specific term. As such, a final backstop is required.	Amend APP2 (Biodiversity offsetting): 8. Time lags: The delay between loss of indigenous biodiversity at the impact site and gain or maturity of indigenous biodiversity at the offset site must be minimised <u>the shortest necessary to achieve the best possible biodiversity outcome and must not exceed the consent period or 35 years, whichever is shorter</u> so that gains are achieved within the consent period and <u>Any time lag must be identified within the biodiversity offset management plan.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.171	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Oppose	Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.116, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.401	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support in part	Considers trading up is not appropriate to include in offsetting principles. It is contrary to the requirement that the offset is like for like. It is not an accepted offsetting principle, although may be appropriate for compensation. We seek that this principle is deleted from APP2.	Amend APP2 (Biodiversity offsetting): 9. Trading up: When trading up forms part of an offset, the proposal must demonstrate that the indigenous biodiversity values gained are demonstrably of higher value than those lost, and the values lost are not indigenous taxa that are listed as Threatened, At risk or Data deficient in the New Zealand Threat Classification System lists, or considered vulnerable or irreplaceable.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.172	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Oppose	Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.116, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.402	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support in part	Considers this principle needs minor amendments to be clear and effective.	Amend APP2 (Biodiversity offsetting): 11. Proposing a biodiversity offset: A proposed biodiversity offset must include a specific biodiversity offset management plan, that: a. Sets out baseline information on the indigenous biodiversity that is potentially impacted by the proposed activity at both the donor and recipient sites, and b. Demonstrates how the requirements set out in this schedule <u>are met, and how they will be carried out, and</u> c. Identifies the monitoring approach that will be used to demonstrate how the principles set out in this schedule will be fulfilled over an appropriate timeframe <u>in accordance with the principles set out above.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.173	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Oppose	Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.116, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.326	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of APP2 – Biodiversity Offsetting	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.327	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Amend	Consider it should state the long-term outcome must be at least a 10 percent biodiversity gain or benefit to have regard to Policy 24 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to amend to require that that biodiversity offsets shall provide at least a 10 percent net biodiversity gain.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.174	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Oppose	Meridian opposes the requested requirement for a +10% net biodiversity gain.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.328	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Amend	Consider it should state the long-term outcome must be at least a 10 percent biodiversity gain or benefit to have regard to Policy 24 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks the appendix should set out the limitations where biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.175	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Oppose	Meridian opposes the requested requirement for a +10% net biodiversity gain. The submission does not detail the wording proposed for setting out the limitations on biodiversity offsetting.	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.515	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support	Considers biodiversity offsetting to be a less-than-ideal solution, the reality is that it will be necessary at times, and these principles ensure that environmental damage will be minimised.	Retain APP2 (Biodiversity Offsetting) as notified.
Paul Blaschke	FS129.11	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support	Support submission points made by a significant number of individuals and groups that essentially support the same proposition "Reinstate the overlay of all properly delineated SNAs or part SNAs on all relevant residential zoned properties".	Allow
Director-General of Conservation	385.84	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Support	Supports the proposed framework of principles for the use of biodiversity offsets, which is in line with the guidance document "Biodiversity Offsetting under the Resource Management Act".	Retain APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting as notified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.134	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP2 Biodiversity Offsetting	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there is awareness of the impending National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. [Inferred decision requested]
Meridian Energy Limited	228.118	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Amend	Considers clarification of the expression 'trading up' is required.	Clarify the expression 'trading up' in APP3 - Biodiversity Compensation.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	228.119	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Support in part	The reference to Policy ECO-P2 may be incorrect and the management hierarchy is actually set out in Policy ECO-P1. The policy framework and APP3 should allow consideration of biodiversity compensation where necessary to address residual adverse effects that are more than minor. Some amendments are appropriate to align APP3 to the approach adopted in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan.	Retain APP3-Biodiversity Compensation with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.120	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Amend	The reference to Policy ECO-P2 may be incorrect and the management hierarchy is actually set out in Policy ECO-P1. The policy framework and APP3 should allow consideration of biodiversity compensation where necessary to address residual adverse effects that are more than minor. Some amendments are appropriate to align APP3 to the approach adopted in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan.	Amend APP3-Biodiversity Compensation as follows (or similar): The following sets out a framework of principles for the use of biodiversity compensation. Principles must be complied with for an action to qualify as biodiversity compensation. 1. Adherence to effects management hierarchy: Biodiversity compensation is a commitment to redress residual adverse effects <u>that are more than minor</u> . It must only be contemplated after the management hierarchy steps in <u>ECO-P1</u> ECO-P2 have been demonstrated to have been sequentially exhausted and thus applies only to residual adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity <u>that are more than minor</u> . 2. Limits to biodiversity compensation: In deciding whether biodiversity compensation is appropriate, a decision-maker must consider the principle that many indigenous biodiversity values are not able to be compensated for because: a. The indigenous biodiversity affected is irreplaceable or vulnerable; b. There are no technically feasible or socially acceptable options or no <u>appropriate site, knowledge, proven methods, expertise or mechanism available to design and implement an adequate biodiversity offset options</u> by which to secure gains within acceptable timeframes; and ...
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.37	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 3 Biodiversity Compensation as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.403	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Support in part	Opposes the use of compensation as a management approach for indigenous biodiversity. As such, we seek the deletion of this Appendix, and the provisions elsewhere in the Plan providing for compensation.	Delete APP3 (Biodiversity compensation).
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.38	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	Transpower supports the recognition of compensation and the provision of schedule APP3.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.176	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	Considers that biodiversity compensation is a valid response, endorsed by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity and numerous Environment Court decisions. Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.120, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of APP3. Disallow the requested amendments to APP3.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.404	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Support in part	However, if compensation is to be retained, we support the mandatory application of principles to its use, and support this appendix, with the exception of the below comments. Pōtai: query why the pōtai is different from the offset appendix.	Amend APP3 (Biodiversity compensation): Pōtai:... <u>These principles will be used when assessing the adequacy of proposals for the design and implementation of offsetting as part of resource consent applications.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.177	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	Considers that biodiversity compensation is a valid response, endorsed by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity and numerous Environment Court decisions. Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.120, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of APP3. Disallow the requested amendments to APP3.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.405	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Support in part	<p>However, if compensation is to be retained, we support the mandatory application of principles to its use, and support this appendix, with the exception of the below comments.</p> <p>Limits to biodiversity compensation: again, this is a crucial principle, and must be absolutely clear. The drafting of this principle includes a confusing standard of appropriateness, as well as a direction to 'consider the principle'. The 'limits to offsetting' principle is intended to operate as a simple limit, if certain features are present. Incorporating a test of appropriateness defeats the purpose of the principle, which is to set out situations where compensation simply won't be available. It is also not something to simply be 'considered', it is a test that must be met is compensation is allowed. The reason this principle exists is to safeguard against some of the worst outcomes that can be associated with compensation –because compensation is an uncertain management approach, the limits to compensation principle puts a line in the sand, and says that some things are too precious to apply this approach to. It 'bites' as a prior step, before compensation can even be considered. The amended wording below avoids an argument that a value can still be offset, despite its irreplaceable or vulnerable status. In our experience, this is an argument that consent applicants will use when the wording of the 'limits to offsetting' principle is drafted along the lines of the current wording. As such, we seek the following amendments:</p>	<p>Amend APP3 (Biodiversity compensation):</p> <p>2. Limits to biodiversity compensation: In deciding whether biodiversity compensation is appropriate, a decision maker must consider the principle that many indigenous biodiversity values are not able to be compensated for because biodiversity compensation is not available, and the activity causing the residual adverse effects must be avoided where:</p>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.178	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	<p>Considers that biodiversity compensation is a valid response, endorsed by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity and numerous Environment Court decisions. Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.120, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of APP3.</p> <p>Disallow the requested amendments to APP3.</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.406	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Support in part	<p>However, if compensation is to be retained, we support the mandatory application of principles to its use, and support this appendix, with the exception of the below comments.</p> <p>Scale of biodiversity compensation: in general we support this principle, but it needs amendment to ensure it is consistent with Council's obligation to maintain indigenous biodiversity. That obligation requires no net loss of biodiversity, rather than the vague standard of 'proportionality'.</p>	<p>Amend APP3 (Biodiversity compensation):</p> <p>3. Scale of biodiversity compensation: The values to be lost through the activity to which the biodiversity compensation applies must be addressed by positive effects to indigenous biodiversity that are proportionate to the adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity. <u>There must be at least no net loss of indigenous biodiversity values as between the values lost through the activity and the values gained through the biodiversity compensation.</u></p>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.179	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	<p>Considers that biodiversity compensation is a valid response, endorsed by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity and numerous Environment Court decisions. Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.120, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of APP3.</p> <p>Disallow the requested amendments to APP3.</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.407	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Support in part	<p>However, if compensation is to be retained, we support the mandatory application of principles to its use, and support this appendix, with the exception of the below comments.</p> <p>Time lags: we seek amendments for the reasons set out in relation to APP2 above. We seek the following amendment:</p>	<p>Amend APP3 (Biodiversity compensation):</p> <p>7. Time lags: The delay between loss of indigenous biodiversity at the impact site and gain or maturity of indigenous biodiversity at the compensation site must be minimised <u>the shortest necessary to achieve the best possible biodiversity outcome and must not exceed the consent period or 35 years whichever is shorter, so that gains are achieved within the consent period and Any time lag must be identified within the biodiversity offset management plan.</u></p>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.180	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	<p>Considers that biodiversity compensation is a valid response, endorsed by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity and numerous Environment Court decisions. Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.120, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of APP3.</p> <p>Disallow the requested amendments to APP3.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.408	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Support in part	However, if compensation is to be retained, we support the mandatory application of principles to its use, and support this appendix, with the exception of the below comments. Proposing biodiversity compensation: we seek a new principle to replicate principle 11 of APP2.	Amend APP3 (Biodiversity compensation) to add new principle: <u>10. Proposing a biodiversity offset: A proposed biodiversity offset must include a specific biodiversity offset management plan, that:</u> <u>a. Sets out baseline information on the indigenous biodiversity that is potentially impacted by the proposed activity at both the donor and recipient sites, and</u> <u>b. Demonstrates how the requirements set out in this schedule will be carried out, and</u> <u>c. Identifies the monitoring approach that will be used to demonstrate how the principles set out in this schedule will be fulfilled over an appropriate timeframe.</u>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.181	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Oppose	Considers that biodiversity compensation is a valid response, endorsed by the exposure draft NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity and numerous Environment Court decisions. Meridian considers the wording amendments proposed by its submission point 228.120, refined where necessary to give effect to the NPS-Indigenous Biodiversity (when that is gazetted), more appropriately give effect to the RMA and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow / Disallow the requested deletion of APP3. Disallow the requested amendments to APP3.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.329	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to principle 3. The positive effects offered should outweigh the adverse effects incurred. This recognises the inherent risks and uncertainty of compensation, thus aiming for an overall net gain from the exchange (though not in the strict technical sense of offsetting as these are like-for-unlike exchanges). This approach would align with that suggested in the definition for biodiversity compensation provided in this plan (see comment above) and with the approach taken in the NRP and in the in the NPS-IB exposure draft	Seeks to amend principle 3 (Scale of biodiversity compensation:) to: 2. Scale of biodiversity compensation: The values to be lost through the activity to which the biodiversity compensation applies must be addressed by positive effects to indigenous biodiversity that are proportionate to <u>outweigh</u> the adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.330	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Amend	Principle 8 is redundant for managing biodiversity compensation exchanges as it essentially just specifies what the limits of biodiversity compensation are. Compensation exchanges are always like for unlike.	Seeks to delete principle 8 (Trading up).
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.331	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Amend	Considers that principle 2 should be amended to incorporate direction from principle 8 into the limits of offsetting under the Plan	Amend principle 2 (Limits to biodiversity compensation) to: 2. Limits to biodiversity compensation: In deciding whether biodiversity compensation is appropriate, a decision-maker must consider the principle that many indigenous biodiversity values are not able to be compensated for because: a. The indigenous biodiversity affected is irreplaceable or vulnerable; <u>ba. The values lost are not indigenous taxa that are listed as Threatened, At-risk or Data deficient in the New Zealand Threat Classification System lists;</u> b. There are no technically...".
Director-General of Conservation	385.85	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP3 Biodiversity Compensation	Support	Supports the proposed framework of principles for the use of biodiversity compensation, which is in line with the guidance document "Biodiversity Offsetting under the Resource Management Act".	Retain APP3 Biodiversity Compensation as notified.
Wellington City Council	266.171	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Amend	Considers it necessary to amend Table 19 of Appendix 4 (Permitted Noise Standards) to increase the permitted noise levels in the Open Space Zone and Sport/Active Recreation Zones so that sports events can occur on Sundays without unnecessary noise restrictions. Considers allowing 55 dB LAeq (15 mins) until 10pm is a pragmatic way to allow for higher daytime and evening noise levels for recreational activity.	Amend Table 19 by replacing it with table provided in full submission. [Refer to original submission, including detailed table attached]
Wellington City Council	266.172	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Amend	Considers there is a type in Table 19 (no 'd' at the end of receive)	Amend the title of Table 19 in Appendix 4 - Permitted Noise Standards as follows: Noise emitted from activities within the Town Belt Zone, Natural Open Space Zone, Open Space Zone, Sport and Active Recreation Zone as received in other areas (any Residential Zone, Town Belt Zone, Natural Open Space Zone, Open Space Zone, and Sport and Active Recreation Zone) must not exceed the following limits.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.38	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 4 Permitted Noise Standards as notified.
Steve Dunn	288.13	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Amend	Considers that there is a cumulative effect of increased noise on the local community from emergency aircraft using the rooftop of Wellington Regional Hospital as well as ventilation.	Seeks that noise standards or measures are added to manage noise from emergency aircraft on top of Wellington Regional Hospital
Steve Dunn	288.14	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Amend	Considers that there is a cumulative effect of increased noise on the local community from emergency aircraft using the rooftop of Wellington Regional Hospital as well as ventilation.	Seeks that ambient noise levels are regulated and enforced [inferred around Wellington Regional Hospital] to give added protection from noise and ensure the local community is not affected.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.94	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Amend	<p>Considers that APP4 should be amended to provide more clarity on the terminology of zones used. It is assumed that reference to noise emitted from “the Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones” within Table 15 – APP4, Table 16 – APP4, Table 17 – APP4, Table 18 – APP4 is encompassing of all of the Centres Zones (being the City Centre, Metropolitan Centre, Local Centre and Neighbourhood Centre Zones) as well as the Commercial Zone and a Mixed-Use Zone. This clarification is sought as the PDP as notified otherwise does not include standards for the Centre Zones and proposes the creation of both a Commercial Zone and a Mixed-Use Zone within the broader umbrella of Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones.</p> <p>It is noted that the use of emergency generators is expressly exempt from compliance however this is limited to generators operated by emergency services or lifeline utilities, or for the continuation of radiocommunication broadcasts. It is considered that the proposed exclusion could be comfortably extended to include emergency use by supermarkets given the essential role they play as community infrastructure in crises, for example making sure there is access to refrigerated food during storm events.</p>	Amend Appendix 4 - Permitted Noise Standards to clarify the terminology of zones used in Tables 15, 16, 17 and 18.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.155	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Support	APP4 is supported as it includes noise limits for activities contained within a single zone and separate standards for activities generated in one zone but received in another.	Retain Appendix 4 - Permitted Noise Standards as notified.
CentrePort Limited	402.211	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Amend	Alterations to Table 20 are required to comply with the methodology in NZS 6809:1999 (Port Noise Standard).	Amend Table 20 in APP4 Permitted Noise Standards as per submission. [Refer to original submission for changes sought to Table 20 in APP4].
CentrePort Limited	402.212	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Support	Support the intent of this standard subject to the alterations to Table 20 which are required to comply with the methodology in NZS 6809:1999 (Port Noise Standard).	Amend Table 20 in APP4 Permitted Noise Standards as per submission. [Refer to original submission for changes sought to Table 20 in APP4].
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.548	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Oppose	Opposes APP4 Permitted Noise Standards. [See paragraphs 4.70 and 4.74 of original submission for full reason]	Delete Table 21 in APP4 in it's entirety.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.163	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.60	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Amend	Considers that it is unclear why the plan has two different noise levels for night time in residential receiving environments.	Clarify the LAEQ and LAFmax noise levels for night time in residential zones. [Inferred decision requested].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.61	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP4 Permitted Noise Standards	Not specified	Considers that noise levels up to 85 decibels is questionable in a public space. It is important in public spaces, even in industrial zones, to not have dangerous noise levels.	Not specified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.39	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP5 Fixed Plant Noise Standards	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 5 Fixed Plant Noise Standards as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.40	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP6 Permitted Noise Standards for Temporary Activities	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 6 Permitted Noise Standards for Temporary Activities as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.45	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP6 Permitted Noise Standards for Temporary Activities	Oppose in part	Considers that NZDF has developed bespoke noise standards with respect to TMTA (refer to Attachment 3) that NZDF is seeking to be included in every district plan throughout the country, and requests these standards be included in the District Plan. The standards have been specifically developed by NZDF to manage the particular noise characteristics of TMTA (as outlined in Attachment 4). The standards provide appropriate controls to manage noise effects from TMTA (which include minimum separation distances and peak sound levels for both daytime and nighttime periods), as well as having a standard practice of informing affected landowners and occupiers of properties. Based on these control methods, adverse noise effects in any zone can be appropriately mitigated.	Opposes the noise standards in Table 26 – APP6: Noise standards for temporary military training activities as notified.
New Zealand Defence Force	423.46	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP6 Permitted Noise Standards for Temporary Activities	Amend	Considers that NZDF has developed bespoke noise standards with respect to TMTA that NZDF is seeking to be included in every district plan throughout the country, and requests these standards be included in the District Plan. The standards have been specifically developed by NZDF to manage the particular noise characteristics of TMTA (as outlined in Attachment 4). The standards provide appropriate controls to manage noise effects from TMTA (which include minimum separation distances and peak sound levels for both daytime and nighttime periods), as well as having a standard practice of informing affected landowners and occupiers of properties. Based on these control methods, adverse noise effects in any zone can be appropriately mitigated.	Seeks that Table 26 – APP6: Noise standards for temporary military training activities is amended to be replaced with the standard in Attachment 3 of the original submission.
Nick Ruane	61.3	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP7 Temporary Activities Event Management Plan	Amend	Inferred support for the requirements of the Temporary Activities Event Management Plan.	Retain Appendix 7 - Temporary Activities Event Management Plan. [Inferred decision requested]
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.41	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP7 Temporary Activities Event Management Plan	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 7 Temporary Activities Event Management Plan as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.135	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP7 Temporary Activities Event Management Plan	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Schedule 7 is amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City."
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.70	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP7 Temporary Activities Event Management Plan	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.136	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP7 Temporary Activities Event Management Plan	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Appendix 7 is amend to remove any other references to iwi. [Inferred decision requested]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.71	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP7 Temporary Activities Event Management Plan	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.42	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP8 Quantitative Wind Study and Qualitative Wind Assessment – Modelling and Reporting Requirements	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 8 Quantitative Wind Study and Qualitative Wind Assessment – Modelling and Reporting Requirements as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.43	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP9 City Centre Zone & Special Purpose Waterfront Zone – Minimum Sunlight Access and Wind Comfort Control – Public Space Requirements	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 9 City Centre Zone & Special Purpose Waterfront Zone – Minimum Sunlight Access and Wind Comfort Control – Public Space Requirements as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.44	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.332	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Support	Supports the requirement for masterplans for the Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi User Ferry Precinct and recognition in the draft Plan of the need to enhance access by active modes and public transport and to ensure good transport network integration.	Retain Appendix 10 (Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements) as notified.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.117	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Support in part	Appendix 10 is generally supported as it provides an essential outline of what needs to be considered in relation to any developments in these areas. It is essential that use and development in these two precincts are subject to very careful control over time. It is understood that a masterplan is to be prepared for the Inner Harbour Port Precinct and a plan change carried out before substantial development can take place. However, an amendment is sought in relation to the Multi-user Ferry Precinct.	Retain Appendix 10 - Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements, with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.118	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Amend	Considers that Appendix 10 should recognised that the Multi-user Ferry Precinct is the main gateway to the central city. This fact should become a consideration when assessing any development proposals for the area.	Amend Appendix 10 - Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements as follows: ... Appendix 10-B: Multi-User Ferry Precinct requirements ... 7. Provide a mana whenua engagement plan and either a Cultural Impact Assessment, a Cultural Values report or an assessment prepared by mana whenua. 8. Demonstrates recognition that the Precinct is in a key gateway position at the entrance to the City Centre from passenger railways, from cycleways, from State Highway 1 and from the harbour, and provides layout and design which does not detract from, and, if practical, contributes to, recognition and celebration of this position.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.137	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Appendix 10-A is amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City."
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.72	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.138	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Appendix 10-B is amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City."
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.73	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
CentrePort Limited	402.213	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Support in part	Appendix 10-A: Inner Harbour Port Precinct requirements - This set of requirements are generally supported however there is no reference to the scale of the activity or structure proposed. The first line should have the words 'that is required' added to reflect this, noting submission points in relation to the rules that apply to the Inner Harbour Port Precinct. In relation to the clause 1 this would be improved with the addition of a reference to the Coastal Marine Area noting that there are complimentary provisions in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan concerning heritage listed wharf structures that directly adjoin the precinct.	Retain Appendix 10-A: Inner Harbour Port Precinct requirements, with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.214	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Amend	Appendix 10-A: Inner Harbour Port Precinct requirements - This set of requirements are generally supported however there is no reference to the scale of the activity or structure proposed. The first line should have the words 'that is required' added to reflect this, noting submission points in relation to the rules that apply to the Inner Harbour Port Precinct. In relation to the clause 1 this would be improved with the addition of a reference to the Coastal Marine Area noting that there are complimentary provisions in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan concerning heritage listed wharf structures that directly adjoin the precinct.	Amend Appendix 10-A: Inner Harbour Port Precinct requirements as follows: Any application <u>that is required</u> for development must: 1. Contribute to the compatibility of existing and future activities, buildings and public space within the site and integrate with the transport network and adjacent sites, particularly at interfaces with the Waterfront Zone, City Centre Zone, and Commercial Port and <u>activities within the coastal marine area</u>
CentrePort Limited	402.215	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Support in part	Appendix 10-B: Multi-User Ferry Precinct requirements - This set of requirements are generally supported however there is no reference to the scale of the activity or structure proposed. The first line should have the words 'that is required' added to reflect this, noting submission points in relation to the rules that apply to the Inner Harbour Port Precinct.	Retain Appendix 10-B: Multi-User Ferry Precinct requirements, with amendment.
CentrePort Limited	402.216	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP10 Inner Harbour Port Precinct and Multi-User Ferry Precinct Requirements	Amend	Appendix 10-B: Multi-User Ferry Precinct requirements - This set of requirements are generally supported however there is no reference to the scale of the activity or structure proposed. The first line should have the words 'that is required' added to reflect this, noting submission points in relation to the rules that apply to the Inner Harbour Port Precinct.	Amend Appendix 10-B: Multi-User Ferry Precinct requirements as follows: Any application <u>that is required</u> for development must:
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.45	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP11 Kilbirnie Bus Barns Development Plan	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 11 Kilbirnie Bus Barns Development Plan as notified.
Bus Barn Ltd	FS95.1	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart /Appendices / APP11 Kilbirnie Bus Barns Development Plan	Oppose	The original submission proposed by Claire et al seeks to retain the bus barn provisions as notified. Bus Barn Ltd seeks to modify this provision as outlined in their submission.	Disallow / Retain the Kilbirnie Bus Barn Development, as modified by the Bus Barn Limited submission
Waka Kotahi	370.453	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP11 Kilbirnie Bus Barns Development Plan	Support in part	Appendix 11 is supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain APP11 - Kilbirnie Bus Barns Development Plan and seeks amendment.
Bus Barn Ltd	FS95.2	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart /Appendices / APP11 Kilbirnie Bus Barns Development Plan	Oppose	The submission provided by Waka Kotahi states that pedestrian linkages must go through the site. Bus Barn Limited considers that this does not allow for any flexibility within the design which may restrict safe and cohesive pedestrian linkages. The provision within DEV1-APP-R7 as it stands allows for this flexibility.	Disallow / Retain the provision DEV1-APP-R7 as originally proposed

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Bus Barn Ltd	FS95.3	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart /Appendices / APP11 Kilbirnie Bus Barns Development Plan	Oppose	The submission provided by Waka Kotahi states that pedestrian linkages must go through the site. Bus Barn Limited considers that this does not allow for any flexibility within the design which may restrict safe and cohesive pedestrian linkages. The provision within DEV1-APP-R7 as it stands allows for this flexibility.	Disallow / Retain the provision DEV1-APP-R7 as originally proposed
Waka Kotahi	370.454	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP11 Kilbirnie Bus Barns Development Plan	Amend	Considers that pedestrian linkages through the Bus Barn area should be a non-negotiable to enable a well connected transport route.	Amend DEV1-APP-R7 of APP11 - Kilbirnie Bus Barns Development Plan as follows: <p>☐ A public, mid-block pedestrian and vehicular link shall be provided to connect Onepu Road and Ross Street, and to provide access to commercial and residential units as indicated in the Development Plan.</p> <p>The layout and design of the internal road and pedestrian link shall be in general accordance with the Concept Plan, but depending on the final design and layout of development on the site it may not be possible to provide 'active edges' strictly in accordance with District Plan definition along the full length of the internal road. Access into and from the site shall be confined to the points indicated on the concept plan in order to ensure traffic, cyclist, and pedestrian safety and efficiency.</p>
Rod Halliday	25.49	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Not specified	Not opposed to the provision of a new school of 3ha in DEV2-APP-R2 (School site) provided two clarifications are sought.	Not specified.
Rod Halliday	25.50	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Amend	Considers that the land provided for the new school of 3ha in DEV2-APP-R2 (School site) should be purchased by the Ministry of Education.	Amend DEV2-APP-R2 (School site) to include that the land would need to be purchased by the Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education	FS52.1	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Oppose	The Ministry of Education wishes to oppose Sub No/Point No 25.50 as it seeks to change the requirements for the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area. The Ministry fully supports the identification of a new school in this area to support the future population growth that is envisaged. However, the requirement that the Ministry should purchase the land of 3ha which must be set aside for schools under DEV2-APP-R2 as a District Plan matter is opposed.	Disallow
Rod Halliday	25.51	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Amend	Considers that the requirement for the land provided for the new school in DEV2-APP-R2 (School site) to be flat will be difficult and expensive.	Clarify DEV-APP-R2 (School site) to include that the land for the new school may be handed over in original form and allow the Ministry of Education to obtain earthworks consents as a designating authority.
				No other school site in Wellington's Northern suburbs is flat and are typically built over multiple levels. The land in Lincolnshire is not flat and obtaining consents from GWRC for bulk earthworks is extremely difficult given the current legislature and planning framework. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	
				The NES - Freshwater Standards that re-defined and expanded the definition of wetlands to include stock wetlands, and new rules relating to earthworks, stormwater discharges and vegetation removal within certain distances from these areas, makes it difficult to achieve a largely flat site for a school.	
Rod Halliday	25.52	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Not specified	Not opposed to the provision of a community facility in DEV2-APP-R3 (Community facilities) provided two clarifications are sought.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Halliday	25.53	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that the requirement for the land provided for the new community facility in DEV2-APP-R3 (Community facility) to be flat will be difficult and expensive.</p> <p>The land in Lincolnshire is not flat and obtaining consents from GWRC for bulk earthworks is extremely difficult given the current legislature and planning framework. [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p> <p>The NES - Freshwater Standards that re-defined and expanded the definition of wetlands to include stock wetlands, and new rules relating to earthworks, stormwater discharges and vegetation removal within certain distances from these areas, makes it difficult to achieve a largely flat site for a community facility.</p>	Clarify DEV-APP-R3 (Community facilities) to include that the land for the new community facility may be handed over in original form and allow Wellington City Council to obtain earthworks consents as a designating authority.
Rod Halliday	25.54	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Support in part	Not opposed to the provision of a new community park of between 4-6ha in DEV-APP-R4 (Open spaces) provided two clarifications are sought.	Not specified.
Rod Halliday	25.55	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that the requirement for the land provided for the new community facility in DEV2-APP-R4 (Open spaces) to be flat will be difficult and expensive.</p> <p>The land in Lincolnshire is not flat and obtaining consents from GWRC for bulk earthworks is extremely difficult given the current legislature and planning framework. [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p> <p>The NES - Freshwater Standards that re-defined and expanded the definition of wetlands to include stock wetlands, and new rules relating to earthworks, stormwater discharges and vegetation removal within certain distances from these areas, makes it difficult to achieve a largely flat site for a sports field.</p>	Clarify DEV-APP-R4 (Open spaces) to include that the land for the new community park may be handed over in original form and allow Wellington City Council to obtain earthworks consents as a designating authority.
Rod Halliday	25.56	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Amend	Considers that Lincolnshire Farm Ltd are developing land.	Clarify DEV-APP-R4 (open spaces) to include that the land for the new community park will be formalised in a reserves agreement with Lincolnshire Farm Ltd who are developing the land.
Wellington City Council	266.173	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Amend	Considers amendments necessary to provide clarification, cross reference and better connection between the Development Plan maps and appendices.	<p>Amend DEV2-APP-R4.1.i as follows:</p> <p>The neighbourhood parks required by DEV2-APP-R4.c to DEV2-APP-R4.e must be constructed and accessible for public use at the time the 100th dwelling within the relevant neighbourhood park catchment area, shown on the Development Plan <u>maps as catchment areas A to J</u>, is constructed.</p>
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.46	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.195	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP12 Lincolnshire Farm Development Area	Support	Considers existing transmission lines traverse the northern part of the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area, over areas zoned for Medium Density Residential and Open Space (noting the Development Area layer obscures the transmission lines). Transpower supports the reference within the DEV2-APP-R4.	Retain DEV2-APP-R4 (Open Spaces) as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Edwin Crampton	21.2	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that Greyfriars Crescent is the most logical connection point to make, as it was designed to provide for such a connection when the Redwood block was subdivided in the 1970's.</p> <p>As the development of Churton Park has proceeded, it is expected by the Churton Park community that Upper Stebbings has a road connection to Tawa.</p>	Seeks that a road connection be provided to join Upper Stebbings with Greyfriars Crescent, Tawa.
Rod Halliday	25.57	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that the planned intersection designed to link Glenside West Development Area and Westchester Drive has already been designed and approved by the Council as part of the resource consent for the Reedy Stage 2 subdivision (WCC SR No. 416389). A multi-modal safety audit to assess the safety of the intersection is therefore not required and should be removed from the provision. The second point in DEV-APP-R5.2 is unnecessary.</p>	Seeks that DEV3-APP-R5 (Roads) be amended to not require a multi-modal safety audit be carried out.
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.4	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Oppose	<p>We submit that the development of the intersection and Te Kahu Road should be brought forward and built now.</p> <p>Completing the Te Kahu link road to Westchester Drive is necessary to reduce circuitous route through Churton Park. The intersection and related road is necessary now, to reduce emissions, reduce wear and tear on roads and to prevent traffic conflicts and near misses at Melksham-Westchester drive intersection.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that it a requirement to construct the Te Kahu link road and intersection in readiness for any further development.
Heidi Snelson	FS24.11	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Oppose	<p>Submitter looks to not undertake multi-modal safety audit as required with necessary points within DEV-APP-R5.2 being disregarded/deleted/not required to be upheld.</p> <p>The submitter is currently in the process of requesting additional housing density changes, road position changes and dwelling sites changes outside of MDR areas within the Glenside West Development Area.</p> <p>This will mean more road use at this proposed intersection rather than less, requiring an audit and amended/enhanced safety requirements. The proposed intersection is between one blind corner and another with restricted sight lines and heavy use of both commuters and earth moving trucks. Any development of this area will see increased use by the latter for a considerable period of time.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed to retain the requirement for a multi-modal safety audit in accordance with DEV3-APP-R5.2 given the increasing use of this roading infrastructure.
Rod Halliday	25.58	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that the planned intersection designed to link Glenside West Development Area and Westchester Drive has already been designed and approved by the Council as part of the resource consent for the Reedy Stage 2 subdivision (WCC SR No. 416389). A reference to this construction plan (BECA 3321886-S3-C-0023) should be added in the provision.</p>	Seeks that the first point in DEV3-APP-R5 (Roads) be amended to include a reference to the intersection's approved construction plan (BECA 3321886-S3-C-0023).
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.5	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Oppose	<p>Submits that the development of the intersection and Te Kahu Road should be brought forward and built now.</p> <p>Completing the Te Kahu link road to Westchester Drive is necessary to reduce circuitous route through Churton Park. The intersection and related road is necessary now, to reduce emissions, reduce wear and tear on roads and to prevent traffic conflicts and near misses at Melksham-Westchester drive intersection.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that it a requirement to construct the Te Kahu link road and intersection in readiness for any further development.
Heidi Snelson	FS24.12	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Oppose	<p>The submitter is currently in the process of requesting additional housing density changes, road position changes and dwelling sites changes outside of MDR areas within the Glenside West Development Area.</p> <p>This will mean more road use at this proposed intersection rather than less, requiring an audit and amended/enhanced safety requirements. The proposed intersection is between one blind corner and another with restricted sight lines and heavy use of both commuters and earth moving trucks. Any development of this area will see increased use by the latter for a considerable period of time.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rod Halliday	25.59	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that the planned intersection designed to link Glenside West Development Area and Westchester Drive has already been designed and approved by the Council as part of the resource consent for the Reedy Stage 2 subdivision (WCC SR No. 416389).</p> <p>Considers that the second point in DEV-APP-R5.2 is unnecessary.</p>	Seeks that the second point in DEV3-APP-R5 (Roads) be deleted.
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.6	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Oppose	<p>Submits that the development of the intersection and Te Kahu Road should be brought forward and built now.</p> <p>Completing the Te Kahu link road to Westchester Drive is necessary to reduce circuitous route through Churton Park. The intersection and related road is necessary now, to reduce emissions, reduce wear and tear on roads and to prevent traffic conflicts and near misses at Melksham-Westchester drive intersection.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that it a requirement to construct the Te Kahu link road and intersection in readiness for any further development.
Heidi Snelson	FS24.13	Part 4 / Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Oppose	<p>The submitter is currently in the process of requesting additional housing density changes, road position changes and dwelling sites changes outside of MDR areas within the Glenside West Development Area.</p> <p>This will mean more road use at this proposed intersection rather than less, requiring an audit and amended/enhanced safety requirements. The proposed intersection is between one blind corner and another with restricted sight lines and heavy use of both commuters and earth moving trucks. Any development of this area will see increased use by the latter for a considerable period of time.</p>	Disallow
John L Morrison	28.4	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that DEV3-APP-R2 does not include an acceptable road connection between Tawa and Upper Stebbings. A local road should be constructed to connect Melksham Drive or Rochdale Drive in Upper Stebbings to Greyfriars Crescent in Tawa, requiring consequential modifications to the DEV3 Chapter.</p> <p>Adding this road connection would facilitate a compact urban form, which is a WCC objective.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend APP13, DEV3-APP-R2 (Roads) as follows:</p> <p>1. A collector road shall be constructed which connects Melksham Drive and Rochdale Drive to form a loop through Upper Stebbings. A local road shall be constructed to connect Melksham Drive/ Rochdale Drive in Upper Stebbings Valley to Greyfriars Crescent Tawa.</p>
Colin Roy Miller	34.1	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that the current Development Plan for Upper Stebbings and Glenside West does not provide an acceptable road link between Upper Stebbings Valley and Tawa.</p> <p>There is a clear need for more than one access road in and out of the Upper Stebbings Valley development primarily to cope with traffic heading directly north to Tawa, Linden, Kenepuru and Porirua.</p> <p>Considers that in the absence of a community centre at Stebbings Valley, displaced residents must rely on emergency services at either Johnsonville or Tawa.</p> <p>Considers that the Greyfriars link road is the logical northern access route during or after an emergency because of its proximity to Tawa. The Greyfriars link road would not be impacted in adverse circumstances due to its elevation and is also unlikely to be congested.</p> <p>In a worst-case scenario of the overhead Cook Strait DC towers and cables that cross the Stebbings Valley development, access via a connector road to Tawa would be especially valuable.</p>	<p>Amend DEV3-APP-R2 (Roads) as follows:</p> <p>1. A collector road shall be constructed which connects Melksham Drive and Rochdale Drive to form a loop through Upper Stebbings.</p> <p><u>2. A local road shall be constructed to connect the Upper Stebbings loop road to Greyfriars Crescent, Tawa</u></p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard H. Taylor	35.4	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that DEV3-APP-R2 does not include an acceptable provision for a road connection between Tawa and Upper Stebbings. A local road should be constructed to connect Melksham Drive or Rochdale Drive in Upper Stebbings to Greyfriars Crescent in Tawa. Reasons for adding this road connection are: This road connection would facilitate a compact urban form, which is a WCC objective.</p> <p>A. This is a prime opportunity to increase the resilience of the whole city. The proposed connection will clearly assist in achieving this.</p> <p>B. To help achieve the Council's objective of a compact urban form a connection between Tawa and this new development in Churton Park is necessary. If not undertaken, the development becomes an isolated group of residences.</p> <p>C. The PDP states that the development area has easy access to SH1, the NIMT railway as well as town centres and facilities available in Tawa and Johnsonville. This is a very misleading assertion. Only if there is a connection road via Greyfriars Crescent to Tawa will the railway and Tawa town centre access be available as stated in the PDP.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend DEV3-APP13 (Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area) to include a provision for a road to connect Melksham Road in Upper Stebbings with Greyfriars Crescent in Tawa.
Brian Sheppard	169.5	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	<p>Considers that a connection between Upper Stebbings and Tawa would be of benefit to the adjacent communities as well as the whole Wellington Region. A road connection is required to achieve the WCC objective of compact urban form and for the Development Area to have easy access to SH1, the NIMT railway as well as the town centres and facilities at Tawa and Johnsonville.</p> <p>Tawa and Stebbings Valley are only about 200m apart but, without connection, the separation becomes several kilometres. In addition, the transmission lines exclusion separates Upper Stebbings from Churton Park, creating an isolated island community.</p> <p>Churton Park is unusual amongst the northern suburbs, in having no direct public transport access to the north. A road connection would enable a new bus route to be created that would provide a much-needed bus service from Johnsonville to Porirua which would serve Churton Park and the western side of Tawa.</p> <p>The north end of Stebbings Valley is a long way from the facilities in Johnsonville. A connection to Tawa would bring services much closer and provide a much needed boost to Tawa businesses and organisations.</p> <p>This connection would provide a resilient alternative route for people leaving the City for their homes further north.</p> <p>It has been suggested that, with a connection such this, vehicles bound for the motorway would add to traffic congestion in Tawa. Commuters from Upper Stebbings are more likely, however, to access the motorway from the closer junction at Churton Park. During the day, it is more likely that vehicles using the connection will primarily be heading to and from facilities in Tawa.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that a road connection is provided to join Upper Stebbings and Tawa.
Wellington City Council	266.174	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	Considers amendments necessary to provide clarification, cross reference and better connection between the Development Plan maps and appendices.	Amend DEV3-APP-R1.5 as follows: The neighbourhood parks required by DEV3-APP-R1.6 must be constructed and accessible for public use at the time the 100th dwelling within the relevant neighbourhood park catchment area, shown on the Development Plan maps as catchment areas A to C, is constructed.
Wellington City Council	266.175	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	Considers amendments necessary to provide clarification, cross reference and better connection between the Development Plan maps and appendices.	Amend DEV3-APP-R4.3 as follows: The Neighbourhood Park required by DEV3-APP-R4.3.1 must be constructed and accessible for public use at the time the 50th dwelling is constructed within catchment area D shown on the Development Plan map.

Design Guides

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.47	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.196	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Support	Considers existing transmission lines traverse the northern part of the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area, over areas zoned "Unbuilt areas" (noting the Development Area layer obscures the transmission lines). Transpower supports the recognition of the existing National Grid assets within clause b.	Retain DEV3-APP-R1 (Open Spaces) as notified.
Richard Herbert	360.8	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Support in part	Supports APP13, as it is directed towards providing for development of the greenfield development area, safeguarding natural resources and green spaces and recognising that this area also adjoins the Outer Green Belt, with areas within the Ridge Lines and Hilltops Overlay zone of the existing District Plan.	Retain APP-13 - Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area with amendment.
Richard Herbert	360.9	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Amend	Considers that the Appendix for the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area should retain the areas designated within the Ridge Lines and Hilltops Overlay zone of the existing District Plan.	Seeks that the areas designated within the Ridge Lines and Hilltops Overlay zone be retained in APP-13 - Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area.
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.10	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP13 Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area	Support	DEV3-APP-R5 is supported. It is agreed that an intersection connecting a road from the Development Area to Westchester Drive must be constructed prior to the construction of any dwellings in the Glenside West Development Area. It is noted that the developer used Te Kahu road (The link from the Reedy block to Westchester Drive) for earthworks on the Reedy block and has still not opened this road for public access, despite being required to as part of the Reedy development.	Retain DEV3-APP-R5 (Roads) as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.48	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP14 Wind Chapter Best Practice Guidance Document	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 14 Wind Chapter Best Practice Guidance Document as notified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.49	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP15 Ecological Assessment	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain Appendix 15 Ecological Assessment as notified.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.409	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP15 Ecological Assessment	Support in part	Generally supports this appendix, however considers it is missing a requirement to clearly identify the potential effects of the proposal, including any cumulative effects. Supports paragraph 2(a) and (b) but notes ECO P1 needs to be amended to explicitly incorporate these concepts. We have sought amendments above to achieve this.	Amend APP15 - Ecological Assessment: <u>2. Identifying the biodiversity values and potential effects of the proposal, including cumulative effects.</u>
Director-General of Conservation	385.86	Appendices Subpart / Appendices / APP15 Ecological Assessment	Support	Supports the proposed Ecological Assessment guidelines, which links to the guidance document "Biodiversity Offsetting under the Resource Management Act"	Retain APP15 Ecological Assessment as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Supports the endeavour to make the design guides more simplified and accessible as well as limiting the potential for different interpretations.	Retain Design Guides as notified.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.65	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Supports the prioritisation of higher density urban form and living and the public outcomes over private amenities.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.1	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	<p>Considers that the suite of design guides in the PDP need considerable editing and tightening up to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of the PDP.</p> <p>Considers that the suite of design guides in the PDP are too long and unnecessarily complicated, and the content needs to be reassessed and edited.</p> <p>Considers that the design guides need to be to the point and easy to use, and the proposed design guides don't achieve this.</p>	Not specified.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.85	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports the review of the design guides but also seeks that the design guides are taken out of the District Plan and provided as a non-statutory guidance. If Design Guides are retained in the Plan, the plan provisions need to be clear to identify the key outcomes sought rather than full compliance with the entire suite of design guides. Any consequential changes to plan provisions resulting from amendments to design guides and their referencing is also sought.	Disallow / Seeks that Design Guides are taken out of the Plan and provided as non-statutory guidance. If Design Guides are retained in the Plan, the plan provisions need to be clear to identify the key outcomes sought rather than full compliance with the entire suite of design guides. Any consequential changes to plan provisions resulting from amendments to design guides and their referencing is also sought.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.2	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the specific amendments requested to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and Residential Design Guide in the submission should be applied to all of the design guides.	Seeks that all Design Guides are subject to a high level of scrutiny and refinement.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.3	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that as the design guides overlap and assessments will be required against more than one Design Guide, unnecessary complication will occur, particularly when repeated over multiple sites.	Seeks that the entire suite of Design Guides is restructured and coordinated to remove unnecessary overlap and repetition between the design guides.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.4	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that for small developments the full Design Guide may not be relevant and the level of assessment required will not be fit for purpose, being unnecessarily onerous and inefficient.	Seeks that the entire suite of Design Guides is restructured and coordinated to remove unnecessary overlap and repetition between the Design Guides.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.5	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that there is no mechanism for departing from the guidelines or clarity on how this will be assessed.	Seeks that the Design Guides include mechanism for departure from the guidelines, which should be tied into identified, relevant and numbered objectives or outcomes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.6	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the outcomes are identified as being part of this statutory document and must be met. Therefore these should be numbered to allow cross reference in assessments.	Seeks that the 'outcomes' in each design guide are numbered and integrate with the relevant section / guidelines to avoid flipping back and forth between Design Guides.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.7	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the same set of outcomes appears in each of the Design Guides, in addition to the 16 page Introduction to the Design Guides. This is unnecessary repetition and has the effect of bloating the suite of guides.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.8	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Considers that the function of the Design Guide Introduction is not clear, other than providing the rationale for the approach taken through the suite of guides. If that is the case, it is useful information for this process of explaining and implementing a new set of guides. But it does not and need to be and should not be within the set of statutory Design Guides.	Seeks that the Design Guide Introduction is removed from the Proposed District Plan.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.9	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that repetition should be eliminated from the Design Guides because the degree of overlap and repetition makes the document unnecessarily long, unwieldy and inefficient to apply. Because a point is made multiple times may not necessarily lead to efficient application, and it could give undue and unintended over-emphasis to some design direction. This would allow the design guides to be materially shortened without loss of content, and the task of applying them made considerably more efficient.	Seeks that the content of the Design Guides is restructured to eliminate repetition within individual design guides and edit to ensure consistency of expression of guidelines.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.10	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that in many cases a matter is dealt with in a section by multiple guidelines, when it would be equally effective and more efficient to combine into a reduced number of guidelines. An example is Residential GG99, G101 and G102	Seeks that the content of the Design Guides is restructured to eliminate repetition within individual design guides and edit to ensure consistency of expression of guidelines.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.11	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the guidelines in the design guides should be edited to ensure consistency of expression. Many are directive such as maintain visual connection..., Orientate building frontages; Use planting to..... But others are passive descriptive statements. Considers that the approach of being directive is preferred as it will enhance legibility and it will also allow the text to be shortened.	Seeks that the content of the Design Guides is restructured to eliminate repetition within individual design guides and edit to ensure consistency of expression of guidelines.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.12	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose in part	Considers that the Design Guides inappropriately combine good practice in detailed building design, specification and construction which are properly covered at the time of building consent with issues which relate to the design, configuration and amenity effects of the building. Those matters should be stripped out as they require a level of detail that is inappropriate to develop and provide before resource consent is granted. That is due to the cost of providing that information in a situation where it may be quite uncertain whether a consent can/will be achieved.	Seeks that requirements for detailed information on construction, materials, services that is only reasonably developed following receipt of resource consent are removed.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.58	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guides. [Specific Design Guides not referenced]	Retain the Design Guides as notified.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.59	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Opposes the City Outcomes Contribution - referenced in the Design Guides and PDP	Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contribution are removed from the Design Guides and Proposed District Plan policies.
Amos Mann	172.26	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that accessibility and universal design requirements are provided for in the Design Guides and in incentives.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.6	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Inconsistent with the RVA's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as the RVA is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.6	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Inconsistent with Ryman's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as Ryman is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Wellington City Youth Council	201.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Supports making design guides clear and concise to facilitate easier access and accessible knowledge about design standards.	Seeks that design guides are clear and concise to facilitate easier access and accessible knowledge about design standards.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.43	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers the importance of high quality, high density residential development and urban form, ensuring that people have access to green spaces, light, warmth, and air. Considers that high quality, sustainable materials should be a focus for buildings and infrastructure that stands the test of time. Considers that ensuring spaces are clean, welcoming and have an attractive aesthetic are also immensely important to contribute to wellbeing for everyone in the city.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Youth Council	201.44	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that new builds and developments are required to be safe for those with different access needs.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.45	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that design guides reward the use of environmentally sustainable building materials to promote climate friendly development.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.46	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Supports and emphasises the importance of current, new, and renovation toward high-performance Buildings.	Not specified.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.47	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that partnering with mana whenua especially for high impact urban developments is essential to weaving te ao Māori throughout the urban landscape.	Not specified.
Go Media Ltd	236.35	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that the signs design guide is broad and open to interpretation.	Not specified.
Alan Fairless	242.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed.
Alan Fairless	242.25	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that Wellington is a folded landscape with valleys and ridges, where a single large dwelling in the wrong place can adversely affect many others. The Plan needs to allow and adjust for this reality by adopting a more carefully tailored and locally nuanced approach, rather than a one-size-fits-all approach. Planning needs to drive and encourage quality and ensure the design of new, more intensive development works with the city's idiosyncratic landscape and for the communities in which it is located.	Seeks that the District Plan strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas.
Stratum Management Limited	249.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that for apartment developments both the Residential Design Guide and Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide will apply, with over 200 guidelines to be considered and work through.	Seeks rationalisation of the Residential Design Guide to reduce the number of guidelines as much as possible.
Stratum Management Limited	249.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that for apartment developments both the Residential Design Guide and Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide will apply, with over 200 guidelines to be considered and work through.	Seeks rationalisation of the Mixed Use Design Guide to reduce the number of guidelines as much as possible.
Stratum Management Limited	249.43	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Considers that the ranking of guidelines within the Design Guides is appropriate.	Retain ranking system in Design Guides as notified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.44	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that it is unclear what the 'Outcomes' section of each Design Guide attempts to achieve.	Seeks that the 'Outcomes' that read as policies are included as policies, if that is the intention; alternatively deletion or appropriate qualification of the 'Outcomes'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McDonald's	274.75	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the PDP, rather than being formally incorporated into it. Incorporating the design guides into the PDP elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants and is onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the PDP and for the relevant provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.182	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with The RVA's primary submission to have these references removed but opposes relevant provisions instead referring to specific design guidelines to the extent these provisions apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from any specific design principles as sought within The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.182	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with Ryman's primary submission to have these references removed but opposes relevant provisions instead referring to specific design guidelines to the extent these provisions apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from any specific design principles as sought within Ryman's primary submission.
Roland Sapsford	305.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan rather than replace them with the minimum daylight provisions of the proposed Plan.	Seeks reinstatement of the operative district plan design guidance for minimum sunlight access [Inferred decision requested]
Carolyn Stephens	344.13	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the plan should strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that urban design qualities be strengthened in Design Guides.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.333	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers the design guides are one part of how the District Plan can give effect to the NPS-FM, and should rate freshwater matters with appropriate weight throughout the guides. The current ratings for guidelines for stormwater, freshwater bodies and water conservation are currently rated as having lowest weight in the residential design guide for example.	Seeks that Design Guides are amended as necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM, including by rating freshwater guidelines to recognise their importance.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.19	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Agree that the Design Guides can give effect to the NPS-FM and should prioritise measures that enhance freshwater and water conservation.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.65	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.65	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.334	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers the design guides are one part of how the District Plan can give effect to the NPS-FM, and should rate freshwater matters with appropriate weight throughout the guides. The current ratings for guidelines for stormwater, freshwater bodies and water conservation are currently rated as having lowest weight in the residential design guide for example.	Seeks to apply ratings for freshwater matters equally between the Rural Design Guide and the Urban Design Guide.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.20	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Agree that the Design Guides can give effect to the NPS-FM and should prioritise measures that enhance freshwater and water conservation.	Allow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.66	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Woolworths New Zealand	359.96	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	<p>Considers that the status of the notification of these Guides, as well as their bearing on subsequent legal weighting as the plan-making process continues should be clarified.</p> <p>The PDP states that these Design Guides have been notified using the ISPP process, however, they have been referenced in the context of parts of the PDP which have been notified under both the ISPP process and the P1 Sch1 process.</p> <p>The status of these Guides would appear to be statutory by reference within the matters of discretion of relevance. Given the prescriptive, yet subjective, nature of the assessment, elevating these Guides to a statutory requirement for compliance or assessment is not considered appropriate or commensurate in respect of a restricted discretionary activity assessment.</p> <p>In the proposed consenting framework this means that the design of supermarket buildings will be considered against all matters within these Guides (which have been ranked via a rating system). The subjective nature of the Design Guides and their inclusion as matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities is opposed by Woolworths as it is considered that restricted discretionary consent applications should be straightforward with clear discretion parameters. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks clarification on the status of the notification of Design Guides, as well as their subsequent legal weighting.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	<p>Considers that the plan should be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design. This is to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments, and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the plan be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect to urban design.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	<p>Considers that the plan should strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that urban design qualities be strengthened in Design Guides.
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.11	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	<p>Considers that Design guides should be stricter in restricting earthworks in elevated development area, particularly Upper Stebbings and Glenside West.</p>	Seeks that Design Guides be stricter in restricting earthworks in elevated development areas, particularly Upper Stebbings and Glenside West.
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.6	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	<p>The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.</p>	Disallow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.516	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	<p>Generally supportive.</p>	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.765	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose in part	<p>The inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan is opposed, as they act as de facto rules to be complied with. Any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan is opposed.</p> <p>The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, it is sought that that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p>	Remove Design Guides from within the District Plan, as well as any references or requirements related to Design Guides. Treat Design Guides as non-statutory tools, outside of the District Plan.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Submitter 391 seeks to omit references to Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide from the Plan. The Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide are important for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criteria.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.128	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow
LIVE WELLington	FS96.45	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	FS117.44	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.165	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.165	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.766	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that Design Guidelines should sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. (Option A)	<p>Seeks that a note be added in the District Plan as follows:</p> <p><u>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></p>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.166	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.166	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.767	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that design guidelines should be amended, simplified, and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development. (Option B)	<p>Amend Design Guidelines to clarify and simplify them.</p> <p>[See original submission for further details].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.167	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.167	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.768	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that Kāinga Ora should get the opportunity to review Design Guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document. (Option C)	Seeks that Kāinga Ora be allowed to review Design Guidelines.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.168	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.168	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.138	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the district plan [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside of the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.109	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.109	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Guy Marriage	407.8	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that a multi-unit specific design guide is much needed. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of a Multi-Unit Design Guide.
Guy Marriage	407.9	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that while the Facades section of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide has 4 points listed under Facades (and no such Star system ***) and 9 points regarding Artificial Lighting, there is no associated rating for Natural Lighting, or Sunlight and that all these points need to be related.	Seeks that points on Facades, Artificial Lighting, Natural Lighting and Sunlight need to be related.
Guy Marriage	407.10	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that access to natural light and daylight and sunlight is just as important in the Inner City Housing as it is in suburban areas.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Cheryl Robilliard	409.7	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Retain Design Guides as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
VicLabour	414.51	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks the prioritisation of pedestrian experience, including the emphasis on accessibility, for subdivisions.
VicLabour	414.52	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that accessibility needs to be a key focus throughout the plan.	Seeks that the Council considers recommendations from disabled people and advocates and explore co-design with remuneration where appropriate.
VicLabour	414.53	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Supports references to waste minimisation.	Seeks that provisions for waste minimisation should be strengthened where possible
VicLabour	414.54	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Supports emphasis on mitigating stormwater problems, and particularly endorse the water conservation guidelines	Retain design guidance relating to mitigating storm water and water conservation. [inferred decision requested]
VicLabour	414.55	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that ecology guidelines should incorporate a te ao Māori perspective
VicLabour	414.56	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Support guidelines around the installation of place-based site interpretation.	Seeks a greater emphasis on recognising history of places and sites in a way that is not settler perspective dominant
VicLabour	414.57	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the design guides include direction that within walking catchments of the central city transport links car parking may not be required, with emphasis on accessibility.
VicLabour	414.58	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Supports sustainable building and considers more can be done.	Seeks that a low emissions design guide be made compulsory.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.197	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Supports the intent of the Design Guides, their inclusion in the PDP significantly expands the matters Council must consider when exercising its discretion and, perversely, may even limit Council's flexibility to promote quality design outcomes. While well-intentioned, the Design Guides may become a 'tick-box' exercise and may discourage innovation. Our proposal is to make the Design Guides nonstatutory; they should be a useful 'how-to' resource (for example, like the Auckland Design Manual) which developers and Council can turn to when considering the design of new developments. It also provides more flexibility to adjust the Guides over time, as requirements and preferred design outcomes evolve, without requiring a plan change process.	Supports the intent of the design guides, but seeks that these are non-statutory.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.198	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	<p>Supports the intent of the Design Guides, their inclusion in the PDP significantly expands the matters Council must consider when exercising its discretion and, perversely, may even limit Council's flexibility to promote quality design outcomes.</p> <p>While well-intentioned, the Design Guides may become a 'tick-box' exercise and may discourage innovation. Our proposal is to make the Design Guides nonstatutory; they should be a useful 'how-to' resource (for example, like the Auckland Design Manual) which developers and Council can turn to when considering the design of new developments. It also provides more flexibility to adjust the Guides over time, as requirements and preferred design outcomes evolve, without requiring a plan change process.</p>	<p>Amend the Design Guides to be non-statutory</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.261	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.261	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.199	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and they do not consider that it meets the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Include HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in a non-statutory Design Guide.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.200	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and the submitter does not consider that it meets the section 32 Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Submitter suggests that Council may wish to include the maximum building depth provision in a non-statutory Design Guide.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.262	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.262	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.201	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	<p>Generally supports the intent of the Design Guides, but opposes their inclusion in the District Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In many areas, the Design Guides overlap with the objectives and policies in Part 3. This will cause confusion for both planners and developers in attempting to interpret the Design Guides alongside Part 3. In particular, the submitter queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan. - It will be simpler to update the Design Guides to reflect best practice if they remain non-statutory. - The way the Design Guides are included as relevant criteria for restricted discretionary activities significantly expands the Council's discretion beyond what could normally be expected, for example, the Residential Design Guide contains various provisions dealing with internal areas such as G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage). 	Seeks that references to the Design Guide in the Proposed District Plan be removed and that the Design Guides should be non-statutory in a similar way to the Auckland Design Manual. They should be used for guidance on how the objectives and policies in Part 3 may be implemented.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.103	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Submission point 416.201 supports submission points 476.1 & 476.102.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.263	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.263	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.202	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Generally supports the intent of the Design Guides, but opposes their inclusion in the District Plan for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In many areas, the Design Guides overlap with the objectives and policies in Part 3. This will cause confusion for both planners and developers in attempting to interpret the Design Guides alongside Part 3. In particular, the submitter queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan. - It will be simpler to update the Design Guides to reflect best practice if they remain non-statutory. - The way the Design Guides are included as relevant criteria for restricted discretionary activities significantly expands the Council's discretion beyond what could normally be expected, for example, the Residential Design Guide contains various provisions dealing with internal areas such as G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage). 	Seeks that if the Design Guides are to be retained, the Design Guides should be significantly pared back and reviewed for double-up / alignment with the objectives and policies in Part 3.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.264	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.264	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.203	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Generally supports the intent of the Design Guides, but opposes their inclusion in the District Plan for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In many areas, the Design Guides overlap with the objectives and policies in Part 3. This will cause confusion for both planners and developers in attempting to interpret the Design Guides alongside Part 3. In particular, the submitter queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan. - It will be simpler to update the Design Guides to reflect best practice if they remain non-statutory. - The way the Design Guides are included as relevant criteria for restricted discretionary activities significantly expands the Council's discretion beyond what could normally be expected, for example, the Residential Design Guide contains various provisions dealing with internal areas such as G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage). 	Seeks that if the Design Guides are to be retained, the Design Guides should be significantly pared back and reviewed for double-up / alignment with the objectives and policies in Part 3.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.265	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.265	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.204	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	<p>generally supports the intent of the Design Guides, but opposes their inclusion in the District Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In many areas, the Design Guides overlap with the objectives and policies in Part 3. This will cause confusion for both planners and developers in attempting to interpret the Design Guides alongside Part 3. In particular, the queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan. - It will be simpler to update the Design Guides to reflect best practice if they remain non-statutory. - The way the Design Guides are included as relevant criteria for restricted discretionary activities significantly expands the Council's discretion beyond what could normally be expected, for example, the Residential Design Guide contains various provisions dealing with internal areas such as G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage). 	Seeks that Council consider a Design Excellence Panel (or similar) which is constituted for each project (with representatives agreed by Council and the developer) and is charged with ensuring the development achieves the quality urban outcomes sought by Council. Submitter notes that provided approval is obtained from the Design Excellence Panel, Council would not have discretion to consider urban outcomes (to ensure there is no overlap of roles between Council and the Design Excellence Panel).
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.266	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.266	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Fabric Property Limited	425.105	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	<p>Submitter supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the District Plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the District Plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the design guides, for example under Rules CCZ-R19 and CCZ-20. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.</p> <p>Submitter seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed Plan and for the relevant district plan provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. As above, the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the District Plan, and can be appropriately referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide".</p> <p>Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.</p>	Seeks that Design Guides are removed from the Proposed District Plan and used as external reference documents.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.29	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.29	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Miriam Moore	433.20	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Support of the design guides holding statutory weight as a matter of discretion in the PDP.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Miriam Moore	433.21	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Considers that assessments against the Design Guide(s) could take extra time in the consenting process. Seeks that the Council is well-resourced in Design Review, and works well with developers to get good and timely outcomes. Hopes the enforcement of design guides can achieve a good number of accessible homes - Auckland's similar intensification rules have resulted in many multi -storey terraced homes, while these are good compact designs for family homes, they exclude our ageing population and those who aren't able bodied. Believes Wellington needs density to be inclusive and done well to bring those on board, who may be nervous about the changes coming.	Seeks consent efficiency.
Paul M Blaschke	435.11	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Supports the widespread use of Design Guides and their inclusion in the statutory plan.	Retain Design Guides as notified.
Marilyn Head	457.8	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers the landscaping standards to be too low. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers it is appropriate to amend design guide as enough capability in the current plan to accommodate the projected population growth.	Seeks to amend the design guides. [inferred decision requested].
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.31	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Considers that the WCC's latest revisions of the design guides has produced a lot of very good changes. There are now far clearer descriptions of what defines the character that is sought to be protected, compared to that laid out in the versions that accompanied the draft district plan.	Not specified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.63	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Supports in general the intent and provisions of the design guides.	Not specified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that it is important that design guides are reference documents that sit outside of the district plan. Including them in the district plan elevates them into standards, rather than guidance. Considers that it is not appropriate to provide that the councils discretion is restricted to all matters in design guides. The design guides do not provide any clear direction or certainty for applicants and it is onerous to potentially need to address two design guides.	Seeks that the design guides are used as reference documents which sit outside of the district plan
Foodstuffs North Island	476.102	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guide, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the PDP, rather than being formally incorporated into it. Incorporating the design guides into the PDP elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants and is onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Remove the design guides from the plan and instead revise provisions to refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.62	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that there are no blank frontages.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.174	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.174	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.63	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that entryways are designed so people entering buildings can move off the public space while they do that (e.g. while they find their keys or seek permission to enter).
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.175	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.175	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that the worst possible outcome for pedestrians is that they are in a cold, wet space that never dries out in winter because it never gets any sun.	Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that buildings do not unduly shade public space unless they are providing a verandah.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.176	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.176	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.65	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that there are a number of buildings in Wellington that generate their own weather in the adjacent public square eg. Majestic Centre.	Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that design does not generate wind problems.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.177	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.177	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington	182.31	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that the design guides as notified are too 'loose'.	Seeks a new multi unit design guide to ensure that new development is well designed and will complement the predominant patterns of local neighbourhoods. [Inferred decision requested]
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.72	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.72	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington	182.32	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Not specified	Considers that urban design panels could be used as part of the assessment process [of the new multi unit design guide]. [Refer to original submission].	Not specified.
Alan Fairless	242.26	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that local Design Guides, founded on a sophisticated understanding of local character, are a proven and effective vehicle for addressing good residential quality.	Seeks that local design guides, tailored to local areas, are created and used to strengthen the urban design qualities of the city. [Inferred decision requested].
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.5	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	Inconsistent with the RVA's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as the RVA is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.5	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	Inconsistent with Ryman's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as Ryman is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.13	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that the Multi-Unit Design Guide should be reinstated, or otherwise brought back in a revised form.	Seeks that the Multi-Unit Design Guide be reinstated.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.226	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.226	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Roland Sapsford	305.65	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that an Aro Valley specific design guide which applies to all new developments within the existing character areas (as identified in the Operative Plan) should be instated.	Reinstate the Operative Plan's Design Guide specific to Aro Valley.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.205	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Submitter considers that the building separation distance is too restrictive and they do not consider it meets the RMA tests for appropriateness.	Include HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in a non-statutory Design Guide.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.267	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.267	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.15	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that this would be a great move to sustainability. Considers that a 'must' have rather than a negotiation to get more height and induce more shading for others, if it is installed.	Seeks that all new developments must have solar or wind for communal lighting and heating.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.16	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that there will never be another chance to include this in a building than when it is built. Considers that retrofitting will be expensive.	Seeks that water conservation would be madatory in design guides. [Inferred decision requested].
Craig Palmer	492.49	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Design Guides are introduced for all verandahs. [Refer to original submission for full guidance on verandah design guide notes].
Paul Burnaby	44.20	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Supports City Outcomes Contribution (pages 29 to 31).	Retain Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as notified.
Nick Ruane	61.4	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Opposes G91 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its current form and seeks amendment.
Nick Ruane	61.5	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that G91 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is amended as follows: For developments that are likely to be occupied by people with limited mobility, where possible, provide ground level access that is accessible by people using wheelchairs, and design units with reference to New Zealand Standards for access and mobility. Consider things such as....
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.185	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.185	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.66	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Supports that ground-floor level buildings in centres are used for non-residential activities. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that ground-floor level buildings in Centres are used for non-residential activities.
Mclndoe Urban Limited	135.13	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that G97 (City Outcomes Contribution) is removed from the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.
Mclndoe Urban Limited	135.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the extent of scope to increase height and public/neighbour involvement in that, and remove possibility for height to extend above the permitted envelope to be delivered using the City Outcomes Contribution mechanism in the residential zones is reconsidered.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.15	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the workability and effectiveness of the City Outcomes Contribution methodology is tested.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.16	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the content of the G97 (City Outcomes Contribution) is refined with consideration of the matters identified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.17	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the title 'Responding to whakapapa of place' under the broad title of 'Responding to the natural environment' would be better as 'Responding to context' as many of the matters addressed are responses to the cultural and built environment.	Amend heading 'Responding to whakapapa of place' as follows: 'Responding to context'
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G1 has two lists and multiple overlapping layers, and that a single much tighter list should be used. Considers that the level of detail required in this guideline will be too much for some projects. Considers that context analysis should be framed around the scope of the project. Considers that there is a focus on existing context but no recognition of planned urban context and character. Considers that when there is no specific requirement to respond to matters such as materials, finishes and textures, this is unnecessary detail.	Amend G1 (Responding to whakapapa of place) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as follows: ... "...should include, <u>where relevant</u> , the following:"
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G2 repeats G1 and these two guidelines should be integrated.	Seeks that G1 and G2 (Responding to whakapapa of place) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.20	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	G3 is an essential requirement, yet there will be situations where planting at the interface of the public realm is problematic, for example along the Golden Mile.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.21	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers G3 will place an overemphasis on planting in centres, where it may be inappropriate within the private realm along a retail.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.22	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G11 is sound in principle, but is already covered by the Residential Design Guide. Considers that there may be challenges in relying on natural ventilation in the central city context unless there are very strict controls on external noise after hours.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.23	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that while G14 can't be disagreed with in principle, it is too vague as a direction.	Clarify G14 (Designing with Topography) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G15 should not be included in the Design Guide as this is covered by Council standards.	Seeks that G15 (Designing with Topography) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is deleted.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.25	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that the 'Designing with Water' section of the Design Guide contains unnecessary repetition that will lead to multiple assessments and inefficiencies. Matters relating to water are covered in three sections - G5 (vegetation and planting), G15 (designing with topography) and G16/G17 (designing with water).	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.26	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G19 overlaps with G2, G4 and G8	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.27	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that while G20 is sound as an objective, this risks being overly broad as a guideline as it can be taken to mean many different things.	Clarify G20 (Ground floor interface and frontage) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.28	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that while G22 is sound the diagrams are questionable. [Refer to submission for details]	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.29	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that while G22 is sound the diagrams are questionable. [Refer to submission for details]	Amend the diagrams under G22 (Ground floor interface and frontage) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.30	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that the methods identified under G28 may be unnecessary in some instances or too onerous in others.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.31	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that passive surveillance is already covered by G21, and then again by G41 and G50.	Seeks that G31 (Passive surveillance) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is removed to avoid unnecessary repetition.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.32	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G33 is too open and undefined. Queries what is meant by 'an appropriate transition' - i.e. what is the principle to be followed? Considers that the types of open space need to be defined. Considers that if sunlight protection is desirable then that should be a rule.	Clarify G33 (Massing and scale) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.33	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G35 is contrary to design in context and could lead to arbitrary outcomes.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.34	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Submission point re G42. No specific reason provided.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.35	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that the methods identified under G45 in italics are undefined and open the opportunity of use of ineffective methods.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.36	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G46 repeats G45.	Seeks that G45, G46 and G47 (Roofscape) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.37	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G47 repeats G45 / G46.	Seeks that G45, G46 and G47 (Roofscape) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.38	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the five guidelines under 'Connections for People' should be compressed into fewer guidelines.	Seeks that the five guidelines under 'Connections for People' are compressed into fewer guidelines.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.39	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G49 and G53 could be combined into a single guideline.	Seeks that G49 and G53 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.40	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that passive surveillance is covered multiple times and this should be rationalised.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the wording of G51 should be amended.	Amend G51 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as follows: Avoid entrapments opportunity for entrapment and minimise blind corners along routes by providing good sightlines and alternative routes
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G51 and G52 could be combined into a single guideline.	Seeks that G51 and G52 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.43	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Submission point re G52. No specific reason provided.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.44	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Submission point re G53. Combine with G49.	Seeks that G49 and G53 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.45	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Submission point re G53. Considers that lighting should be covered later. To give certainty, this should better identify the situations where pedestrian connectivity is enhanced.	Clarify G53 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.46	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that while G55 is sound in principle, there may be instances in a centre or mixed use area where it is acceptable to have a car-park, subject to appropriate facade design located at upper levels extending to the street edge and this should be acknowledged - but the guideline and associated illustration preclude this.	Amend G55 (Car-parking and service vehicles) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to allow for parking in some instances.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.47	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that lighting is a matter of detail that can be covered by standards and referred to in conditions on a resource consent.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.48	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G62 and G63 cover the same matter and should be combined.	Seeks that G62 and G63 (Lighting) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are combined.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.49	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G70 identified a list of five matters that need to be considered, and that G71 and G73 are matters of the same order and should be included in that list.	Seeks that the matters under G71 (design of communal areas should maximise their use and enhance their safety and accessibility) and G73 (Consider the design of communal spaces to enhance a sense of place) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide be included in the list under G70 (Open and communal space).
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.50	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Consider that the focus of G72 only on outdoor space omits consideration of the shared communal facilities that are a useful feature of build to rent and other emerging apartment developments and the content should be modified to recognise that. Notes that the text needs to be amended with no specific details provided.	Seeks that the content of G72 (Open and communal space) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide be amended to allow consideration of shared communal facilities.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.51	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the wording of G77 is ambiguous and that precluding any ventilation from to/from the street is unnecessarily restrictive.	Seeks that G77 (Servicing) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is clarified and amended.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.52	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that using the words 'where possible' in G78 could result in negative effects on the site use and particularly on small narrow lots in centres and mixed use zones. Considers that the guideline should instead focus on how such facilities are 'required' in order to avoid adverse effects on the street environment, rather than encouraging on site vehicle access of the type.	Amend G78 (Servicing) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.53	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that G82 is an important guideline and is essential to achieving outcomes that are more than an assemblage of uncoordinated response to a range of guidelines; but that the wording is currently too vague.	Retain G82 (Architectural coherence) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, with amendment.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.54	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G82 is an important guideline and is essential to achieving outcomes that are more than an assemblage of uncoordinated response to a range of guidelines; but that the wording is currently too vague.	Amend G82 (Architectural coherence) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to include the following underlined wording, taken from G81 (Wind effects on the public): Provide appropriate solutions to mitigate any impacts of the development on wind or micro-climate within and beyond the site that are functional and do not <u>compromise the coherence and compositional integrity of the building.</u>
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.55	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G87 is unsound and precludes the diagrid buildings that are a feature of innovative contemporary structural and architectural design in Wellington. Further, in an earthquake prone city, expression of strength of a building can be structurally efficiency, psychologically comforting and architecturally viable.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.56	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Submission point on G88 - considers that exoskeletons, external columns and external bracing elements should not be precluded as these may be the only way of saving existing unsound buildings, and can be successfully achieved,	Seeks that G88 (Seismic bracing/strengthening) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is amended to identify the qualities that are required, should this approach be taken.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.57	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Submission point re G89. No specific reason provided.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.58	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that while G90 is sound in principle, the second bullet point is vague and undefined.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.59	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose in part	Considers that the italicised bullet points under G91 address a level of detail that is not provided and should not be necessary at the time of resource consent. These should be deleted.	Amend G91 (Compatibility of uses (Mixed Use)) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as follows: G91. For developments that are likely to be occupied by people with limited mobility, where possible, provide ground level access that is accessible by people using wheelchairs, and design units with reference to New Zealand standards for access and mobility. Consider things such as: — Lever handles on all doors — Easy to reach window sills, power sockets and light switches — Sufficient space to access storage spaces including wardrobes — Ensuring flush levels between rooms, at entryways, and shower access — Ensuring smoke alarms have both visual and audible alerts — Best practice guidance for accessible kitchen, laundry and bathroom design — Best practice standards for signage legibility and colour contrast
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.60	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G93 requires a level of detail that is unlikely to be known or assessed at the time of resource consent.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.61	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G95 and G96 are sound in principle but relating to matters of specification and construction methodology and are more properly addressed at the time of building consent.	Seeks that G95 (Waste reduction) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is deleted.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.62	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G95 and G96 are sound in principle but relating to matters of specification and construction methodology and are more properly addressed at the time of building consent.	Seeks that G96 (Waste reduction) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is deleted.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.63	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G97 relating to City Outcomes Contributions should be deleted.	Seeks that G97 (City Outcomes Contribution) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is deleted.
Stratum Management Limited	249.45	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that the guideline (G5) appears to introduce requirements additional to the Three Waters chapter.	Remove guideline G5 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide (Vegetation and planting).
Stratum Management Limited	249.46	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the guideline (G8), as worded, will be difficult to apply in a city centre context.	Re-word the guideline G8 (Urban Ecology) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to make it achievable in the city centre context.
Stratum Management Limited	249.47	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes the guideline (G69) in relation to the bike storage in respect of the Transport chapter.	Seeks that appropriate qualification is ensured in the guideline G69 (Carbon reduction - site) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.
McDonald's	274.76	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Seeks that G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.45	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Considers that while large scale residential developments "will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city", such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply "satisfying the relevant design guide". It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact "The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes." This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McDonald's	274.77	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Retain Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, subject to amendments outlined other submission points.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is too vague and should be amended to push for greater analysis of the construction carbon footprint.	Clarify the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to provide greater analysis of the construction carbon footprint.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.227	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.227	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.15	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide should be amended to require a Design Review Panel made of urban planners, architects, landscape architects, Iwi and public representatives.	Amend the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to require a Design Review Panel.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.225	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.225	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that inserting the term 'ensure' rather than 'consider' in clause G91 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide provides greater emphasis on the need to meet standards.	Amend G91 (Accessibility) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as follows: For developments that are likely to be occupied by people with limited mobility, where possible, provide ground level access that is accessible by people using wheel chairs, and design units with reference to New Zealand standards for access and mobility. Consider Ensure things such as: ... [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.225	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (and the associated policy and matters of discretion linkages), do not recognise or provide for the functional or operational requirements of activities.</p> <p>The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p> <p>The Design Guide places unreasonable requirements on applicants on matters that are more appropriately dealt with at a national level (for example, reducing travel/shipping costs of materials to reduce carbon emissions, and installing insulation above minimum requirements). The imposition of “thresholds” for certain types of development result in a “pass/fail” assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.</p>	Delete Te Aratohu Hoahoa o Ngā Pokapū Whakamahinga Rau - Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.69	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Submission point 349.225 has a similar outcome to FSNI submission point 476.102.	Allow
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.305	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs)	Opposes the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and seeks amendment to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.123	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	<p>Opposes this policy which requires some developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions in accordance with the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This provision elevates what is normally a design guide into a rule. A design guide should be separate to a plan. The Design Guide should be an external document to the District Plan and be referenced as a guide only. - Further, this provision, provides a mechanism for the Council to require these aspects as part of a development. This is inappropriate. A development should be assessed on its merits. 	Includes reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide in the Introduction as follows: “For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide”.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.82	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Plan Part	Support	Submission point 383.123 supports FSNI submission points 476.1, 476.61, and 476.102.	Allow
McDonald’s Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.7	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	McDonald’s Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports these submissions seeking deletion of the City Outcomes Contributions. While MRNZL recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.47	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Considers that while large scale residential developments “will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city”, such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply “satisfying the relevant design guide”. It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact “The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes.” This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.124	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes the use of the City Outcomes Contributions for reasons outlined in previous submission points.	Delete G97 and all references to City Outcomes Contributions.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.83	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Submission point 383.124 supports FSNI submission points 476.1, 476.61, and 476.102.	Allow
McDonald’s Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.8	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	McDonald’s Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports these submissions seeking deletion of the City Outcomes Contributions. While MRNZL recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Allow
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.48	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Considers that while large scale residential developments “will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city”, such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply “satisfying the relevant design guide”. It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact “The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes.” This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.94	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Supports the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in part. Submitter notes that the design guide is intended to encourage developers to use more sustainable materials to help meet the climate change challenge (Strategic Direction Chapter).	Retain the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, with amendment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.95	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that this guidance should extend to the encouragement of the use of timber as a structural material in high rise buildings to reduce the use of concrete which has a very high carbon cost.	Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide be amended as follows: <u>G84 (a) Consider the use of timber as a structural basis for high rise buildings, or words to like effect.</u>
Investore Property Limited	405.139	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, considers that it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the district plan [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain the Design Guides and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.110	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.110	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.140	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the district plan [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside of the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.111	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.111	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Investore Property Limited	405.141	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.	Amend Design Guides to combine the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential Design Guides into a single design guide document.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Investore Property Limited	405.142	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	<p>Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development is inappropriate. Submitter recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, but considers it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects.</p> <p>Considers that the provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>Should the City Outcomes Contributions provisions be retained, there needs to be greater clarity and predictability provided under Table 3 of G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>	<p>Opposes Table 3 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and seeks amendment.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for attachment].</p>
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.26	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	<p>Considers that while large scale residential developments "will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city", such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply "satisfying the relevant design guide". It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact "The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes." This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.</p>
Investore Property Limited	405.143	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development is inappropriate. Submitter recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, but considers it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects.</p> <p>Considers that the provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>Should the City Outcomes Contributions provisions be retained, there needs to be greater clarity and predictability provided under Table 3 of G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>	<p>Amend Table 3 of Guideline G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide greater clarity and predictability around the City Outcomes points that will be achieved for different outcomes; - Enable a codified system for credits for City Outcomes Contributions achieved by earlier stages of development to be used for later stages of development on the same property. - Change the reference from "public open space" to the defined term "public space"; - Update the comments section to provide objective criteria for outcomes that relate to 'Contribution to Public Space and Amenity'; - Include a set number of points for providing a lane-way or through block connection through a site; - Provide objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in various reuse situations under 'Adaptive reuse of buildings' outcome; - Provide objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in reducing embodied carbon; - Provide objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in relation to different resilience measures; and - Provide objective criteria for 'Urban Design Panel' Outcomes. <p>[Refer to original submission for attachment].</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.27	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Considers that while large scale residential developments “will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city”, such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply “satisfying the relevant design guide”. It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact “The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes.” This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.
Guy Marriage	407.11	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that there is a clear need for a Design Review Panel. The mix of the panel would include urban planners, architects, landscape architects, Iwi and public representatives. We believe improving the design guide also presents the council with an opportunity to push for greater analysis of the construction carbon footprint.	Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in reviewed by a Design Review Panel.
Guy Marriage	407.12	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guides repeat much of what has been raised in the Residential Design Guide, which highlights the need for far more specialization of the Guides.	Seeks that each Design Guide has more specialisation.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.247	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA’s primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.247	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.84	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G28 of the Centres and Mixed use design guide lacks practical specificity on how to manage height and scale and that the operative district plan design guidance should be reinstated on this matter.	Amend the design guide to include G3.5 and the associated diagrams from the current Central Area Urban Design Guide
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.248	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA’s primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.248	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.206	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	<p>Supports Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p>	Retain Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97, with amendments.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.268	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.268	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.207	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	<p>Supports Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that G97 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution guideline will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Delete Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 if height limits are also deleted.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.269	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.269	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.208	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Supports Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains “subject to” numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 is also phrased to “require” City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Seeks that Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 be amended if floor area ratios are used instead of height standards. Amend to allow greater additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required) if the relevant outcomes are achieved.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.270	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.270	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.209	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Supports Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains “subject to” numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 is also phrased to “require” City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Seeks that if Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 is retained, it should be re-phrased so that, rather than “Require over and under height” developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions, the height limit for developments is varied where City Outcomes Contributions are achieved. The change of phrasing reflects the possibility that, as currently proposed, over and under height developments still have a theoretical pathway to obtain a restricted discretionary consent without achieving City Outcomes Contributions. It would also make it clearer that the developer providing the outcome is entitled to the increase in height (or floor area).
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.271	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.271	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.106	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose in part	<p>Submitter supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the District Plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the District Plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the design guides, for example under Rules CCZ-R19 and CCZ-20. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.</p> <p>Submitter seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed Plan and for the relevant district plan provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. As above, the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the District Plan, and can be appropriately referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide".</p> <p>Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.</p>	Opposes the inclusion of the Design Guides within the Proposed District Plan and seeks that these sit outside the Plan as external reference documents.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.30	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.30	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.107	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose in part	<p>Submitter supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the District Plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the District Plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the design guides, for example under Rules CCZ-R19 and CCZ-20. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.</p> <p>Submitter seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed Plan and for the relevant district plan provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. As above, the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the District Plan, and can be appropriately referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide".</p> <p>Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.</p>	Seeks that all direct references to design guides in the City Centre Zone provisions are replaced with references as appropriate and necessary to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.31	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.31	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.108	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Submitter supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the District Plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the District Plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the design guides, for example under Rules CCZ-R19 and CCZ-20. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.</p> <p>Submitter seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed Plan and for the relevant district plan provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. As above, the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the District Plan, and can be appropriately referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide".</p> <p>Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.</p>	Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and Residential Design Guide are combined into one Design Guide.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.32	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.32	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Fabric Property Limited	425.109	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>If the references to the City Outcomes Contributions are to be retained, considers that there needs to be greater clarity and predictability provided under Table 3 of G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. As notified, there is a wider range of points set out for different "outcomes" with little detail provided on how these will be allocated or scored. While many developments may achieve the outcomes set out in Table 3 regardless, it will be difficult for applicants to design developments to achieve these outcomes when it is unclear how points will be awarded for many of the outcomes. For example, in providing a lane-way or public amenities when it could be awarded anywhere between 1-10 or 1-5 points and there is no objective criteria as to how points are awarded.</p> <p>Submitter has provided more comments on Table 3 in Appendix C of their original submission to identify how Table 3 could be amended to provide certainty and clarity for the Council and applicants in how points will be awarded.</p>	<p>If the Proposed District Plan retains provisions relating to the City Outcomes Contribution:</p> <p>Seeks that Table 3 of G97 in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is amended to provide greater clarity and predictability around the City Outcomes points that will be achieved for different outcomes.</p> <p>[See Appendix C of original submission for amendments to Table 3]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Fabric Property Limited	425.110	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to the design guides to anticipate situations where a consent holder will provide a City Outcomes Contribution for current and future stages of a staged development, and receive a credit toward future stages. This should be a codified system in which points achieved but not needed by a development are recorded against a property for use for a later project. This would encourage comprehensive development to take a future-focussed approach in light of the outcomes sought in the design guides.</p> <p>It is appropriate that points be retained as credits to reflect that outcomes have been achieved which have community benefits, and significant investment may have been undertaken in order to achieving points under Table 3.</p> <p>This is important for the redevelopment of a large site where City Outcomes Contributions are provided and credits earned on early stages but not used in that stage, and therefore should be available to be used in future stages.</p>	<p>If the Proposed District Plan retains provisions relating to the City Outcomes Contribution:</p> <p>Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is amended to enable a codified system for credits for City Outcomes Contributions achieved by earlier stages of development to be used for later stages of development on the same property.</p>
Johnsonville Community Association	429.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that large-scale developments will likely have adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>It is unclear what would enable a development to meet the criteria of "satisfying the relevant design guide".</p> <p>Considers that it is unfair to encourage developments by rewarding height increases beyond PDP maximums.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.65	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Supports in general the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Not specified.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.66	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide should be a reference document that sits outside of the district plan and referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way: "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide"	Delete all direct references to the design guides in the Metropolitan Centre Zone provisions and replace with references as appropriate and necessary to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.67	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides.	Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential Design Guides are combined into a single design guide document.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.68	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	<p>Opposes the 'City Outcomes Contributions' in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.</p> <p>Considers that there is a wider range of points set out for different "outcomes" with little detail provided on how these will be allocated or scored.</p> <p>Considers that it will be difficult for applicants to design developments to achieve these outcomes when it is unclear how points will be awarded for many of the outcomes.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove all references to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.31	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Considers that while large scale residential developments “will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city”, such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply “satisfying the relevant design guide”. It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact “The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes.” This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.69	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers appropriate that as an alternative to removing references to 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides, that changes to G97 are necessary. Considers that there is a need for greater clarity and predictability provided under Table 3 (G97). Considers that there is little detail provided on how the different outcomes will be allocated or scored. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks alternative to the preferred relief of remove all references to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides. Seeks to amend Table of G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to provide greater clarity and predictability around the City Outcomes points that will be achieved for different outcomes, in light of the submitter's comments in Appendix B. [refer to original submission for attachment].
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.70	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers appropriate that as an alternative to removing references to 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides, to replace a codified system for credits for City Outcomes Contributions. Considers appropriate that where points are awarded for the current stage of a development, that this should be able to be used as credits at later stages of development (of a staged development) or for future projects. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks alternative to the preferred relief of remove all references to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides. Seeks to amend the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to enable a codified system for credits for City Outcomes Contributions achieved by earlier stages of development to be used for later stages of development on the same property. [refer to original submission for attachment].
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.71	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that 'public space' should be used instead of 'public open space'.	Amend Table 3 as follows: .. For every 10% of the site accessible as public open space [Inferred decision requested]
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.72	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that objective criteria is needed for outcome of 'For every 10% of the site accessible as public open space'. [Inferred decision requested]
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.73	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there should be a set number of points for providing a lane-way or through block connection through a site, for outcome 'Any lane-way or through block connection'. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.74	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that objective criteria is needed for outcome of 'Provision of appropriate communal gardens, playgrounds, and roof gardens'. [Inferred decision requested]
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.75	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that objective criteria is needed for outcome of 'Provision of permanent public amenities, i.e. public toilets'. [Inferred decision requested]
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.76	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there should be objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in various reuse situations, for the outcome of "Adaptive reuse of buildings". [Inferred decision requested]
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.77	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there should be objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in reducing embodied carbon, for the outcome of "Reduction in embodied carbon in buildings". [Inferred decision requested]
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.78	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there should be objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in relation to different resilience measures, for the outcome of "Additional seismic resilience measures, including base isolations, seismic dampers, etc.". [Inferred decision requested]
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.79	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that objective criteria is needed, for the outcome of "Urban Design Panel Approval". [Inferred decision requested]
Foodstuffs North Island	476.61	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose in part	Opposes the City Outcomes Contribution and seeks that it be removed from the plan in its entirety.	Delete the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) from the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.103	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that 'The internal spaces' (page 10 Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide) section is useful for some developments, supermarkets are designed and constructed for a specific activity therefore the guidance should recognise also the functional and operational requirements of activities and development, i.e. practicalities such as servicing, storage and rubbish bins.	Amend 'The internal spaces' (page 10 Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide) section as follows: Buildings in Centres and the Central area are designed to facilitate multiple uses and changes in use over time <u>while recognising the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>
Foodstuffs North Island	476.104	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that 'The internal spaces' (page 10 Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide) section is useful for some developments, supermarkets are designed and constructed for a specific activity therefore the guidance should recognise also the functional and operational requirements of activities and development, i.e. practicalities such as servicing, storage and rubbish bins.	Amend 'The internal spaces' (page 10 Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide) section as follows: Buildings in Centres and the Central area are designed to facilitate multiple uses and changes in use over time <u>while recognising the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.96	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain the Commercial and Mixed Use Design guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested]

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.190	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.190	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Nick Ruane	61.11	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that G116 of the Residential Design Guide is amended to: "Where possible, ensure ground level dwellings and all habitable rooms are designed for accessible and practical use. - Consider having the kitchen, a bathroom and a bedroom on the ground level. - Consider transition between rooms, and the ability to turn and manoeuvre mobility devices."
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.191	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.191	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Nick Ruane	61.12	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Opposes G117 of the Residential Design Guide with decision requested not stated.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.192	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.192	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Nick Ruane	61.13	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Opposes G132 of the Residential Design Guide with decision requested not stated.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.193	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.193	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Nick Ruane	61.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Opposes G133 of the Residential Design Guide in its current form and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.194	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.194	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Nick Ruane	61.15	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that G133 is amended to: Provide ground-level access that is accessible by people using wheelchairs, and design units with reference to <u>which is compliant with</u> NZ standards for access and mobility"
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.195	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.195	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Nick Ruane	61.16	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Opposes G53 of the Residential Design Guide in its current form and seeks amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.196	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guide/s / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.196	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guide/s / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Nick Ruane	61.17	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that G53 is amended to: Developments designed for limited mobility users should <u>must</u> provide an accessible link between parking spaces and their associated unit.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.197	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.197	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow
Brett McKay	69.3	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes the Residential Design Guide relating to residential development within the inner residential suburbs of the city are opposed.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions are recrafted to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock.
Richard Murcott	FS71.4	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Reasonable, well-regulated intensification in MDRZ's is OK. Unreasonable intensification is not OK. Intensification that jeopardises things that are valued by communities (liveability), and risk things that are valuable for the city's reputation overall (its character and heritage), may be considered imprudent or irresponsible. The city doesn't need to rush into this. This increases the risks. The stakes are high; one mistake at this point could jeopardise a lot over the next 10-30yrs.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dennis Michael Hunt	119.3	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that refined design is key to the future of the area. The current design guidelines do not exhibit refinement and are based on box like structures and words which read well but do not contemplate how the written features would be practically incorporated.</p> <p>Sun and park-like areas should be prioritised and that exposed decks at higher levels in apartment buildings are not often used primarily due to wind.</p> <p>The steep terrain is advantageous for the creation of sheltered, sunny outdoor areas but would still require at least 30 metres between six-storey apartment blocks on the north east facing slope.</p>	Seeks that more refined design concepts are established for the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	<p>Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G137) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that G137 (City Outcomes Contribution) is removed from the Residential Design Guide.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.49	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	<p>Considers that while large scale residential developments “will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city”, such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply “satisfying the relevant design guide”. It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact “The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes.” This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.</p>	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.65	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G137) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the extent of scope to increase height and public/neighbour involvement in that, and remove possibility for height to extend above the permitted envelope to be delivered using the City Outcomes Contribution mechanism in the residential zones is reconsidered.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.66	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	<p>Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G137) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the workability and effectiveness of the City Outcomes Contribution methodology is tested.

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

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.90	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G59 addresses the same matter as G55 and the two guidelines should be combined, with the qualifying matter to G55 that a shared surface approach may be suitably safe and the optimal solution in some circumstances.	Seeks that G55 and G59 (Grouped parking and shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide are combined, with amendment to allow for a shared surface approach in some circumstances .
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.91	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G60 is both unspecific and broad, could mean many things.	Seeks that G60 (Grouped parking and shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide is edited or deleted.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.92	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G60 conflicts with G58.	Seeks that G60 (Grouped parking and shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide is edited or deleted.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.93	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that the italicised statement above G62 relates to neighbourhood design yet the guideline relates to design within the site.	Seeks that the italicised statement above G62 (Legibility) of the Residential Design Guide is deleted as follows: Safety, accessibility and legibility contribute to vibrant connected neighbourhoods.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.94	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G62 should be integrated into 'Connections for People'.	Seeks that G62 (Legibility) of the Residential Design Guide is relocated to the section titled 'Connections for People'.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.95	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	Submission point re G63 to G72 (Lighting). Considers that lighting is a matter of detail that is generally covered later and can be referred to in conditions on a resource consent.	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.96	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Submission point re G75 to G79 (Communal open space). Considers that these five guidelines could be compressed into one.	Seeks that G75 to G79 (Communal open space) of the Residential Design Guide are combined into one guideline.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.97	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Submission point re G75 to G79 (Communal open space). Considers that the more guidance is required on what an appropriate level and extent of sun should be for shared spaces.	Clarify the use of 'sunlight access' within G75 to G79 (Communal open space) of the Residential Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.98	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G84 should include some provision for private occupation of parts of the frontage, with low fencing along the balance.	Seeks that G84 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to include some provision for private occupation of parts of the frontage, with low fencing along the balance.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.99	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the more guidance is required on what an appropriate level and extent of sun should be for private open spaces.	Clarify the use of 'sunlight access' within G84 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.100	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G89 should refer to 'occupiable space', as clothes lines are a legitimate use that is required by the RDG.	Seeks that G89 (Balconies and sunrooms) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to refer to 'occupiable space'.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.101	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that there is much overlap and scope for considerable compression of G90-G92 (Waste collection) and G93 -G94 (Waste storage). Notes that these guidelines refer to the Council's Waste Collection Bylaw 2020 which might supersede much of this content.	Seeks that G90-G92 (Waste collection) and G93 -G94 (Waste storage) of the Residential Design Guide are compressed into less guidelines.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.102	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	No specific reason provided.	Seeks that G99, G101, G102 and G103 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide are combined into a single guideline,

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.103	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	No specific reason provided.	Seeks that G104 and G105 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide are combined into a single guideline,
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.104	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that guidance should be provided to address uncertainty created by G100.	Clarify G100 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.105	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G105 may be challenging to achieve when storage and service areas are within basements and some service areas are on rooftops, and the text should be edited for more precision.	Seeks that the text of G105 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide is edited for more precision.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.106	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that light (and heat) absorbent risk contributing to the urban heat island effect. Questions priorities - whether visibility of a building in an urban area is more important than minimising contribution to atmospheric heat gain. If the latter, the second bullet point of G107 should be removed.	Seeks that the second bullet point of G107 (Architectural context) of the Residential Design Guide is removed, depending on priorities. Use roof materials and colours that are dark and absorb rather than reflect light.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.107	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the wording of G110 should be turned around to provide for reasonable internal privacy.	Seeks that the wording of G110 (Visual privacy) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to provide for reasonable internal privacy.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.108	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that while G115 provides one way of dealing with noise, it is not strictly necessary and it would be preferable to identify that this might also be addressed by construction.	Amend G115 (Internal living spaces) of the Residential Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.109	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G117 combines too many, not convincingly grouped matters. The guideline mixes room space standard with circulation layout and capacity, and room size is already covered by G114. And, for example, wayfinding does not apply to kitchens and bathrooms.	Amend G117 (Circulation) of the Residential Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.110	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the title of G118 should be 'Sun Exposure' as the three guidelines refer to sun, and natural light is covered by G121 and G122 below this.	Amend title preceding G118-G120 (Light and sun) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Light and Sun <u>Sun Exposure</u>
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.111	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the use of 'direct natural lighting' needs to be defined or clarified. If this means exposure to the sky, this should be stated.	Clarify term 'direct natural lighting' at G118 (Light and Sun) of the Residential Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.112	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G118 sits better under the 'Natural Lighting' heading.	Seeks that G118 (Light and Sun) of the Residential Design Guide is relocated under the heading 'Natural Light' below.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.113	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the use of the words 'maximum possible' at G119 leads to uncertainty and ambiguity, and that the minimum amount of sun that should be provided should be defined, allowing for some flexibility.	Amend G119 (Light and sun) of the Residential Design Guide to remove uncertainty.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.114	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that if there is no clear and unequivocal empirical link between borrowed light and mental wellbeing, then that part of the text should be removed.	Seeks that, if no link between borrowed light and mental wellbeing is shown, G122 (Natural light) of the Residential Design Guide is amended.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.115	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that while G123 is sound in principle, this guideline which 'must be applied' may be problematic for apartments in noisy entertainment districts, and this situation must be recognised.	Amend G123 (Natural ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.116	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	There needs to be guidance about what is meant by 'large' at G126. This mandatory requirement might be relevant to a large apartment development, but might be irrelevant to a large terraced housing development.	Clarify the use of the word 'large' at G126 (Community internal amenity) of the Residential Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.117	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	There needs to be guidance about what is meant by 'are inclusive of' at G132 as this is a 'must be applied' guideline.	Clarify the use of 'are inclusive of' at G132 (Accessibility) of the Residential Design Guide.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.118	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G133 might be an important aspect of achieving G132, but is given little weight (one dot).	Not specified.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.119	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G137 relating to City Outcomes Contributions should be deleted.	Seeks that G137 (City Outcomes Contribution) of the Residential Design Guide is deleted.
Jill Ford	163.16	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Supports the Residential Design Guide G99 as notified.	Retain G99 (For large developments, provide a secure weatherproof storage area external to the unit large enough to store a bicycle) in the Residential Design Guide as notified.
Jill Ford	163.17	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Supports the Residential Design Guide G100 as notified.	Retain G100 (External storage areas must be of an appropriate size and volume in relation to the occupancy of the allocated unit.) in the Residential Design Guide as notified.
Jill Ford	163.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Supports the Residential Design Guide G101 as notified.	Retain G101 (Where possible locate bicycle storage near to primary entrances for convenient access and to encourage usage) in the Residential Design Guide as notified.
Jill Ford	163.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Supports the Residential Design Guide G102 as notified.	Retain G102 (Bicycle storage should accommodate electric bicycles (wallmounted racks are inappropriate for electric bicycles). Bicycle storage should also consider including spaces for larger bicycles and adaptable bicycles) in the Residential Design Guide as notified.
Patrick Wilkes	173.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain Residential Design Guide guidance GG 99-102 (external bike storage) with amendment to include in objectives policies and rules.
Jaqui Tutt	209.1	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers the importance of sunlight in Aro Valley.</p> <p>Considers the role of Aro Valley residents in writing appropriate sunlight rules.</p> <p>Supports the definition of sunlight as amenity attribute by Boffa Miskell and wider recommendations from Boffa Miskell.</p> <p>Considers that the Councillors recognise the importance of sunlight.</p> <p>Considers that it is unreasonable for Aro Valley Residents to have to leave their houses to access sunlight.</p> <p>Supports an amendment to include sunlight provisions in all residential zoned housing.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks addition to Residential Design Guide to include the following:</p> <p>"Sun access to outdoor spaces between spring and autumn equinox (4hrs) as well as sun access to internal living spaces in winter (2hrs)".</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stratum Management Limited	249.48	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the guideline (58) presents as a standard.	Seeks that guideline 58 (Grouped car-parking or shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide is removed or appropriately qualified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.49	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that the guideline (58) presents as a standard.	Seeks that guideline 58 (Grouped car-parking or shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide is removed or appropriately qualified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.50	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the guideline (73) will be applied as a standard and is concerned with this. Considers that given the guideline applies to residential development, the provision of end of trip facilities would appear to be axiomatic, and the requirement can be deleted.	Seeks that guideline 73 (Carbon reduction - site) of the Residential Design Guide is appropriately qualified, for instance by amending the first sentence to "Encourage the provision of..."
Stratum Management Limited	249.51	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	The guideline (74) presents as a standard.	Seeks that guideline 74 (Carbon reduction - site) of the Residential Design Guide is appropriately qualified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.52	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that this outcome may not always be possible and a qualification along the lines of "wherever possible" should be added. The guideline (82) has the potential to have a significant impact on city centre housing stock particularly.	Seeks that guideline 82 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide is appropriately qualified.
Stratum Management Limited	249.53	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers the matters listed in G93 present as standards and may be better achieved as a standard.	Seeks that guideline 93 (Waste collection) of the Residential Design Guide is removed.
Stratum Management Limited	249.54	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers the matter (94) presents as standards and may be better accommodated as such, if required.	Seeks that guideline 94 (Waste collection) of the Residential Design Guide is removed.
Stratum Management Limited	249.55	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that these guidelines (G99-G105) present as standards. As noted above, provision of bicycle storage for each apartment in a building can require significant space which comes at a cost, in turn affecting affordability. Not all users of an apartment building will require such storage. The practicality of G105 needs to be considered, particularly in an apartment context where access is controlled through security systems.	Seeks that guidelines G99-G105 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide are appropriately qualified to not present as standards and are removed where possible.
Stratum Management Limited	249.56	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that these guidelines (G99-G105) present as standards. As noted above, provision of bicycle storage for each apartment in a building can require significant space which comes at a cost, in turn affecting affordability. Not all users of an apartment building will require such storage. The practicality of G105 needs to be considered, particularly in an apartment context where access is controlled through security systems.	Seeks that guidelines G99-G105 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide are appropriately qualified to not present as standards and are removed where possible.
Stratum Management Limited	249.57	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that this guideline (120) presents as a standard in 'avoid' terms and would preclude any south facing apartment units which are often unavoidable in a city centre context.	Seeks to remove guideline 120 (Light and Sun) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it, for example with "wherever possible".
Stratum Management Limited	249.58	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that this guideline (120) presents as a standard in 'avoid' terms and would preclude any south facing apartment units which are often unavoidable in a city centre context.	Seeks to remove guideline 120 (Light and Sun) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it, for example with "wherever possible".
Stratum Management Limited	249.59	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers guideline (122) presents as a standard and requires something over and above building code requirements. This guideline is particularly problematic for city centre apartments.	Seeks to remove guideline 122 (Natural Light) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Stratum Management Limited	249.60	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers guideline (122) presents as a standard and requires something over and above building code requirements. This guideline is particularly problematic for city centre apartments.	Seeks to remove guideline 122 (Natural Light) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it.
Stratum Management Limited	249.61	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers guideline (123) presents as a standard and requires something over and above building code requirements. This guideline is particularly problematic for city centre apartments.	Seeks to remove guideline 123 (Natural ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it.
Stratum Management Limited	249.62	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers guideline (123) presents as a standard and requires something over and above building code requirements. This guideline is particularly problematic for city centre apartments.	Seeks to remove guideline 123 (Natural ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it.
Stratum Management Limited	249.63	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers this (guideline 126) presents as a standard and would impose costs to multi-unit development.	Seeks to remove guideline 126 (Communal internal amenity) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it.
Stratum Management Limited	249.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers this (guideline 126) presents as a standard and would impose costs to multi-unit development.	Seeks to remove guideline 126 (Communal internal amenity) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it.
Stratum Management Limited	249.65	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers the guideline (129) presents as a standard and is unclear on whether the requirement is for each and every residential unit.	Remove guideline 129 (Communal internal amenity) of the Residential Design Guide.
Stratum Management Limited	249.66	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers the guideline (130) presents as a standard and is inherently subjective.	Seeks to remove guideline 130 (Internal Storage) of the Residential Design Guide or greater qualification.
Stratum Management Limited	249.67	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers the guideline (130) presents as a standard and is inherently subjective.	Seeks to remove guideline 130 (Internal Storage) of the Residential Design Guide or greater qualification.
Stratum Management Limited	249.68	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Considers the guideline (131) presents as a standard and is inherently subjective.	Seeks to remove guideline 131 (Internal Storage) of the Residential Design Guide or greater qualification.
Stratum Management Limited	249.69	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers the guideline (131) presents as a standard and is inherently subjective.	Seeks to remove guideline 131 (Internal Storage) of the Residential Design Guide or greater qualification.
McDonald's	274.78	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Seeks that G137 of the Residential Design Guide (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.228	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.228	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.17	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Residential Design Guide requires clarification. The thorough guidance provided by the now former Multi-Unit Design Guide has now be replaced by vague-sounding statements.	Clarify the Residential Design Guide to be less vague.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.229	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.229	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G109 in the Residential Design Guide has vague statements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Clarify G109 in Residential Design Guide to provide more guidance on Medium Density housing and High Density Housing needs.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.230	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.230	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose in part	Considers that the City Outcomes Contributions will not maintain the concept of High City / Low City form in the Operative District Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes G137 (City outcomes Contributions) of the Residential Design Guide.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.20	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Facades section of the Residential Design Guide (G41) is too short and inadequate and should be amended to be more thorough. The section should include provisions on proportion, materials, texture and colour.	Amend the G41 (Facades) of the Residential Design Guide to include provisions on proportion, materials, texture and colour.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.231	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.231	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.21	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Facades section of the Residential Design Guide (G41) should require multi-storey buildings to be designed by Registered Architects, such as the NZIA.	Amend G41 (Facades) of the Residential Design Guide to require multi-storey buildings to be designed by Registered Architects.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.232	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.232	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.22	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G87 (Balconies and Sunrooms) should mandate the provision of a balcony or deck to every living space in the CCZ, even where something as small as a student housing unit is proposed. The Residential Design Guide states: "Good quality balcony spaces or sunrooms can substantially improve residents' quality of life and increase the value and desirability of apartments to potential buyers". Therefore, these should be mandatory. The events of the last few years with the Covid pandemic showed the world the vital importance of access to external open space. While people in the MDRZ can access a front or rear yard, people living in the CCZ must have access to a balcony space.	Amend G87 (Balconies and sunrooms) of the Residential Design Guide to mandate a balcony or deck to every living space in the City Centre Zones.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.233	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.233	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.23	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the star rating of importance in Private Open Space and Communal Open Space should be amended to give more importance to multi-unit housing rather than single houses. Single houses under Private Open Space G80 to G84 have a three-star rank, implying they are of highest importance than multi-housing under Communal Open Space in G75 to G79.	Seeks that G75 to G79 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide be classified as being of three-star importance.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.234	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.234	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that items G63 to G72 under the Light section are only concerned with artificial electric light, and do not refer to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. The Lighting section of the Residential Design Guide should be re-titled as "Artificial Light".	Amend the heading of the 'Lighting' section in the Residential Design Guide to rename it to "Artificial Light".
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.235	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.235	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.25	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Lighting section of the Residential Design Guide should be moved next to sections on Light and Sun (G18 to G120), and Natural Light (G121 & G122).	Amend the Residential Design Guide to put the 'Lighting' section near the 'Light and Sun' and 'Natural Light' sections.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.236	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.236	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.26	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Natural Ventilation section of the Residential Design Guide should require opening windows on two separate facades. G123 states: "Ensure habitable rooms, especially bedrooms and living spaces have at least one openable window to an external wall for direct access to fresh air". Research has shown a greatly increased ability for natural ventilation to actually work when there are opening windows on two separate facades, which allows far better pull through of natural ventilation.	Amend G123 (Natural ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide to require opening windows on two separate facades.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.237	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.237	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
James Coyle	307.28	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the word 'daylight' is too vague and should be replaced with 'sunlight' as sunlight is direct and can be measured. Daylight can be indirect and is not specific enough to be measured sufficiently.	Seeks that the term 'daylight' be changed to 'sunlight' in the Residential Design Guide. [Inferred decision requested]
James Coyle	307.29	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	The term "daylight" should be amended to "sunlight" in the Residential Design Guide. Buildings should look to solar gain for regulating temperature and need direct sunlight for this. The carbon footprint of buildings need to be reduced and air conditioning usage should be decreased. Natural techniques for ventilation and temperature regulation should be used. Direct sun in Winter should be maximised.	Amend language in the Residential Design Guide to replace "daylight" with "sunlight".
Bruce Crothers	319.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Supports G99 to G102 (external bike storage) and considers that these should be carried into the PDP rules, policies and objectives.	Retain G99 to G102 (external bike storage) of the Residential Design Guide as notified.
Joan Fitzgerald	323.5	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Supports GG99 to G102 (external bike storage).	Retain G99-102 (External bike storage) of the Residential Design Guide as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Bruce Rae	334.6	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that the proper use of Appendices should be clarified. The residential design guide flowchart makes it clear the appendices must be used in conjunction with the main design guide. However, in the 'unqualified' parts of the MRZ the main design guide is only engaged when four or more units are intended for a site.</p> <p>In character areas, an alteration affecting neither floor area nor function of rooms, triggers a requirement to follow both the main residential design guide as well as the character precincts appendix, which seems excessive.</p> <p>Additional scope guidance is needed at the start of the appendices, making it clear that the assessment does not need to expand to the whole of the building on the whole of the site when only limited works on a limited part of the site are contemplated. Clarification of whether a full and expensive assessment or a more streamlined assessment is needed will suffice.</p>	Seeks that the Residential Design Guide Appendices be amended to have an additional scope guidance at the start of appendices, so as to clarify the scope of required assessments.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.15	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that inserting the term 'must' rather than 'should' in clause G37 of the Residential Design Guide provides greater emphasis on the need to meet standards.</p>	<p>Submitter has incorrectly referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Sought] Amend G37 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide as follows:</p> <p>Entrances should must be of adequate dimensions to provide universal access for all and allow for movement from a wide range of users, including moving furniture and wheelchairs.</p>
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.16	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that the use of "where possible" in clause G39 of the Residential Design Guide is not appropriate and does not emphasise the need for greater compliance and uptake from designers, developers and builders.</p> <p>[Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]</p>	<p>Amend G39 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide as follows:</p> <p>Where possible, ensure dwellings on the ground floor have a step-free entry.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.17	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that inserting the term 'must' rather than 'should' in clause G53 of the Residential Design Guide provides greater emphasis on the need to meet standards.</p> <p>[Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]</p>	<p>Amend G53 (Garages, carports and carpads) of the Residential Design Guide as follows:</p> <p>Developments designed for limited mobility users should must provide an accessible link between parking spaces and their associated unit.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that the use of 'where possible' in clause G116 of the Residential Design Guide is not appropriate and does not emphasise the need for greater compliance and uptake from designers, developers and builders.</p> <p>[Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]</p>	<p>Seeks to amend G116 (Internal living spaces) as follows:</p> <p>Where possible, ensure ground level dwellings and all habitable rooms are designed for accessible and practical use.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	<p>Supports clause G117 of the Residential Design Guide as this provision will ensure uptake and compliance from designers, builders and developers.</p> <p>[Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]</p>	<p>Retain G117 (Circulation) of the Residential Design Guide as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.20	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that inserting the word 'impairments' rather than 'abilities' in clause G132 of the Residential Design Guide is more appropriate. Notes that using the term 'abilities' to refer to disabled people is regarded as euphemistic by many within the disabled community.</p> <p>[Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]</p>	<p>Amend G132 (Accessibility) of the Residential Design Guide as follows:</p> <p>Ensure developments are inclusive of people of all ages and abilities impairments, including the ageing population, children and pregnant women or parents with infants and toddlers.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.21	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that inserting 'ensure' rather than 'where possible, provide' in clause G133 of the Residential Design Guide provides greater compliance and uptake by designers, builders and developers.</p> <p>[Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]</p>	<p>Amend G133 (Accessibility) of the Residential Design Guide as follows:</p> <p>Where possible, provide Ensure ground-level access that is accessible by people using wheelchairs, and design units with reference to NZ standards for access and mobility</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.22	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that inserting the term 'must' rather than 'should' in clause G37 of the Residential Design Guide provides greater emphasis on the need to meet standards. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Amend G37 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Entrances should must be of adequate dimensions to provide universal access for all and allow for movement from a wide range of users, including moving furniture and wheelchairs. [Inferred decision requested]
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.23	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the use of "where possible" in clause G39 of the Residential Design Guide is not appropriate and does not emphasise the need for greater compliance and uptake from designers, developers and builders. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Amend G39 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Where possible, ensure dwellings on the ground floor have a step-free entry. [Inferred decision requested]
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that replacing "limited mobility users" with "people with mobility impairments, i.e., wheelchair users, mobility aid users, etc" is more appropriate as the intention is to refer to this grouping of the disability community. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Amend G53 (Garages, carports and carpads) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Developments designed for limited mobility users people with mobility impairments, i.e., wheelchair users, mobility aid users, etc , should provide an accessible link between parking spaces and their associated unit. [Inferred decision requested]
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.25	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Seeks to add "Changes in the level should be properly ramped" as an additional sentence to point 7 of clause G76 of the Residential Design Guide. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Amend G76 (Communal open space) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Communal open space should: » Offer a sense of manaakitanga (are safe and inviting). » Be the focus of the development.» Be of an appropriate proportion and defined by the built form. » Have a direct or easy connection to all dwellings. » Be located and oriented to receive sun and shelter at times of highest use. » Be flat, but may incorporate changes in level where these are designed to add to the visual and functional amenity of the space. <u>Changes in level should be properly ramped.</u> » Include landscape elements that are of an appropriate scale e.g trees, seating and fences. [Inferred decision requested]
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.26	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that inserting the term 'accessible' will ensure spaces can be accessible for all people, including disabled people and that reference should be made to kitchenettes in clause 78 of the Residential Design Guide.	Amend G78 (Communal open space) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Where possible, provide <u>accessible</u> communal spaces for social interaction and outdoor activities, including kitchenettes. Especially in more significant developments or where private outdoor living spaces are insufficient for people to meet their everyday needs. [Inferred Decision Sought]
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.27	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that inserting the term 'accessible' before "open space" would indicate that sometimes balconies are inaccessible to disabled people, particularly wheelchair or mobility aid users due to the fact that too often balconies are too small to accommodate wheelchairs or mobility aids and lips can be difficult to negotiate.	Amend G81 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Assign private <u>accessible</u> open space to individual units of a type and quality appropriate to the dwelling typology, wherever possible. [Inferred decision requested]
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.28	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Support clause G86 of the Residential Design Guide on the basis that the concept of accessibility will be understood by guide users.	Retain G86 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.29	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Support clause G91 of the Residential Design Guide on the basis that the concept of accessibility as it applies to the needs of disabled householders is understood.	Retain G91 (Waste storage) of the Residential Design Guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested]

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

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Considers that direct sunlight to a home is an integral part of creating and maintaining a healthy home and supporting residents' wellbeing. The Design Guidelines recognise the benefit of solar access to improve energy efficiency and wellbeing.	Retain Residential Design Guide as notified, especially provisions relating to the benefits of sunlight access. [Inferred decision requested]
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.12	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Residential Design Guide's section on Built Form should be strengthened to include form, colour and light pollution for housing that is visually prominent. Where houses are visually prominent, attention needs to be paid by the architect and builder to the form, shape and colour of the building. This is especially important for houses in high altitude locations or houses which are visible from a distance. It is suggested that the Residential Design Guide refers to the preferred use of forms that harmonise with the landscape where concentrated housing developments are located high on hillsides or close to ridgelines. This includes the use of natural materials, and colour schemes selected from a palette of subdued natural colours that vary from building to building where possible.	Amend the Residential Design guide to more strictly regulate visually prominent form and colours.
Andy Foster	FS86.33	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 374.12].	Allow
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.13	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Residential Design Guide's section on Light should be amended to more strongly minimise long-distance and cross-valley light pollution. Light pollution is of special concern when the light arises from new, visually prominent housing developments. Light pollution from a new housing development in Glenside West will adversely affect the Glenside Valley unless measures are taken to ensure that outside lighting including street lighting is diverted downwards and shielded.	Amend the Residential Design guide to more strictly regulate light pollution.
Guy Marriage	407.13	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that there is now the low-end MDRZ, the high-end CCZ, and all the other Zones clustered in between. The guidelines for what to do in the high density CCZ need to offer markedly different advice from the much lower density MDRZ. The MDRZ in particular is still likely to comprise single family houses for many years to come, and even the new housing in this zone is likely to be mainly just one or two storey high, even if denser than before.	Seeks that the Residential Design Guides are split into three parts redesigned to adequately reflect the different residential zones in the Proposed District Plan.
Guy Marriage	407.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to account for how denser housing interfaces with concerns of existing residents in existing housing.
Guy Marriage	407.15	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the former daylight access planes almost guaranteed sunlight and daylight for any house in what was the Inner and Outer Residential Zones. The revised recession planes imposed by the new MDRS and the adoption of the MDRZ removes the chance for sunlight, while also reducing the chance of adequate daylight.	Seeks the addition to the Residential Design Guide on how to manage sunlight considerations.
Guy Marriage	407.16	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that guidance on Medium Density and High Density Housing needs to be so much more, or we will end up with continued urban housing disasters.	Seeks that guidance on the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is expanded.
Guy Marriage	407.17	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that guidance on Medium Density and High Density Housing needs to be so much more, or we will end up with continued urban housing disasters.	Seeks that guidance on the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is expanded.
Guy Marriage	407.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the events of the last few years with the Covid pandemic showed the world the vital importance of access to external open space. While people in the MDRZ can access a front or rear yard, people living in the CCZ must have access to a balcony space.	Seeks that G87 (Balconies and sunrooms) of the Residential Design Guide mandates the provision of a balcony or deck to every living space in the City Centre Zone.
Guy Marriage	407.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing.	Seeks that G80 (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guy Marriage	407.20	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing.	Seeks that G81 (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested]
Guy Marriage	407.21	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing.	Seeks that G82 (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested]
Guy Marriage	407.22	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing.	Seeks that (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested]
Guy Marriage	407.23	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing.	Seeks that G84 (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested]
Guy Marriage	407.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing.	Seeks that G75 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide should be amended to be given three star (***) importance.
Guy Marriage	407.25	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing.	Seeks that G76 in the Residential Style Guide should be amended to be given more importance.
Guy Marriage	407.26	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing.	Seeks that G77 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide should be amended to be given three star (***) importance.
Guy Marriage	407.27	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing.	Seeks that G78 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide should be amended to be given three star (***) importance.
Guy Marriage	407.28	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing.	Seeks that G79 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide should be amended to be given three star (***) importance.
Guy Marriage	407.29	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G63 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.
Guy Marriage	407.30	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G64 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.
Guy Marriage	407.31	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G65 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.
Guy Marriage	407.32	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G66 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Guy Marriage	407.33	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G67 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.
Guy Marriage	407.34	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G68 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.
Guy Marriage	407.35	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G69 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.
Guy Marriage	407.36	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G70 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.
Guy Marriage	407.37	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G71 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.
Guy Marriage	407.38	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight.	Seeks that G72 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight.
Guy Marriage	407.39	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Amend the Residential Design Guide to put the "Lighting" provisions (G62 - G72) next to the "Light and sunlight" provisions (G118 to G120).
Guy Marriage	407.40	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Amend the Residential Design Guide to put the "Lighting" provisions (G62 - G72) next to the "Artificial Light" provisions (G121 to G122).
Guy Marriage	407.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that research has shown a greatly increased ability for natural ventilation to actually work when there are opening windows on two separate facades, which allows far better pull through of natural ventilation.	Seeks that G123 (Natural Ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to mandate the provision of windows on two different facades. [Inferred decision requested]
Guy Marriage	407.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G41 is short and inadequate. The external appearance of buildings makes up the physical appearance of the capital city,	Seeks that G41 (Facades) of the Residential Design Guide is expanded, requiring multi-storey buildings to be designed by Registered Architects.
Guy Marriage	407.43	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G41 is short and inadequate. The external appearance of buildings makes up the physical appearance of the capital city,	Seeks that G41 (Facades) of the Residential Design Guide includes a provision for statements on proportion, materials, texture and colour.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.1	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the design guide Mount Victoria section should note that under streetscape attribute, it is characteristic for buildings in Mt Victoria to have had alterations pre-1930 as found in the assessment made by Michael Kelly in 2017.	Amend page 12 under streetscape attributes as follows: Many of the remaining older buildings have been substantially modified over time <u>and pre-1930 alterations are characteristic of many Mt Victoria buildings. However,</u> their original primary form generally remains apparent.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.85	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the guidance G31 of the residential design guide should include a diagram to show how to manage height and scale adjacent to a heritage place.	Amend the design guide to include G3.5 and the associated diagrams from the current Central Area Urban Design Guide
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.249	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.249	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow
Metlifecare Limited	413.43	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose in part	Design guide does not provide guidelines relating to retirement village development and should not be applied to this type of development. Any design guide should also not sit within the plan as a standard but sit outside the plan as a guidance tool only.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Metlifecare Limited	413.44	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Design guide does not provide guidelines relating to retirement village development and should not be applied to this type of development. Any design guide should also not sit within the plan as a standard but sit outside the plan as a guidance tool only.	Seeks to amend the Residential Design Guide to make it clear that it does not apply to retirement village development.
Metlifecare Limited	413.45	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Design guide does not provide guidelines relating to retirement village development and should not be applied to this type of development. Any design guide should also not sit within the plan as a standard but sit outside the plan as a guidance tool only.	Seeks to provide for the Residential Design Guide as a guidance tool only that sits outside of the District Plan.
VicLabour	414.59	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	Supports the suggestion that on-site car parks may not be required for new developments.	Retain G56 of the residential design guide. [Inferred decision requested]
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.210	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that generally, a more permissive approach to multi-unit housing should be taken within the Medium Density Residential Zone provided the relevant height limits and building envelope controls are complied with. The Residential Design Guide should be non-statutory. [Refer to submission points made on 'Design Guides' and HRZ – P6].	Seeks that the Residential Design Guide be made non-statutory. [Inferred decision].
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.272	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.272	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that large-scale developments will likely have adverse impacts on neighbouring properties. It is unclear what would enable a development to meet the criteria of "satisfying the relevant design guide". Considers that it is unfair to encourage developments by rewarding height increases beyond PDP maximums. [See original submission for full reason]	Delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Residential Design Guide in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ingrid Downey	443.2	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that the existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan should be retained rather than replacing them with the minimum daylight provisions in the PDP.</p> <p>Keeping the Operative Plan provisions will ensure a minimum level of quality - and humanity - will be maintained in our new homes.</p> <p>Considers that light is fundamental to our well-being, and shading is far more than simply a minor issue. Reductions in sunlight can and do affect: heating and light cost; dampness; the ability to dry clothes outside and grow food; and mental well-being.</p>	<p>Seeks that the existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan are reinstated in the Design Guides.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.17	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that good design will take these trees into account and provide a better outcome for residents.</p>	<p>Seeks amendment that Residential Design Guide G19 (regenerate waterways and enhance the stream ecology where waterways exist above or below ground) is mandatory.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that good design will take these trees into account and provide a better outcome for residents.</p>	<p>Seeks amendment that Residential Design Guide G20 (protect and enhance existing native bush and significant trees on-site and in the surrounding area) is mandatory.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	<p>Considers that G24 partially supports a 1.5m-2m minimum setback for the planting of a street scape i.e. trees</p>	<p>Not specified.</p>
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.32	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>The wording of the "Guiding Principles" does not suggest it is mandatory for developers to conform to them.</p>	<p>Amend the "Guiding Principles" in the Residential (Character Precincts) Design Guide (page 5-9) so that the wording makes conformance with the principles mandatory, unless the developer can persuade the council otherwise.</p>
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.8	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	<p>Inconsistent with the RVA's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as the RVA is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.8	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	<p>Inconsistent with Ryman's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as Ryman is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.33	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Developers should be required to conform to "Guiding principles" specified in the design guide. As worded, the policies present more of an advisory note than a mandatory requirement. All developers should be required to conform to the "Guiding principles".</p>	<p>Include a requirement in the "Guiding Principles" in the Residential (Character Precincts) Design Guide (page 5-9) that "Applicants must demonstrate that the provisions of this Design Guide have been acknowledged and interpreted and their objectives satisfied".</p> <p>Noted that this may require a change to MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Purpose).</p>
Foodstuffs North Island	476.62	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes the City Outcomes Contribution and seeks that it be removed from the plan in its entirety.</p>	<p>Delete the City Outcomes Contribution (G137) from the Residential Design Guide.</p>
Catharine Underwood	481.33	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that the design guides should require all new development to have solar or wind for communal lighting and heating, rather than incentivising or negotiating it. Making these a requirement would be a great move to sustainability.</p>	<p>Amend the Residential Design Guide to require solar or wind for communal lighting and heating.</p>
Catharine Underwood	481.34	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support in part	<p>Supports the planting of more native trees as per G5 and G6. It is expected that hope the range of specimen trees mentioned in G10 are predominately native trees, as they provide a better habitat for native species, contribute to the street scape as well as off setting emissions.</p>	<p>Retain Vegetation and Planting recommendations in the Residential Design Guide (G5, G6 and G10) as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Catharine Underwood	481.35	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that it is unclear and uncertain whether the Residential Design Guide guidelines with actually provide protection for trees and require designs to be made around them. There is concern regarding developers getting permission to raze and cut down trees.	Amend the Residential Design Guide to clarify that trees will actively be protected from development. [Inferred decision requested]
Catharine Underwood	481.36	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that water conservation (G17 and G18) should be made mandatory, as it will be very costly, if not impossible, to include water retrofittings in buildings after they have been built. New Zealand should take note of what Japan is doing.	Seeks that Water Conservation recommendations in the Residential Design Guide (G17 and G18) be made mandatory.
Catharine Underwood	481.37	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G19 and G20 (Ecology) in the Residential Design Guide should be made mandatory. Good design will take trees into account and provide a better outcome for residents, instead of cutting down trees to get more money from extra apartments. G24 also supports prior amendment suggestions of 1.5m minimum setback for the planting of a street scape.	Seeks that Ecology recommendations in the Residential Design Guide (G19 and G20) be made mandatory.
Catharine Underwood	481.38	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G60 in the Residential Design Guide is unclear, as it refers to grouping carparks to improve setbacks, despite it being understood that there would be not setbacks to the front or sides.	Clarify the intent of G60 of the Residential Design Guide [Inferred decision requested]
Catharine Underwood	481.39	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that sub-points in the Residential Design Guide regarding cars and carparking tend to have 'must' in their wording, while sub-points on storage for ebikes, bikes, scooters and other modes of transport have 'should' in their wording, such as G74 under the heading Carbon Reduction.	Not specified.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.97	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support in part	Supports the Residential Design Guide as it provides direction on matters such as urban design, stormwater and implementation of climate change measures that are part of PDP's pivotal strategic objectives.	Retain the residential design guide as notified.
Dinah Priestley	495.3	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes the provisions of the MRZ and associated design guides relating to residential development within the residential suburbs of the city. Considers that Council's proposals are aimed specifically at achieving a complete transformation of the inner residential neighbourhoods through intensification that will result in the irrevocable loss of the city's older housing stock which gives Wellington its special character and unique sense of place. It is believed that the inner residential neighbourhoods can make an acceptable contribution to city growth without destroying the existing residential fabric.	Seeks that the Residential Design Guide is re-written to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock. The Guide will need to recognize both residential character and heritage qualities ensure appropriate implementation.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.64	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	The TRA believes that the city can have its cake and eat it. That it is not necessary to plan and zone for irrevocable loss of the city's valued older housing stock. And especially when this is part of Wellington special character and unique sense of place. It is observed how liveable cities overseas are enhanced by appreciating these values, and undertaking urban planning accordingly to get the right balance. Inner residential neighbourhoods like Thorndon have made an acceptable contribution to city growth, and can continue to do so without destroying the existing residential fabric.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dinah Priestley	495.4	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	<p>Opposes the provisions of the MRZ and associated design guides relating to residential development within the residential suburbs of the city.</p> <p>Considers that Council's proposals are aimed specifically at achieving a complete transformation of the inner residential neighbourhoods through intensification that will result in the irrevocable loss of the city's older housing stock which gives Wellington its special character and unique sense of place. It is believed that the inner residential neighbourhoods can make an acceptable contribution to city growth without destroying the existing residential fabric.</p>	Seeks that the Residential Design Guide is re-written to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock. The Guide will need to recognize both residential character and heritage qualities ensure appropriate implementation.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.65	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Support	<p>The TRA believes that the city can have its cake and eat it.</p> <p>That it is not necessary to plan and zone for irrevocable loss of the city's valued older housing stock. And especially when this is part of Wellington special character and unique sense of place.</p> <p>It is observed how liveable cities overseas are enhanced by appreciating these values, and undertaking urban planning accordingly to get the right balance.</p> <p>Inner residential neighbourhoods like Thorndon have made an acceptable contribution to city growth, and can continue to do so without destroying the existing residential fabric.</p>	Allow
Robert and Chris Gray	46.16	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Amend	<p>Mount Victoria's character is unique in Wellington and New Zealand for its concentration of Victorian and Edwardian wooden dwellings.</p> <p>Considers that a critical mass is required to preserve character.</p> <p>Notes that the area that WCC Officers, presumably guided by the Boffa Miskell assessment, originally recommended to be classified as Character Precincts in Mount Victoria was considerably larger than the those in the PDP.</p>	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to encompass Boffa Miskell Primary/Contributory Character sub-area plus Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's recommendations.
Owen Watson	51.6	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Amend	Considers that that the character areas in Mt Victoria should be extended, in line with the recommendations in the Boffa Miskell Report.	Seeks that Character Precincts in Mount Victoria be extended to areas recommended by Heritage New Zealand submission.
Avryl Bramley	202.46	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that a provision is added to allow design alteration on streetscapes to bring them in line with original plans, only allowing use of materials in the same style (Excluding strength, fire and insulation requirements).
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.51	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Retain the Character Precincts design guide as notified
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.86	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Amend	Considers that content should be revised to focus on pre-1930 character as opposed to 'original' elements because it is characteristic of many buildings in the character areas to have had alterations in the 1920s.	Seeks that content under the heading 'Building age and style revise paragraphs 2 and 4 to ensure the emphasis is on pre-1930 character as opposed to 'original' elements.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.87	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Amend	Identifies a grammatical mistake	Amend sentence in paragraph 8 which does not make sense.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.88	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Amend	Considers that references to 'originality' or 'original' throughout this guide should be changed to 'pre-1930'.	Amend references to 'originality' or 'original' throughout the guide to 'pre-1930'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Lee	454.7	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that 'Character' areas should all be renamed heritage areas because character is a subjective term, unlike 'heritage' which has a legal force in the RMA.	Seeks that 'Character' areas should all be renamed heritage areas.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Support	Suports submission seeking all character areas should be relabelled to Heritage Areas.	Allow
Christina Mackay	478.15	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Character Precincts Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Character Precincts Design Guide appears too permissive, which could led to an undermining of the integrity of historical houses and their neighbourhood. Submitter supports a more conservation and preservation approach.	Seeks a more conservation and preservation approach for Character Precincts Design Guide.
Avryl Bramley	202.47	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that a provision is added to allow design alteration on streetscapes to bring them in line with original plans, only allowing use of materials in the same style (Excluding strength, fire and insulation requirements).
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.36	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Support	Supports the recognition of papakāinga supporting Māori who don't necessarily whakapapa to a particular place, and as a concept of communal purchase of land by common Kaupapa to support intergenerational communal living.	Retain introduction 'What is a 'papakāinga' of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.37	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Support	Support the recognition of urban papakāinga for mātāwaka who are wanting to live in more communal ways to support the revitalization of culture and te reo me ōna tikanga (language and its cultural practices).	Retain introduction 'What is a 'papakāinga' of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.38	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Support	Supports the cross reference between the Residential Design Guide and the Papakāinga Design Guide.	Retain introduction 'Coordination with Residential Design Guide' of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.39	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Support	Supports the inclusion of this section, and the identification of increased interest in medium and high density papakāinga models and associated kaupapa or principles underpinning papakāinga.	Retain 'Kaupapa' section of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.40	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Support	Supports the guidelines included in the design guide.	Retain guidelines of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Support	Supports glossary.	Retain glossary of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.337	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Support in part	Supports the Papakāinga Design Guide and the approach to providing for papakāinga using guiding Kaupapa, as long as this design guide does not undermine tino rangatiratanga. Currently the District Plan only references this design guide for Tapu Te Ranga land in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain the Papakāinga Design Guide with amendment.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.69	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.69	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.338	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Amend	The submitter notes that there is no papakāinga chapter, nor are papakāinga activities specifically provided for in the zone chapters. The PDP does not provide for papakāinga on Māori owned land or ancestral land. Seeks to ensure the approach to providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land, and enabling Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms, has regard to direction from Policies UD.1 and UD.2 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to clarify how the Papakāinga Design Guide will apply in areas outside the Tapu Te Ranga land.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.98	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide	Support	Supports the Papakāinga design guide	Retain Papakainga Design Guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Paul Burnaby	44.21	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	Supports the Heritage Design Guide provisions in principle.	Retain Heritage Design Guide as notified.
Paul Burnaby	44.22	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	Supports, in principle, the proposed 'Additional Considerations' as stated on page 5 of the Heritage Design Guide (HDG).	Retain Heritage Design Guide as notified.
Paul Burnaby	44.23	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that clarification is needed as to the meaning, purpose, interpretation, and application of the 'additional considerations' within the HDG.	Clarify additional considerations in the Heritage Design Guide.
Paul Burnaby	44.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that clarification is needed regarding the status (meaning, purpose, interpretation, and application) of the orange guidance notes in the HDG.	Clarify notes on page 20 of the Heritage Design Guide.
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.3	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that Wellington needs to be striving for design excellence to ensure that our heritage buildings are part of the future.	Not specified.
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.4	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G10 in the Heritage Design Guide should be amended to reflect that the relationship between aligning key elements is important but is not a measure of a good design.	Amend G10 (Where contrast is discouraged) in the Heritage Design Guide as follows: ... also consideration can be given to the alignment of floor levels and window heads and sills.
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.5	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the relationships outlined on page 20 are too prescriptive, will lead to confusion, and should be deleted. Different buildings and different contexts need to be considered on a case by case basis.	Amend the Heritage Design Guide by deleting the whole section relating to managing scale transitions within heritage areas outlined on page 20. [Inferred decision requested].
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.6	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	Supports G15 in the Heritage Design Guide as correct.	Retain G15 (Retaining and restoring significant heritage shopfronts) in the Heritage Design Guide as notified.
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.7	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes G16 in the Heritage Design Guide as while it is appropriate to restore and reconstruct shopfronts, particularly where heritage fabric remains, this should not be imposed on buildings where little, or no heritage fabric remains. G16 conflicts with the objectives outlined in the Gehl Report. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Delete G16 (Restore or reconstruct shopfronts where there is evidence of original form, detailing and materials) from the Heritage Design Guide.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.8	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G40 in the Heritage Design Guide should be clarified to reflect that the strengthening of certain buildings in Wellington poses considerable challenges and the guidelines need to be flexible enough to enable a variety of engineering solutions. In some cases, an external support structure is the only option.	Amend G40 (The installation of exoskeletons, external columns, and external bracing elements is discouraged) in the Heritage Design Guide as follows: G40. The installation of exoskeletons, external columns, and external bracing elements is discouraged , <u>should only be considered where there is no viable, alternative engineering solution and consideration should be given to particularly where these would:</u> ...
Historic Places Wellington	182.33	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	Supports the Heritage Design Guide on facadism.	Retain G37 (Built form) of the Heritage Design Guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Historic Places Wellington	182.34	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission]	Retain the Heritage Design Guide with amendment.
Historic Places Wellington	182.35	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that while the submitter recognises the special significance of tangata whenua as partners in Te Tiriti they submit that other cultural backgrounds and heritages that contribute to New Zealand's multicultural society also warrant recognition.	Amend the Heritage Design Guide outcomes as follows: "New development respects and responds to nearby scheduled sites and areas <u>of significance to Māori, heritage areas of significance to all New Zealand peoples and cultures</u> , buildings, structures and trees.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.14	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Support	The submitter seeks for the Heritage Design Guide outcomes to be amended as follows: "New development respects and responds to nearby scheduled sites and areas of significance to Māori, heritage areas of significance to all New Zealand peoples and cultures, buildings, structures and trees." Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because the suggested amendments will help to protect sites and areas of significance to Māori from development.	Allow
Go Media Ltd	236.36	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Heritage Design Guide expressly recognises the potential for third-party signs on heritage buildings.
Wellington City Council	266.176	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers minor clarification needed in second point of G31.	Amend G31 as follows: (...) - understanding the heritage value <u>values</u> of the place through research, investigation, recording and documentation.
Wellington City Council	266.177	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers clarification is needed in the third point of G31 to match wording in HH-P2.	Amend G31 as follows: (...) - planning and carrying out maintenance and repair in accordance with <u>recognised</u> conservation principles <u>and methods</u> .
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.83	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Supports G2 of the heritage design guide.	Retain G2 of the heritage design guide as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.89	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the heritage design guides should be amended to provide a set of considerations in the heritage design guide to be used when deciding whether to allow removal of a chimney, rather than providing a policy framework in the district plan.	[Inferred decision requested] Amend the heritage design guides to provide a set of considerations to be used when deciding whether to allow removal of a chimney.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.90	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that 'Heritage from both Tiriti o Waitangi partners' does not capture all of Wellington's heritage - only the heritage of the Crown and tangata whenua.	Seeks that references to 'Heritage from both Tiriti o Waitangi partners' be amended to 'heritage from all of New Zealand's peoples' in the application section .

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.91	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that it is heritage conservation that leads to the best learning opportunities, not new development.	Seeks that the application section is amended as follows: " development <u>heritage conservation</u> can lead to learning opportunities for the wider public, making currently unseen heritage and histories more accessible"
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.92	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that it may not always be appropriate to acknowledge or celebrate sites of significance to mana whenua.	Amend the Outcomes section of the heritage design guide as follows: "Mana whenua sites of significance are acknowledged and celebrated <u>where appropriate</u> "
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.116	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Oppose	The submitter considers that it may not always be appropriate to acknowledge or celebrate sites of significance to mana whenua. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission because it is up to mana whenua to decide which of their sites of significance are acknowledged and celebrated in the plan.	Disallow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.93	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the heritage design guide should clearly refer to the CMU and Residential Design Guides that provide guidance on how to design new development adjacent to a heritage place.	Amend the Heritage design guide to clearly refer to the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides that provide guidance on how to design new development adjacent to a heritage place.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.94	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the guideline should not refer to works and that conservation is about understanding and planning and does not always involve works.	Amend G31 of the Heritage Design Guide as follows: Consider effects on heritage fabric by: • undertaking conservation works with consultation, engagement and in partnership with mana whenua.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.95	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Heritage Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the area-specific guides in the operative district plan should be reinstated to help to reduce the likelihood of adverse effects on heritage.	Seeks that the Area Specific Heritage Design Guides in the Operative District Plan be included.
Go Media Ltd	236.37	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	Considers that requiring the confirmation of priority of principles in pre-application discussions will create ambiguity,	Seeks that the Signs Design Guide is amended to make prioritisation of each principle clear without owner or applicant having to enter preapplication discussions with the Council.
Go Media Ltd	236.38	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that G3 (Scale and Location of Signs) in the Signs Design Guide is amended to reflect that architectural features don't necessarily make a positive contribution to the building and local area.
Go Media Ltd	236.39	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that the suggestion to proportion signs to grid locations as illustrated in Diagram 2 in Signs Design Guide can result in sign installations which alter the apparent proportion and form of the building.	Seeks that G3 (Scale and Location of Signs) in the Signs Design Guide is deleted or amended.
Go Media Ltd	236.40	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G10 in the Signs Design Guide assumes that all architectural or other features of a building make a contribution to the building or local area and this may not be the case.	Seeks that G10 (Visual Dominance) in Signs Design Guide is deleted or amended to reflect that architectural features don't necessarily make a positive contribution to the building and local area.
Go Media Ltd	236.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G11 in the Signs Design Guide assumes that all architectural or other features of a building make a contribution to the building or local area and this may not be the case.	Seeks that G11 (Visual Dominance) in the Signs Design Guide is deleted or amended to reflect that architectural features don't necessarily make a positive contribution to the building and local area.
Go Media Ltd	236.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	Considers that Guideline 15 may be appropriate response for some signs, but may not be the most appropriate response.	Seeks that G15 (Visual Dominance) in the Signs Design Guide is deleted or amended to make it only considered on a building by building basis.
Go Media Ltd	236.43	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	Considers that different signs and designs may be appropriate, particularly on different elevations.	Seeks that G16 (Design Quality) in the Signs Design Guide is amended to be more specific to relate more fully to the example within the Guideline.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Go Media Ltd	236.44	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G26 (Illuminated and digital signs) in the Signs Design Guide shows bias against illuminated and digital signs.	Seeks that G26 (Illuminated and digital signs) in the Signs Design Guide is amended to remove bias and the potential for misinterpretation.
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes parts of the Signs Design Guide that are not appropriately balanced to enable a site-by-site consideration of signs and billboards relative to their context. The submitter opposes these guidelines because the submitter considers that they will not: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks that parts of the Signs Design Guide that are not appropriately balanced to enable a site-by-site consideration of signs and billboards relative to their context be deleted. [Inferred decision requested].
Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa	284.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of a Design Guide for Signs for the following reasons: - 'Prioritisation' system between one and three dots, which considers establishes a set of 'pass or fail' requirements; - Considers many of the guidelines replicate standards; - Relationship between Design Guide and other statutory provisions of the District Plan will create an overly complex framework; - 'Prioritisation system' will further restrict the design of signs rather than guiding their design.	Delete Signs Design Guide in Part 4 in its entirety.
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes parts of the Signs Design Guide that are not appropriately balanced to enable a site-by-site consideration of signs and billboards relative to their context. The submitter opposes these guidelines because the submitter considers that they will not: -Promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the RMA; -Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Wellington District, particularly in terms of assisting the retention and generation of employment; and -Represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Seeks that parts of the Signs Design Guide that are not appropriately balanced to enable a site-by-site consideration of signs and billboards relative to their context be deleted. [Inferred decision requested].
Lumo Digital Outdoor Limited	285.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of a Design Guide for Signs for the following reasons: - 'Prioritisation' system between one and three dots, which considers establishes a set of 'pass or fail' requirements; - Considers many of the guidelines replicate standards; - Relationship between Design Guide and other statutory provisions of the District Plan will create an overly complex framework; - 'Prioritisation system' will further restrict the design of signs rather than guiding their design.	Delete Signs Design Guide in Part 4 in its entirety.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.1	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Oppose	Oppose The Signs Design Guide does not appropriately recognise or provide for the functional or operational requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide imposes certain outcomes that are required to be achieved in every circumstances and results in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Delete Te Aratohu Hoahoa o Ngā Pokapū Whakamahinga Rau - Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.30	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Support	Submission point 349.1 supports FSNI submission points 476.1 and 476.102.	Allow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.139	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	Considers that signs design guide does not contain any guidance on language used for signs or requirements for use of Te Reo Māori.	Seeks to amend signs design guide, to include Taranaki Whānui in relation to te reo Māori and as first points of contact in relation to ahi kā and primary mana whenua status matters.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.96	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	Considers that high illumination levels of digital signage can negatively impact historic heritage, in addition to other matters such as driver and pedestrian distraction and that his guidance should be strengthened.	Amend G28 of the Signs Design Guide to receive a three or two "point" rating.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.97	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Amend	Considers that a frequent rate of change (short dwell times) and rapid transition between content can detract from heritage places, as well as causing distraction from drivers.	Add a new guideline as G29 as follows with a three or two "point" rating: "Ensure the rate of change and transition times are appropriate to the context of the sign"
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.98	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Signs Design Guide	Support	Supports the assessment of the visual impacts of signs from a "full range of distances", and the associated requirement to provide views of these in the application.	Retain G9 of the Signs Design Guide as notified.
Mclndoe Urban Limited	135.120	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Subdivision Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Subdivision Design Guide contains a lot of detail that will not be relevant to many small subdivision applications. Different types and scales of subdivision should be identified and a mechanism should be introduced to identify which guidelines apply to each type and scale of subdivision, if this is not already present in the Proposed District Plan. This is to avoid unnecessary inefficiency in minor subdivision projects such as subdividing a single lot.	Seeks that the Subdivision Design Guide identifies different types and scales of subdivision and introduces a mechanism to identify which guidelines apply to each type and scale of subdivision.
Wellington City Council	266.178	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Subdivision Design Guide	Amend	Considers amendment necessary to clarify the use of the terms 'wetlands' to distinguish between 'constructed wetland' and 'natural wetland'.	Seeks to amend G19, G20, and G21 in the Subdivision Design Guide to reference natural wetland, and G23 to reference constructed wetland.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.339	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Subdivision Design Guide	Support in part	Supports the intent of this guideline, and the identification and protection of existing watercourses and wetlands, but care should be taken not to encourage potentially damaging activities in them.	Retain the Subdivision Design Guide with amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.340	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Subdivision Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the current phrasing of policy G21 in the Subdivision Design Guide could suggest that piping streams is a way to avoid adverse effects on water quality. Existing natural wetlands should not be used as stormwater treatment devices. Using natural wetlands as stormwater devices requires disruptive maintenance activities, so constructed wetlands built for that purpose are required. Natural wetlands should not be affected by the development and improved where possible.	Amend wording in the Subdivision Design Guide in the first bullet point to avoid suggesting utilization of natural wetlands and watercourses as stormwater devices and in G21 as follows: 'Streams or wetlands should not be disturbed. However, where development does impact a stream (such as piping streams), alternative design solutions for stormwater management must be provided that will not adversely affect the waterway's quality or ecological health, such as piping streams.'
Glenside Progressive Association Inc	374.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Subdivision Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Subdivision Design guide should be stricter in restricting earthworks in elevated development area, particularly Upper Stebbings and Glenside West.	Seeks that the Subdivision Design Guide be stricter in restricting earthworks in elevated development areas, particularly Upper Stebbings and Glenside West.
Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland	FS75.7	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Subdivision Design Guide	Oppose	The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.99	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Subdivision Design Guide	Support	Supports G1 of the subdivision design guide. Supports the consideration of the cultural and heritage context of new subdivisions	Retain G1 of the Subdivision Design Guide as notified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.100	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Subdivision Design Guide	Support	Supports G4 of the subdivision design guide. Supports the consideration of the cultural and heritage context of new subdivisions	Retain G4 of the Subdivision Design Guide as notified.
Paul M Blaschke	435.12	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Subdivision Design Guide	Support	Supports the widespread use of the Subdivision Design Guide	Retain the Subdivision Design Guide as notified.
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.10	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Amend	Considers that more explicit locational wording should be used instead of referring to “buildings in centres or central areas” and that the Wellington Rural Area is so specific that this will not be complex.	Seeks that the Rural Design Guide should name specific areas, clarify areas by map, or use more explicit locational wording instead of referring to “buildings in centres or central areas”.
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.11	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Amend	Considers that where “providing roof gardens and vegetation on surfaces which would typically be covered by cladding or other external materials” is mentioned in the Rural Design Guide, practical provision for the collection of rainwater from roof surfaces must be an over-riding consideration in the rural area.	Seeks that where “providing roof gardens and vegetation on surfaces which would typically be covered by cladding or other external materials” is mentioned in the Rural Design Guide, practical provision for the collection of rainwater from roof surfaces must be an over-riding consideration in the Rural Zone.
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.12	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the recommendation “Place services underground where possible, otherwise use simple utilitarian timber posts” should be adjusted as the power companies will not install timber poles any more, opting for the higher concrete reinforced poles. The recommendation is redundant if not practicable.	Seeks that the Rural Design Guide should adjust the recommendation “Place services underground where possible, otherwise use simple utilitarian timber posts”.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.121	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Oppose in part	Considers that most of the guidance is relevant to rural production and residential buildings only and not relevant at all for renewable electricity generation activities.	Retain the Rural Design Guide with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.122	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Amend	Considers that most of the guidance is relevant to rural production and residential buildings only and not relevant at all for renewable electricity generation activities.	Amend the Rural Design Guide to include a statement clarifying that the Design Guide does not apply to renewable electricity generation activities (including renewable electricity generation investigation activities and upgrading of renewable electricity generation activities) in the General Rural Zone.
Wellington City Council	266.179	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Amend	Considers amendment necessary to clarify the use of the terms 'wetlands' to distinguish between 'constructed wetland' and 'natural wetland'.	Seeks to amend G26, G27, and G28 in the Rural Design Guide to reference natural wetland.
Te Marama Ltd	337.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Support	The Rural Design Guide is supported, especially G30 (Group buildings together).	Retain the Rural Design Guide as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.341	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Amend	Considers there is no mention of on-site wastewater in the rural design guide, which represents a potential contaminant source in the rural environment.	Amend the Rural Design Guide to include mention of on-site wastewater system installation, discharge fields, treatment/maintenance and potential adverse effects in the rural design guide.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Support	The Rural Design Guide is supported, especially G30 (Group buildings together).	Retain the Rural Design Guide as notified.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.23	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Rural Design Guide	Support	Supports Rural Design Guide, G30: “Group buildings together”	Retain Rural Design Guide, G30: “Group buildings together” as notified.

Schedules

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.87	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / New schedule	Amend	Oppose Council decision on 23 June 2022 at the Planning and Environment Committee on significant natural areas applying to residential land.	Seeks that all 169 groups of residential parcels identified within the SNA overlays within a new schedule named 'Urban Environment Allotments' [Inferred decision requested]
Opoutere Trust	3.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers that Firth House at 18 Vera Street should not be included as a heritage building under SCHED1. Disagrees with the Council's heritage assessment that the house is 'largely unmodified'. The house has been extensively remodelled since 1995 under WCC supervision. Little remains from the house's original design. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Sophie Kahn	FS76.2	Part 4/Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings	Support	The Trust states that the original house no longer exists - that modification under Council's approval decades ago (1995 and 2005) left virtually nothing of the original design intact. The accurately and authentically of the remaining heritage value is low. The modifications were made thirty years ago for very good reasons: the house had to be altered to make it livable for the present. This reflects the Kahn House situation where external an internal modifications have been made, significantly reducing the accuracy and authentically of the remaining 'heritage' value. This also demonstrates that the old modernist houses will over time require major updating to meet the needs and safety requirements of the present, and many of the changes result in changes to the authenticity of the original designs. This is now acutely pertinent for the Kahn House.	Amend / Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. Seeks that Council: - Do not list private homes that have undergone such major alterations where virtually all or none of the original heritage structure exists. - Consider the impact the listing will have on the homeowners ability to make updates and upgrades, especially when the homes is in urgent need of updating - Consider that heritage listing a private home will prevent the homeowner from making changes as desired, and that older heritage homes are often unfit (either unsafe and/or constructed considering primitive living conditions/) for modern living.
Sophie Kahn	FS76.3	Part 4/Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings	Support	The submission (3) discusses that the architectural heritage and original design of 18 Vera Street is well documented in publicly accessible archives and argues with that this is where heritage resides, and is accessible to the public. Kahn House agrees with this point. Opoutere Trust points out that there is a well known restored, preserved, superior, and awardwinning example of Firth's best work in Wellington. It has not been scheduled. The submitter exposes that the identification process is inequitable, unfair, biased, and based on questionable evidence. Kahn House supports this point and agrees the process for identification of homes for listing is poorly evidenced, apparently random and without justification. Indeed, it is highly concerning that it became clear during this process that the WCC itself does not even know what is in its inventory. Opoutere Trust points out that for the owner of a private suburban home severe outcomes are evident: loss of capital value, reduced sales pool, constraints on development and improvements, and increased compliance costs. The owner states he would not have purchased the property if he had been aware that thirty years later the house would be scheduled. Kahn House shares concerns about the grave financial outcomes and endorse his point that owners would never have purchased / built their homes if as a result of this retrospective action. Kahn House supports the submitter's point about the WCC's ability to unilaterally change home designations being unfair to homeowners and endorses an urgent independent review of the means by which government bodies (and Crown Entities) are able to use their power to severely negatively impact the financial (and other) futures, and impose on the property rights of select NZ private citizens. [Inferred reference to submission point 3.1]	Amend / Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. Seeks that: - All privately-owned, standalone independent suburban homes (not in identified precincts) should be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings' - unless the owner(s) seeks and agree to listing. - WCC must provide evidence they have identified effects of listing on private owners (including a financial analysis by an independent body), as well as provide evidence that their quantitative and qualitative evaluation for all private owners has been achieved to a level of detail and accuracy proportional to the significance of the effects on private owners. - List only (and only with full agreement of owners) superior examples of a desired architects/movements/etc representation on the Plan, with detailed, factually-correct reason why it is the key representation of the movement. - One or two listings of each representative theme is reasonable (not redundant listings from a single architect). Any more is excessive, and needs justification. - Do not place 'public need' - especially when no evidence is provided of this need - over the financial security of NZ citizens. Especially in circumstances where the homes are not in a recognised precinct and are almost entirely hidden from public view

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The submitter notes that there appears little reasoning for why some buildings are proposed for listing and others (often better examples) are not. The submitter also notes that the Council had failed to understand what it has in its own heritage inventory and that there is no clear classification system of architectural themes.</p> <p>The submitter share the original submitters concerns regarding the process run by the Council in regard to identifying which properties should be scheduled for listing.</p> <p>The Council has not considered any direct alternatives or options to listing this home to achieve their outcome as would be expected under Clause(1) (b) (i) of s32 of the RMA. This situation reflects the experience with the further submitters home, 28 Robieson St.</p> <p>The further submitter does not support listing where there is no justification given for selection over alternatives (direct alternatives not considered).</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Item 521 (18 Vera Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The Council commission an independent review into the performance and effectiveness of the current heritage protection regime in relation to achieving desired heritage outcomes and requirements of the RMA.</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.32	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the submitters view that the Council has made no effort to understand the impacts that the listing will have on the individual homeowner, and that this impact is significant for isolated homes.</p> <p>The Council has failed to identify the effects of listing and undertake an evaluation or quantitative assessment to a required level of detail that is proportional to the scale and significant of the regulatory intervention as required under s32 of the RMA.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that Item 521 (18 Vera Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The Council does not list private homes in SCHED1 without owner's consent. Especially in the case where these are homes are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct or area that can be appreciated by the public.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only consider listing buildings where there is a net benefit to the community from doing so. Identify the full range of effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance the effect imposed by heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p>
Mark Whitaker Levett	7.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers that very little of the original heritage features of the building exists anymore. The building has undergone numerous construction changes. [Refer to original submission for full list of changes].</p> <p>The Historic Heritage Evaluation refers to features that no longer exist on the current building. Earlier WCC assessments have determined the heritage values to be low, and there is nothing in the current assessment that changes this position.</p> <p>Only has a Heritage New Zealand Historic Places Category 2 listing.</p>	Remove Item 524 (134 Willis Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.43	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	134 Willis Street is included in the New Zealand Heritage List/ Rārangī Kōrero as a Category 2 place and has heritage values to support its inclusion in schedule 1.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitters supports this submission. Heritage value is higher in buildings that are in both original and good condition.	Allow / Seeks that the Council only consider buildings with high heritage value to the community for evaluation and potential listing.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the position of the submitter that reflects their own experience of claimed features that no longer exist being used in our heritage assessment. The further submitter covered this in their submission in the section "The heritage assessment of our home is weak".</p> <p>The process and evidence used to justify the Council's proposed listings is insufficient.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. The full range of effects of listing are identified and the costs and benefits are quantified to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p>
Tony De Lorenzo	9.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that if the PDP is adopted the Council will make ownership of historic properties unaffordable for all except the wealthiest people in Wellington.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.42	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the original submitters concerns around affordability and impact on their financial wellbeing. The Council must consider the costs of a heritage protection regime that demands heritage services form private homeowners. Reduced property value and higher compliance limits access to funds that can be used to remediate and maintain these properties and can lead to less heritage being protected.</p> <p>Requiring the Council to compensate owners for the heritage services they mandate, or for them to offer to purchase properties where owners are opposed, would provide important balance and restraint to their incentives to over procure heritage as they bear no cost of doing so.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council offer to purchase homes proposed for listing when the owners are opposed.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council investigate other non-regulatory incentive schemes (as expected under the RMA) including enduring rates remissions for private owners providing heritage services to the city.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council commission an independent review into the performance and effectiveness of the current heritage protection regime in relation to achieving desired heritage outcomes and meeting the requirements of the RMA.</p>
Tony De Lorenzo	9.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Seeks that all heritage listings to 1 Ranfurly Terrace (SCHED1 Item 415) are deleted and this property is given a generic area based heritage listing. Currently listing is unclear and too restrictive, and will incur disproportionate costs to the owners. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Delete item 415 (1 Ranfurly Terrace) from SCHED1 - Heritage buildings.</p>
Tony De Lorenzo	9.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Seeks that the specific listed provisions in column 5 of SCHED1 Item 415 (1 Ranfurly Terrace) are amended (if this listing is not deleted in its entirety). Currently listing is unclear and too restrictive, and will incur disproportionate costs to the owners. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend term 415 (1 Ranfurly Terrace) of SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as follows: Protections Required All of the exterior of the house including the Exterior - facades, roofs <u>roofline</u>, chimneys and chimney pots. All of the front garden including Front garden - masonry front fence, piers, and metal gates; front garden formal layout including edging around planter beds; tiled path; tiled steps to entrance, rendered plinths, and tiled porch floor. Specific items in the rear garden Rear garden - three sections of masonry fence with plinth, bottle balusters, and top rail. The interior of the house including any Interior - including any original lath and plaster walls and ceilings; decorative plasterwork including ceiling roses, cornices and mouldings, and decorative plaster arches; timber floorboards; timber joinery including timber panelled doors, skirting boards, and architraves. (...)</p>
Rachael Bell and Michael McCormack	15.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Support the removal of 355 The Parade from the list of heritage buildings. The values that this building was proposed to be scheduled for are seen in other buildings in Wellington.</p>	<p>Retain SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings) as notified.</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.43	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports that 355 The Parade is not listed as we understand this would have imposed a significant burden on the owners for little value. This case sets a clear precedent for the Council taking into account the burden imposed on private homeowners, low heritage value, to removing buildings from SCHED1.</p> <p>The further submitter does not believe the Council has correctly recorded the original submitters view as support of SCHED1 when the submission's purpose is to discourage the relisting of their property.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council correct the submitters position to 'support in part' as its only in relation to their property not being scheduled (i.e. the part they support).</p>
Wellington Amusement Holdings	22.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>The portion of the cinema building identified to justify listing does not have sufficient heritage value.</p> <p>Retention and strengthening of this portion of the building compromises redevelopment options, including the continuation of viable cinema activities.</p>	<p>Remove Item 505 (Penthouse Cinema) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Schedule 1 (Heritage buildings) to the extent that the Wellington Central Library (Te Matapihi) is not included.</p>	<p>Retain SCHED1 - Heritage buildings with amendment.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.26	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	OSH supports currently scheduled heritage buildings in our local area, and HNZPTs proposals.	Allow
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.41	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter believes the Council's efforts to delist the library is likely pragmatic. and will save Wellington rate payers from significant excess expense. In short, there is likely a net benefit to community of delisting. We are sympathetic to this situation.</p> <p>The further submitter notes that Council's approach clearly demonstrates the recognition excessive costs and restrictions that arise from remediating a heritage listed building.</p> <p>Notes that the fact that the Council are actively delisting their own buildings to allow significant remediation to occur to avoid this cost on one hand, while they actively pursue the listing of private isolated homes (and other buildings) also in similar need of significant remediation is hypocritical and offensive. The same burden the Council is seeking to avoid, they seek to impose on private homeowners - despite being significantly better placed to bear the burden than private homeowners.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council retain the delisting of the Wellington City Library as proposed and seek heritage input into the remediation project.</p> <p>Seeks the removal of the proposed listings of isolated private homes that are in need of remediation, that have low heritage value, where listing would impose a significant financial burden, and the owners are opposed.</p> <p>Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings (as it fits these same criteria)</p>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.25	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage buildings in Wellington and HNZPTs amendments and proposals.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.39	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that the Wellington Central Library (Te Matapihi) should be included on Schedule 1 (Heritage Buildings) as it has been entered on the NZ Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as a Category 1 Historic Place (list number 9761).	Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to include the Wellington Central Library (Te Matapihi)
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposed to Schedule 1 (Heritage buildings) to the extent that the McClean Flats are not included.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage Buildings with amendment
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.41	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Schedule 1 (Heritage Buildings) should include the McLean Flats as it has been entered on the NZ Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as a Category 1 Historic Place (list number 9783) in the same listing as the Gordon Wilson Flats which is included in Schedule 1.	Amend SCHED1-Heritage Buildings to include McLean Flats as either a separate listing or as part of the listing of the Gordon Wilson Flats (#299).
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.42	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposed to Schedule 1 (Heritage buildings) to the extent that Hurston House is not included.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage Buildings with amendment
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.43	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Schedule 1 (Heritage Buildings) should include Hurston House as this building has recently been added to the NZ Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as a Category 2 Historic Place (list number 9954).	Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to include Hurston House
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.44	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose in part	<p>Notes that a number of entries in Schedule 1 have incorrect New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero references, and incorrect addresses.</p> <p>Notes several instances where legal descriptions appear to be incorrect.</p>	Seeks that all SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings entries are checked for accuracy in terms of address, legal descriptions and Heritage New Zealand Listing number.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.45	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	SCHED1 Item 164.2 has an inaccurate HNZPT # and should be amended.	<p>Amend the SCHED1 Item 164.2 (Cemetery Lychgate) HNZPT # as follows:</p> <p>(HNZPT #) <u>Historic Place Category 2, 1362 1400</u></p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.46	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	SCHED1 Item 165 does not have a HNZPT #.	<p>Amend the SCHED1 Item 165 (Jewish Chapel (former)) HNZPT # as follows:</p> <p>(HNZPT #) <u>Historic Place Category 2, 1362 1362</u></p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.47	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	The SCHED1 Item 179 address should be amended to 55 Lambton Quay (the official address HNZPT uses for this place).	<p>Amend the SCHED1 Item 179 (Government Buildings) address as follows:</p> <p>(Address) 45 <u>55</u> Lambton Quay</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.48	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	The SCHED1 Item 187 entry incorporates two entries in the NZ Heritage List #212 and #1336 and is missing a NZ Heritage List Entry #.	Amend the SCHED1 Item 187 (Old BNZ Building 2) <u>Historic Place Category 2, 1336</u>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.49	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	The SCHED1 Item 220 address is for the vicarage (94 Hamilton Road) and should be amended to the church (90 Hamilton Road).	Amend the SCHED1 Item 220 (All Saints' Church) address as follows: (Address) <u>94 90</u> Hamilton Road
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.50	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>The SCHED1 Item 227 legal description should be amended to the legal description for the church and not the hall.</p> <p>The WCC inventory and NZ Heritage List entry refers to the Church, not the hall, and the current legal description refers to the parcel of land where the hall is situated.</p>	Amend SCHED1 Item 227 (St Annes Church) legal description as follows: (Legal Description) Lot 2 DP 82032 – subj to electricity easement Lot 1 DP 90016

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.51	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	SCHED1 Item 234 has an inaccurate HNZPT #.	<p>Amend the SCHED1 Item 234 (Wellington Central Fire Station) HNZPT # as follows:</p> <p>(HNZPT #) 3654 3645</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.20	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.52	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	SCHED1 Item 274 has an inaccurate HNZPT #.	<p>Amend the SCHED1 Item 274 (Missions to Seamen Building) HNZPT # as follows:</p> <p>(HNZPT #) 3414 3611</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.21	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.53	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	The SCHED1 Item 350 name should be amended to be consistent with SCHED3 Item 12 (St John's Presbyterian Church).	<p>Amend SCHED1 Item 350 (St John's Church) name as follows:</p> <p>(Name) St John's <u>Presbyterian</u> Church</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.22	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.54	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	THE SCHED1 Item 429 address should be amended to 151 Cuba Street as currently it has the same address given to Item 82.2 (Berry Building) 145-149.	<p>Amend the SCHED1 Item 429 (Shop/dwelling) address as follows:</p> <p>(Address) 149 151 Cuba Street</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.23	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of errors being corrected. However, the low level of care, lacking attention to detail, poor process, and lacking evidence gives the further submitter no confidence in the evaluation and that the proposed buildings are appropriate for listings.</p> <p>The further submitter is concerned owners may have missed information due to inaccuracies in their description or addresses, or decided not to respond based on incorrect information being recorded/presented.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance that the effect of the heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p> <p>Seeks that the Council correct errors, and reconsult owners if there is concern they may have missed notifications due to errors (wrong address for example).</p> <p>Seeks that Council commission a review into inaccuracies and systemic failings of Council heritage processes.</p>
Tim Bright	75.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	No details supplied	[Not specified]
Ngatiawa Russell Masonic Lodge 345	78.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Masonic Hall was purpose built for the use of Freemasons and is of no symbolic, traditional or cultural value to the local Masonic community.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Masonic Hall has little use to the rest of the Johnsonville community and is unlikely to have appeal to other organisations.</p> <p>Including the Hall in the SCHED1 reduces the future development potential of the site and future value of the building in a commercial sense.</p>	Remove Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Hall) from SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings).
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.1	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Johnsonville has very few old protected buildings. Johnsonville does not have enough community halls and indoor spaces. The hall would be used more if it was known by the community as being available for meetings, etc.	Disallow / Seeks that Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) is retained in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Ian Attwood	79.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers that Firth House (Item 521) should not be included in SCHED1 because it has been substantially altered and considers that it does not accurately, authentically, and with fidelity reflect Firth's commitment to social housing design in 1941 for which listing is proposed.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission, including appendices for detailed reasons]</p>	Remove Item 521 (Firth House) from SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sophie Kahn	FS76.1	Part 4/Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED 1 - Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The homeowner (18 Vera Street) identifies there are severe failings in the Council's heritage evaluation process. This reflects Kahn House's experience.</p> <p>The homeowner of 18 Vera Street confirms the house has undergone wholly transformative alteration and thus the key reason for listing has no convincing basis. What council is seeking to protect simply does not exist. The further submitter concurs with the owners assertion that Firth House should not be listed in the District Plan.</p>	<p>Amend / Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as significant, fully consented, modifications have occurred on the home, and therefore the heritage value has been reduced.</p> <p>Ensure the heritage evaluations are made using current and accurate information.</p> <p>Provide quantitative and qualitative evidence of 'public desire' and 'public need' when considering the listing of personal homes.</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the position of the submitter which reflects their own experience, of claimed importance of features that no longer exist, and grossly misrepresentative claims of heritage value. The further submitter covered this in their submission in the section "The heritage assessment of our home is weak" on page 63.</p> <p>The process and evidence used to justify the Council's proposed listings is insufficient.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that Item 521 (18 Vera Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p>
Judith Graykowski	80.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	No details supplied	Not specified
Joanna Newman	85.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the reasons for including these buildings are just as well justified as those that are already listed (Reasons listed in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that 53 Ellice Street and 67 Austin Street were proposed to be included in the Draft District Plan and have been removed in the Proposed District Plan. WCC reassessment documents do not support this decision.</p> <p>[See original submission for further detail]</p> <p>Supports evidence submitted by Mt Victoria Historical Society.</p>	<p>Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to add the following properties:</p> <p>13 Austin Street 67 Austin Street 17 Brougham Street 33 Brougham Street 123 - 125 Brougham Street 136/138 Brougham Street 53 Ellice Street 9 Hawker Street 43 Hawker Street 71 Hawker Street 7 Paterson Street 58 Pirie Street 49 Porritt Avenue 23 Stafford Street 1 Tutchen Avenue 53 Ellice Street 67 Austin Street</p> <p>[See original submission for summary of heritage significance]</p>
Angus Hodgson & Sebastian Clarke	86.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that Boffa Miskell report on pre-1930s Character Area review (2019) identified 61 Hankey Street as being of potential historic significance, and worthy of consideration.</p> <p>Considers that for 61 Hankey Street received New Zealand Institute of Architects Wellington Branch - Enduring Architecture Award 2004.</p> <p>Considers that 61 Hankey Street has significant architectural values.</p> <p>Considers that 61 Hankey Street has many heritage value criteria.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasoning]</p>	<p>Add 61 Hankey Street, Mount Cook to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.27	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support in part	The Wellington Operative District Plan specified the curtilage of the heritage listing under Hunter Building so that works outside of the curtilage are not unnecessarily subject to the heritage rules of the PDP. The Hunter Building should be defined as comprising only the entire external building envelope so as to exclude the interior of the building. The heritage value of the Hunter Building relates only to its external façade and envelope rather than any interior features.	Seeks amendment to Item 171 (Hunter Building, Victoria University) of SCHED1 - Heritage buildings to only include the external building envelope, not the inside of the building as follows: Hunter Building (<u>external building envelope</u>), Victoria University
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.44	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Rules HH-R4 and HH-S2 of the PDP serve to manage the curtilage and surrounds of heritage places. As such the requested change can be accepted.	Allow
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.28	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers that the Gordon Wilson Flats have insufficient heritage value to warrant inclusion in the Heritage Schedule. The University also seeks to remove GWF from the Heritage Schedule because: (i) there are no reasonable alternatives to total demolition considering the maintenance, repair and seismic strengthening required; (ii) the building is unusable for any purpose in its present state; (iii) there is no appetite from the University, Council or Housing and Urban Development to repair, refurbish and use the building because it does not fit current needs; and (iv) the cost of refurbishment and conversion to an acceptable design and standard would make such a proposition a financial failure.	Remove Item 299 (Gordon Wilson Flats (Lot 1 DP 363050)) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.48	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Gordon Wilson Flats are entered in NZ Heritage List/ Rārangi Kōrero as a Historic Place Category 1 and has heritage values to support its inclusion in Schedule 1. [Inferred reference to submission 106.28]	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.158	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers the original submitter has not sufficiently explored contemporary strengthening options for repurpose and reuse of this heritage building. Considers the building is a quality building with unique attributes and history, and recognised with a category 1 listing by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga. Considers the carbon emissions associated with converting the building to much needed student accommodation are significantly less than those associated with demolishing it and constructing a new building.	Disallow
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.29	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers that the Robert Stout Building has insufficient heritage value to warrant inclusion in the Heritage Schedule.	Remove Item 497 (Robert Stout Building (PT TOWN BELT TN OF WELLINGTON)) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.27	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The buildings are entered on the NZ Heritage List/Rarangi Korero as Historic Places. Considers that they are nationally significant.	Disallow
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports the heritage listing of all the buildings in Mount Victoria proposed to be included in SCHED1.	Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified, with respect to any buildings in Mount Victoria

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Alan Oliver & Julie Middleton	111.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that additional buildings in Mount Victoria are worthy of heritage listing and should be included in SCHED1.</p> <p>53 Ellice Street and 67 Austin Street were included in the Draft District Plan but are not in SCHED1 of the PDP.</p> <p>Other buildings should be included.</p> <p>67 Austin Street was included in the Draft District Plan but is not in SCHED1 of the PDP.</p>	<p>Add the following buildings to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings:</p> <p>13 Austin Street 67 Austin Street 17 Brougham Street (Owd Trafford) 33 Brougham Street (Hutchinson's House / Women's House) 123-125 Brougham Street (Ionian Flats) 136/138 Brougham Street (Rev Moir's wife's houses) 53 Ellice Street 9 Hawker Street (Hamilton Flats) 43 Hawker Street (Bernard Freyburg's House) 71 Hawker Street (Paterson's House) 7 Paterson Street (William Waring Taylor's House) 58 Pirie Street (George Winder's House) 49 Porritt Avenue (Kate Edger's House) 23 Stafford Street (Wellington Harbour Pilot Holmes's House) 1 Tutchen Avenue (Wellington Harbour Pilot Shilling's House)</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.199	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Oliver Sangster	112.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the inclusion of the Gordon Wilson Flats on SCHED1-Heritage buildings (# 299).</p> <p>Considers that the flats are an embarrassing and sorry sight in a time when there is a growing problem of homelessness and high rents in Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that the flats need to be demolished to make way for more housing near our city centre and Victoria University.</p> <p>Considers that because they already have Heritage New Zealand protection, further protection under the District Plan is unnecessary.</p>	Seeks that Item 299 - Gordon Wilson Flats be deleted from SCHED1 - Heritage buildings
Scots College Incorporated	117.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers that the maps do not identify the curtilage around the heritage listed main College building in order to limit the application of HH-R4 to the reasonable vicinity of the listed building. Because the Campus is a very large site this change is sought so that resource consent is not unnecessarily required for building work that is sufficiently far away from the main building.</p>	Amend item 219 (Scots' College Main Building) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings by inserting <u>Building curtilage for application of the historic heritage rules is mapped</u> against the item, in a similar manner to the heritage listed Hunter Building on the large Kelburn Campus.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.45	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The submission makes a reasonable point that there is no identified curtilage for the recognised heritage building at Scots College. The New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero identifies an extent of the listing, which may form a practical basis for the mapping of a curtilage for this building.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Singvest Group Limited	129.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 522 (154 Victoria Street - Commercial Building) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Considers that the decision to include the Building on Schedule 1 was not conducted fairly or follow due process. [Refer to original submission for comprehensive detailing of process].</p> <p>The comprehensive heritage assessment by heritage expert David Kernohan in 2007 concluded that the recommendation for listing was "unreasonable and should not be sustained".</p> <p>Based on assessments from David Kernohan and Mark Leong (architect), considers that the WCC 2021 Heritage Evaluation Report drew incorrect conclusions which has led to an incorrect assessment that the Building holds significant heritage value.</p> <p>Considers that the impact of the Schedule 1 listing is that SGL will not be able to keep the site commercially viable.</p> <p>With demolition being significantly constrained by a listing, the Building is at risk of becoming uninhabitable after March 2026 as it is also designated as earthquake prone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments].</p>	Delete Item 522 (154 Victoria Street - Commercial Building) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.24	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter shares the original submitters concerns regarding the process run by the Council in regard to SCHED1 listings. The further submission details significant failings in the identification of heritage, assessment of heritage value, identification of effects of listing, and undertaking an evaluation or quantitative assessment to a required level of detail that is proportional to the scale and significant of the regulatory intervention as required under s32 of the RMA.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.</p> <p>Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p>
Andrew Gan	136.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The church has a long term plan to redevelop the building into a modern complex to suit the needs of the community in the near future. Inclusion in SCHED1 will negatively impact, or even make impossible, future development.</p>	Delete Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 514 (28 Robieson Street - Toomath House) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Considers that there are several inaccuracies within the Historic Heritage Evaluation.</p> <p>The house is in need of extensive repairs, maintenance and upgrading and the statement in the Evaluation report that <i>the fabric appears to be sound</i> is incorrect. Significant changes are essential for the survival of the building and to ensure it can continue to serve a useful purpose as a healthy and well-functioning family home. The New Zealand modernist architecture of this house has led to water damage to the property. The building is reasonably intact however several changes have occurred. The neighbouring houses, also designed by Toomath and more refined examples of the architect's design achievements, have not been scheduled.</p> <p>Including the site extent would serve no constructive purpose, creates further challenges for the owners, and prevents alterations that enable appropriate use and enjoyment of indoor-outdoor flow. Considers that the property is not significant for its open plan layout. The study extension, which has significance assigned to it, is an area subsequently destroyed by water damage. Considers that the proposal for listing the exterior is unsubstantiated as much of the evaluation is concerned with the interior. Considers that most of the exterior materials were imported.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson Street - Toomath House) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the submission, and notes that they were surprised at the low quality, lack of evidence, and inaccuracies in the report. The assessment made no attempt to assess heritage value.</p> <p>The further submitters own assessment expands on their findings with regard to the quality of the heritage assessment in the section "The heritage assessment of our home is weak" on page 63 (Of FS 91).</p> <p>The submission from a heritage expert (independent from the Council) notes the modifications and changes that have occurred to the property and that is it not in original condition as simply assumed in the assessment.</p> <p>The further submitter supports the submission and agree the home is far from the example of 'integrity and authenticity' claimed by the Council and does not warrant listing.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Allow / Seeks that Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) is removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The further submitter supports the view that scheduling would place a disproportionate and unreasonable burden on us as homeowners.</p> <p>The further submitter supports this submission and note that listing would reduce our ability to remediate known issues with our property and lead to poor outcomes for both our home, us, and the community.</p>	Allow / Seeks that Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) is removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Foster+Melville Architects Limited	141.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that other authorities including Auckland Council and Heritage New Zealand, recognise that some buildings are more significant than others. The "blanket" approach taken by Wellington City Council makes it difficult to apply heritage in practice.</p>	Seeks that consideration is given to the ranking of heritage items in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Grant Buchan	143.24	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Supports the protection of Heritage Buildings which are excellent examples of their type and are preserved in good and close to original condition.</p>	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Chinese Baptist Church	144.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The church has a long term plan to redevelop the building and neighbouring properties (i.e. 22, 26, 28 Donald McLean Street) into a complex to service the community better and more widely. Item 490 (24 Donald McLean Street) has the largest area and is located at the centre of the plots and its inclusion in SCHED1 will negatively impact, or even make impossible, future development.</p>	Remove Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes delisting of Chinese Baptist Church from Shedule 1 item 490.</p> <p>This area and street Donald Maclean Street is part of our submission to make a character precinct or a heritage area. This street has many of the oldest houses in Newtown as shown on the Thomas Ward map.</p> <p>There is also support for a new character precinct from other submissions as well as the Clare Nolan et al [submission 275] and the Newtown Residents Association submission.</p> <p>A new development would impact detrimentally on older heritage houses. Also, on the streetscape and primary consistency of the street according to Boffa Miskel report 2019.</p> <p>Also, the church itself has heritage attributes otherwise would not be listed with WCC.</p>	Disallow
Hannah Gao	145.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>The church has a long term plan to redevelop the building into a modern complex to suit the needs of the community in the near future. Inclusion in SCHED1 will negatively impact, or even make impossible, future development.</p>	Remove Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
The Coronation Lodge	149.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Masonic Hall was purpose built for the use of Freemasons and is unlikely to have appeal to other organisations.</p> <p>Including the Hall in the SCHED1 reduces the future development potential of the site and future value of the building in a commercial sense.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Delete Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Hall) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.2	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Johnsonville has very few old protected buildings. Johnsonville does not have enough community halls and indoor spaces. The hall would be used more if it was known by the community as being available for meetings, etc.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) is retained in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Vivienne Morrell	155.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>Supports the heritage listings in the heritage schedules.</p>	Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified, and include the recommendations of Heritage NZ and Historic Places Wellington.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.55	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sophie Kahn	161.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Considers that Kahn House (#520) should not be included on SCHED1-Heritage buildings for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Listing is causing emotional distress. - The house is the submitter's sole asset. - The house needs alterations to modernise it and make it suitable for well-being and safety reasons. - Listing could see significant diminution in capital value - It is very unlikely they will continue to contemplate living in the house if they have their rights to developing the house constrained - It is privately, not publicly owned - The owners agreed to listing the house with Heritage New Zealand due to assurances there would be absolutely no restrictions imposed on the owner as a result of the listing - at the time or in the future. - The house is not Plischke's first construction in New Zealand and it is regarded as being far from his best work. - There is only one room that is 'special' - the living/dining room. - Substantial changes have already been made to the house. - Sufficient examples of Plischke's work, both private and public commissions are already listing by Heritage New Zealand and proposed in the District Plan. - Considers that homes, like humans, are at their best when they are living, breathing, adapting entities. - Concerned about loss of right to privacy of our personal history. - Listing the house in the PDP undermines human rights and renders the house incapable of reasonable use. - Listing can lead to neglect. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Item 520 (Kahn House) is removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.47	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Kahn House is included in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as a Category 1 place and has heritage values to support its inclusion in Schedule 1.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Ian Attwood	FS16.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The Kahn House as it now stands needs to be modernised if it's to become a viable contemporary home.</p> <p>What constitutes a contemporary home in 2022 is very different to what was built in constrained circumstances in 1941.</p>	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Ian Attwood	FS16.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The Kahn House, whilst having minimal architectural significance in context when built, is not regarded as a leading example of Plischke's work or of Modernist design principles.</p> <p>Plischke's superior homes are scheduled or already protected, not least by their current owners (Sutch and Lang).</p> <p>The Kahn House history is well-documented in various publications and archives. This is where the 'heritage' is best served and protected.</p>	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Ian Attwood	FS16.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>'Locking up' the Kahn House against the wishes of the family does little to further preserve whatever influences the Modernist architects' had then and now.</p> <p>It is debatable whether the Kahn House is Modernist as Plischke himself considered it more European-inspired than Modernist and was in fact contrary to the prevailing view of New Zealand architects at the time.</p>	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ian Attwood	FS16.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Scheduling the Kahn House is against the wishes of the family. It imposes not insignificant constraints on the right to determine the future of their home. It interferes with an intensely private family's desire for privacy and self-determination.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Ian Attwood	FS16.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Stripping a family of its legally established wealth and managerial right to their primary asset seems contrary to the legal intentions of property law. Heritage rights for Māori and taonga are well established. 'Locking up' marae as examples from 1941 and preservation of 'heritage' would be totally unacceptable, but that is what is proposed in the District Plan for our homes. The 'heritage' of the Kahn House belongs to the family and owners unless they willingly agree to share it with the citizens of Wellington in the interest of the community. Council have no business interfering and impacting long-standing private property ownership.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Ian Attwood	FS16.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Actions and evident attitudes at Council have been deeply impactful and distressing to the Kahn family. It is highly regrettable given the historical context of Nazi persecution and diminution of assets. History and heritage are a measure of our society - in the District Plan lessons have not be learnt and the consequences are profound and difficult to accept. Tiriti o Waitangi has illustrated time and time again that the use of power against disadvantaged communities does not deliver fair and equitable outcomes to the benefit of all. Council have chosen an adversative process that benefits no party and where alternatives might be preferred.	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.156	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers the building has significant heritage value. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga has listed this building as Historic Place Category 1, which is sufficient basis for it being in the heritage schedule in the PDP.	Disallow
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The submitter notes that there appears little reasoning for why some buildings are proposed for listing and others (often better examples) are not. The submitter also notes that the Council had failed to understand what it has in its own heritage inventory and that there is no clear classification system of architectural themes. The submitter share the original submitters concerns regarding the process run by the Council in regard to identifying which properties should be scheduled for listing. The Council has not considered any direct alternatives or options to listing this home to achieve their outcome as would be expected under Clause(1) (b) (i) of s32 of the RMA. This situation reflects the experience with the further submitters home, 28 Robieson St. The further submitter does not support listing where there is no justification given for selection over alternatives (direct alternatives not considered). [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Item 520 (Khan House) be removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings. The Council commission an independent review into the performance and effectiveness of the current heritage protection regime in relation to achieving desired heritage outcomes and requirements of the RMA.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter agrees with the original submitter that the entire process of having their home proposed for listing has and continues to be stressful, tiring, and detrimental to their mental health. This is especially relevant for consultation and engagement of listing family homes. The further submitter supports the submitters concerns about the lack of consideration of homeowner's rights to privacy in their own homes where they become an listed and 'promoted' by the Council.	Allow / Seeks that the Council provide clarification of what information about private homes will become public should they be listed as part of the Council's engagement policy and processes. Seeks that the Council ensure residents of listed homes retain their right to privacy.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports the submission, and was surprised at the low quality, lack of evidence, and inaccuracies in our heritage assessment report. The assessment made no attempt to assess heritage value and was never intended to identify the effects of heritage listing. The further submitters submission expands on their findings with regard to the quality of our heritage assessment in the section "The heritage assessment of our home is weak" on page 63. [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e. free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.35	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports the original submitters concerns that the heritage listing would prevent or inhibit modifications to their home to make it safe for their elderly family to comfortably live there. The health and safety of inhabitants (and modifications to support or facilitate this) should come above providing heritage services to the community that has no access to the private home.	Allow / Seeks that Item 520 (Khan House) be removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings. The Council consider the current and future health and safety needs of the occupants (their 'use value' of the property) above heritage value to the community.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.39	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter shares the original submitters concerns in terms of impact on capital value. A registered valuation the further submitter commissioned for their property illustrated a 30% fall in value would occur if the listing was to proceed. As the Council, nor proponents of listing bear the cost of listing their views should be secondary to owners.	Allow / Seeks that Item 520 (Khan House) be removed from SCHED1-Heritage Buildings. Seeks that the Council does not list private homes in SCHED1 without owner's consent. Especially in the case where these are homes are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct or area that can be appreciated by the public.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.26	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The buildings are entered on the NZ Heritage List/Rarangi Korero as Historic Places. Considers that they are nationally significant.	Disallow
Stephen Inzon	177.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. Considers that the Johnsonville Masonic Hall is significant to the Freemasons community but has little relevance to the rest of the Johnsonville community. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Delete Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Hall) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.3	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Johnsonville has very few old protected buildings. Johnsonville does not have enough community halls and indoor spaces. The hall would be used more if it was known by the community as being available for meetings, etc.	Disallow / Seeks that Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) is retained in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Tim Appleton	181.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church, 24 Donald McLean Street) on SCHED1- Heritage Buildings for the following reasons: - considers that more old buildings do not need to be protected in Newtown. -considers more cost effective housing is needed. - considers the owners should be able to decide for themselves whether or not to develop. - considers the buildings next to the church do not have a nice look and are no in keeping with the main church building.	Delete item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church, 24 Donald McLean Street) from SCHED1- Heritage Buildings.
Historic Places Wellington	182.36	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings) with amendment.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings with amendment.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.46	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Commissioners discount generic submissions in support for SCHED1 listings as they provide no additional evidence relating to specific items proposed. Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Historic Places Wellington	182.37	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that the Wellington Central Library should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Wellington Central Library to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Historic Places Wellington	182.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Hurston House at 1 Mersey Street, Island Bay, should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Hurston House at 1 Mersey Street Island Bay to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Historic Places Wellington	182.39	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Wilkinson holiday flats at 5-7 and 9-11 Grass Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Wilkinson holiday flats at 5-7 and 9-11 Grass Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Historic Places Wellington	182.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Newman House at 15 and 17 Hawkestone Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Newman House at 15 and 17 Hawkestone Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Historic Places Wellington	182.41	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Samuel Brown House at 22 Hanson Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Samuel Brown House at 22 Hanson Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Historic Places Wellington	182.42	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Burns Upholsterer at 47-49 Martin Square should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Burns Upholsterer at 47-49 Martin Square to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Historic Places Wellington	182.43	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Coffey House at 230 Oriental Parade should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. [See original submission for full reasons]	Add Coffey House at 230 Oriental Parade to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Historic Places Wellington	182.44	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that The Salvation Army Citadel on Jessie Street be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. [See original submission for full reasons]	Add The Salvation Army Citadel on Jessie Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Shirley Smith Family Trust	187.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Item 519 (Sutch-Smith House, 79A Todman Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. Considers that the Historic Heritage listing will have a detrimental effect on the overall value of property while achieving no real benefit to it. The listing imposes potential financial harm on the beneficiaries without realistically protecting the house in any meaningful way. Considers that the house is better protected by the will of the family and the Trust than by a Heritage listing. The family are deeply committed to the house and would never alter its exterior fabric further than it has already been altered. Nor would they pass it on to someone who didn't share their commitment.	Delete Item 519 (Sutch-Smith House, 79A Todman Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sophie Kahn	FS76.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	<p>The Submitter (187) is another Plischke home that points to the significant financial harm it will cause the owner and that the reason for doing this to the owner has no sound purpose. Specifically, it will not result in protecting the home in any meaningful way. The further submitter considers that the only outcomes of a forced listing are likely to be negative.</p> <p>The Submitter (187) also points out that the WCC have no reason to claim that the home will be better protected by them and not the owners. The further submitter agrees - Kahn House will be better protected by the Kahn family than a Heritage Listing.</p>	<p>Amend / Delete item 519 (Sutch-Smith House) from SCHED1- Heritage Buildings</p> <p>Do not list private homes in Schedule 1 without owner's consent</p> <p>Consider that the heritage protection of private homes can be maintained by altruistic value to the homeowner</p> <p>Do not list homes that are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct.</p> <p>Do not propose for listing homes where the architect/movement is already adequately represented in the Plan.</p> <p>Commission review into assertion Listing of private homes will achieve desired heritage outcomes as opposed to undesired outcomes.</p> <p>Commission review on the severe financial outcomes on private home owners, including what this means for their well-being in old age.</p> <p>Commission review on the need for a full, robust and encompassing consideration of all the impacts on individuals impacted by the heritage listing process</p>
Nicola Crauford	208.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the house has been altered far beyond its original design in order to meet the needs of modern living.</p> <p>Considers that the original design and concepts have been well preserved.</p> <p>Considers that the house no longer represents those original concepts and designs.</p>	Remove Item 521 (18 Vera Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports all current buildings listed in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings in mount Victoria	<p>Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the reasons for including these buildings are just as well justified as those that are already listed (Reasons listed in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that 53 Ellice Street and 67 Austin Street were proposed to be included in the Draft District Plan and have been removed in the Proposed District Plan. WCC reassessment documents do not support this decision.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to add the following properties:</p> <p>13 Austin Street 67 Austin Street 17 Brougham Street 33 Brougham Street 123 - 125 Brougham Street 136/138 Brougham Street 53 Ellice Street 9 Hawker Street 43 Hawker Street 71 Hawker Street 7 Paterson Street 58 Pirie Street 49 Porritt Avenue 23 Stafford Street 1 Tutchen Avenue 53 Ellice Street 67 Austin Street</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for summary of heritage significance]</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.177	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Mike Camden	226.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports the heritage schedule and new listings, but considers that consultation with community groups and NZIA and a public process for selecting new listings would have been preferable.	Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.51	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.26	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings) with amendment.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings with amendment
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.47	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.27	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings) with amendment.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings with amendment
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.48	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.28	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that the Wellington Central Library should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Wellington Central Library to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.36	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	The further submitter believes the Council's efforts to delist the library is likely pragmatic. and will save Wellington rate payers from significant excess expense. In short, there is likely a net benefit to community of delisting. We are sympathetic to this situation. The further submitter notes that Council's approach clearly demonstrates the recognition excessive costs and restrictions that arise from remediating a heritage listed building. Notes that the fact that the Council are actively delisting their own buildings to allow significant remediation to occur to avoid this cost on one hand, while they actively pursue the listing of private isolated homes (and other buildings) also in similar need of significant remediation is hypocritical and offensive. The same burden the Council is seeking to avoid, they seek to impose on private homeowners - despite being significantly better placed to bear the burden than private homeowners. [See original further submission for full reason].	Amend / Seeks that the Council retain the delisting of the Wellington City Library as proposed and seek heritage input into the remediation project. Seeks the removal of the proposed listings of isolated private homes that are in need of remediation, that have low heritage value, where listing would impose a significant financial burden, and the owners are opposed. Seeks that Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings (as it fits these same criteria)
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.29	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Hurston House at 1 Mersey Street, Island Bay, should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Hurston House at 1 Mersey Street Island Bay to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Wilkinson holiday flats at 5-7 and 9-11 Grass Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Wilkinson holiday flats at 5-7 and 9-11 Grass Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.31	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Newman House at 15 and 17 Hawkestone Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Newman House at 15 and 17 Hawkestone Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.32	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Samuel Brown House at 22 Hanson Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Samuel Brown House at 22 Hanson Street should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.33	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Burns Upholsterer at 47-49 Martin Square should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Burns Upholsterer at 47-49 Martin Square to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.34	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Coffey House at 230 Oriental Parade should be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Coffey House at 230 Oriental Parade to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.35	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that The Salvation Army Citadel on Jessie Street be included on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add The Salvation Army Citadel on Jessie Street to SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.36	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Supports evidence submitted by Historic Places Wellington.	Seeks that additional heritage listings are added for decorative/coloured glass.
Cherie Jacobson	251.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports all historic heritage added to the schedules.	Retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.45	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent. Seeks that the Commissioners note the submitters dissatisfaction with the Council's processes and questioning if the validity the proposed buildings as representative of Wellington.
Graeme Webster	255.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers that Toomath House is a private dwelling with little to no historic or heritage value. The site is not visible from the road. Heritage status would impose an unfair financial burden on the owners. Considers that it is unreasonable to list a property as heritage status without owners consent.	Remove item 514 (28 Robieson Street, Toomath House) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.28	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports this submission point. The property has low heritage value. Listings should focus on publicly accessible buildings or purchasing private properties with 'significant heritage' with a view to make them publicly accessible. [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) be removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).
Graeme Webster	255.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Considers that 26 Robieson Street is a private dwelling with little to no historic or heritage value. The site is not visible from the road. Heritage status would impose an unfair financial burden on the owners. Considers that it is unreasonable to list a property as heritage status without owners consent.	Seeks that 26 Robieson Street is not identified as a heritage building (as notified) and is not entered onto SCHED1-Heritage buildings in the future. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.29	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports this submission point. Notes that properties that are isolated with limited visibility or value should not be considered for listing. Heritage should focus on publicly accessible buildings or purchasing private properties with 'significant heritage' and a net-benefit to the community with a view to making them publicly accessible. [See original further submission for full reason].	Seeks that 26 Robieson St, Roseneath Wellington not be considered for heritage listing in the future. The Council only consider buildings with high heritage value to the community for evaluation and potential listing.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports the original submitters view that listing should only occur with homeowners consent. Notes that it is profoundly unfair to list an isolated homes with low heritage value at extreme financial costs to owners without their consent.	Allow / Seeks that the Council does not list private homes in SCHED1 without owner's consent. Especially in the case where these are homes are isolated and not part of a cohesive precinct or area that can be appreciated by the public.
Johnsonville Masonic Hall	263.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Freemasons Hall has little relevance to Johnsonville Community and that this building should not be included in the heritage schedule. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Hall) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.4	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Johnsonville has very few old protected buildings. Johnsonville does not have enough community halls and indoor spaces. The hall would be used more if it was known by the community as being available for meetings, etc.	Disallow / Seeks that Item 366 (Johnsonville Masonic Lodge) is retained in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Wellington City Council	266.180	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks to re-order Schedule 1 alphabetically by street name.
Wellington City Council	266.181	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers 'Willowgrove' has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add 'Willowgrove' to SCHED1 (Heritage buildings) as follows: <u>Address: 17 Parkvale Road, Karori</u> <u>Name: Willowgrove</u> <u>Legal Description: Lot 2 DP 44016</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire external building envelope</u> <u>Values: A, B, C, E, F</u>
Wellington City Council	266.182	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers the Tea Rooms and Bakehouse (former) has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add 'Tea Rooms and Bakehouse' (former) to SCHED1 (Heritage buildings) as follows: <u>Address: 249-261 Mansfield Street, Newtown</u> <u>Name: Tea Rooms and Bakehouse (former)</u> <u>Legal Description: Part Section 875 TN of Wellington</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire external building envelope</u> <u>Values: A, B, C, E, F</u>
CAMJEC Commercial Limited	268.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the site at 233 Willis Street being included in SCHED1 - Heritage buildings on the basis that this building does not meet the requirements to be listed as a Heritage item [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks to remove item 525 (233 Willis Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Aimee Poy	272.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the church at 24 Donald McLean Street being included in SCHED1 - Heritage buildings. Considers that significant changes of appearance of the church building in the future can't be made. If it is heritage listed then the Church will not be able to carry out its vision for the future and serve the local community. The neighbouring properties adjacent to the Church will also be affected as this will significantly alter the development potential.	Remove item 490 (Former Primitive Methodist Church) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Julie-Anne Daysh	330.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes heritage listing of Item 525 at 233 Willis Street. Resource consents (SRs 496847 & 499648) have been granted to build apartment buildings on the site, namely at Part Lot 7, DP 557, and Lot 1 and 2 DP 5171, and Lot 1 DP 2988. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Delete Item 525 (233 Willis Street) from SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings) in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.22	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>There are multiple reasons why the consideration of scheduling 61 Hankey Street is warranted. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boffa Miskell report on pre-1930s Character Area review (2019) identified 61 Hankey Street as being of potential historic significance, and worthy of consideration • New Zealand Institute of Architects Wellington Branch – Enduring Architecture Award 2004 for 61 Hankey Street. <p>The owners have presented their summary statement of significance could be: 61 Hankey Street has significant architectural values within the Wellington region as a fine example of an intact, single-detached modernist house, designed by prominent Wellington architects Bill Toomath and Derek Wilson.</p>	Amend SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings) to include 61 Hankey Street.
Cho Yam Chan	335.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>Opposes heritage listing of Item 525 at 233 Willis Street. The theme and integrity of the original design of 233 Willis Street has been lost, as the front showroom which protruded out from the front of building was destroyed during the Willis Street road widening. There is limited community recognition of the site, as there are only 2 photos of the building on the NZ Archive website. There are other Anscombe buildings in the heritage list worth preserving.</p> <p>NBS rating is at 34%, which would need to be raised through strengthening. Strengthening would require further capital investment in the vicinity of a few millions, which is more than the value of the building improvement value.</p> <p>The site is also suited for apartment development. The economic value lies in the land. The best return value on investment and best use of the site is apartments/residential development with commercial units at ground level.</p>	Delete Item 525 (233 Willis Street) from SCHED1 (Heritage Buildings) in its entirety.
Wayne Coffey and Gregory Young	347.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that Schedule 1 (Heritage Buildings) should include the Salvation Army Citadel building on Jessie Street. The building has special architectural, social and cultural heritage significance. The Citadel was purpose built as a place of community gathering and worship for a noteworthy group, the Salvation Army. Salvation Army activity on the site dates back over 100 years. It was the home of the world renowned Wellington Citadel Salvation Army Band for more than 125 years. Wellington city is in need of a medium sized performance venue and the Citadel would be suitable for that purpose. The quality space has excellent features for public performance. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend SCHED1-Heritage Buildings to include the Salvation Army Citadel building on Jessie Street.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.53	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	<p>The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wharenui Apartments Ltd	358.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the Wharenui Apartments at 274 Oriental Parade (Item 509) should not be listed under SCHED1. The entire external building envelope has been assessed and listed on the heritage building list. The leasehold company that owns the apartments do not support this listing. A heritage listing imposes significant costs and restrictions on the maintenance of the building. The heritage values of the building are not considered to warrant additional costs and restrictions linked to the listing. The heritage values listed in Item 509 predominantly relate to value associated with the site, not the actual building. The architectural style of the building is less coherent than suggested by officers and does not warrant listing. The listing is considered to not be a sustainable allocation of resources.</p> <p>Detailed counterpoints to heritage values listed in Item 509 are provided. Namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adjacent buildings were completed in the late 1930s and early 40s and arguably influenced the modernist movement more than Wharenui apartments. - The building's architects have worked on a great number of buildings within Wellington. - The heritage status is only applied to the exterior of the building envelope, which is already protected in an archaeological sense since it is listed on the archaeological alert layer. - Despite having a unique outward design, the scale and materials of the building are not unique for the area. - The building was completed in 1958, 30 to 40 years apart from the first modern apartment towers in the area, which are not listed as heritage buildings. - The building's 15m setback makes it hidden from the street. - Minor maintenance has occurred and will need to occur in the future due to the material state of the building and its location being near the beach. - The modernist architectural style and multi-use development is already represented within Oriental Bay. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove Item 509 (274 Oriental Parade) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Wharenui Apartments Ltd	358.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	<p>Considers that the Wharenui Apartments at 274 Oriental Parade (Item 509) should not be listed under SCHED1. The entire external building envelope has been assessed and listed on the heritage building list. The leasehold company that owns the apartments do not support this listing. A heritage listing imposes significant costs and restrictions on the maintenance of the building. The heritage values of the building are not considered to warrant additional costs and restrictions linked to the listing. The heritage values listed in Item 509 predominantly relate to value associated with the site, not the actual building. The architectural style of the building is less coherent than suggested by officers and does not warrant listing. The listing is considered to not be a sustainable allocation of resources.</p> <p>Detailed counterpoints to heritage values listed in Item 509 are provided. Namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adjacent buildings were completed in the late 1930s and early 40s and arguably influenced the modernist movement more than Wharenui apartments. - The building's architects have worked on a great number of buildings within Wellington. - The heritage status is only applied to the exterior of the building envelope, which is already protected in an archaeological sense since it is listed on the archaeological alert layer. - Despite having a unique outward design, the scale and materials of the building are not unique for the area. - The building was completed in 1958, 30 to 40 years apart from the first modern apartment towers in the area, which are not listed as heritage buildings. - The building's 15m setback makes it hidden from the street. - Minor maintenance has occurred and will need to occur in the future due to the material state of the building and its location being near the beach. - The modernist architectural style and multi-use development is already represented within Oriental Bay. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove Item 509 (274 Oriental Parade) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wētā FX	364.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the Heritage listing of Item 511 (139 Park Road) in SCHED1 - Heritage buildings. Weta FX has identified this location as the only one fitting the unique attributes they need to increase their crew members and provide work spaces for them in Miramar. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes 139 Park Road, Miramar being included in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings (Item 511).
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.26	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter believes the RMA places the onus on the Council to provide evidence that there is a higher net-benefit to the community of listing than not listing in order to justify listing a building. The RMA explicitly seeks to balance social, economic, and cultural wellbeing - not just cultural. The Council must weigh the impacts of listing on jobs and the local economy in addition to the financial burden on the owner. The further submission expands on this issue in the section titled "The Council has failed to effectively consider cost and benefits" on page 52. [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that Item 511 (139 Park Road) be removed from SCHED1. Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).
Wētā FX	364.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Opposes the Heritage listing of Item 511 (139 Park Road) in SCHED1 - Heritage buildings. Weta FX has identified this location as the only one fitting the unique attributes they need to increase their crew members and provide work spaces for them in Miramar. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove Item 511 (139 Park Road) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.125	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Argosy's property at 15 Stout Street is recognised as a heritage building as the 'Department Building'. The entire external building envelope is listed.	Retain Schedule 1 - Heritage Buildings, Ref 23 as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.126	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	The former State Insurance Building comprises the first eight floors of the building. In 1998, a three storey addition designed by Athfield Architects, was constructed on top of the former State Insurance Building (Athfield Addition). Argosy opposes the Athfield addition being included in the listing of the State Insurance Building for the following reasons: - The Wellington City Council Heritage Inventory describes the history, architectural information and cultural value of the building. The Heritage Inventory's recognition of the heritage values of the building is limited to the former State Insurance Building. It describes the Athfield Addition as "a large and somewhat incongruous" addition. - Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga lists the former State Insurance Office Building on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Korero.2 The building was registered on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Korero in 1981 (before the Athfield Addition was constructed) and the listing describes the former State Insurance Office Building and not the Athfield Addition. - A heritage order was issued in relation to the State Insurance Building on 29 September 1987. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga is the heritage protection authority in relation to this heritage order. Because the heritage order was issued before the Athfield Addition was constructed, the Council is not restricted by the requirements in s 195A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to altering the heritage listing of the building in the Proposed Plan to exclude the Athfield Addition. - The Athfield Addition does not have any heritage value and should be excluded from the heritage listing of 143 Lambton Quay in the Draft Plan. It is not appropriate for this addition to be subject to the controls of being a heritage building in the Proposed Plan when it has no heritage value and can be easily distinguished from the former State Insurance Building.	Amend Schedule 1, DP Ref 181: Entire external building envelope of former State Insurance Building. <u>Listing excludes the 1998 three-storey addition designed by Athfield architects.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.46	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Although the submission is correct regarding the 1998 addition, the listing in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero is for the entire building. The building, including the 1998 addition, need to be read a whole, and it is appropriate for the scheduled item to include the whole building.	Disallow / Retain as notified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.127	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Argosy's property at 360-366 Lambton Quay is recognised as including two heritage buildings: the 'Equitable Building and Investment Co. Building' and 'Stewart Dawson's Corner'. The entire external building envelope is listed in relation to both buildings.	Retain the Schedule 1 - Heritage buildings listings for Ref 191.1 and 191.2 as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Civic Trust	388.119	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support in part	SCHED1 is partially supported and additional Heritage Buildings are proposed.	Retain Schedule 1 - Heritage Buildings with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.120	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that SCHED1 should include the Michael Fowler Centre, the Municipal Office Building, the Civic Administration Building and Wellington Public Library. These buildings should be identified as having heritage values within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct.	Amend Schedule 1 - Heritage Buildings to include: - The Michael Fowler Centre, - The Municipal Office Building, - The Civic Administration Building, - Wellington Public Library.
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Supports the heritage scheduling of additional sites identified by Historic Places Wellington.	Seeks that the Heritage Buildings identified by the Historic Places Wellington submission are listed in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas. (Historic Places Wellington Submission 182).
Murray Pillar	393.20	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support in part	Supports the WCC proposals for retaining existing, and adding new, listed heritage buildings.	Retain all existing and new Items in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.
Murray Pillar	393.21	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the selection of new listings for SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings involved greater consultation with Historic Places Wellington and other community groups, and to have been a public process.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.101	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support in part	Support the new additions to the schedule of historic heritage items, but considers that they are not representative of what is distinctive about Wellington, the region, and New Zealand.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings as notified, with amendments [Inferred decision requested]
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.44	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent. Seeks that the Commissioners note the submitters dissatisfaction with the Council's processes, questioning if the proposed buildings reflect the values of Wellingtonians, and earlier taking exception to the lack of evidence used to inform the Council's process (412.3). The justification of SCHED1 listings is equally lacking in evidence.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.102	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that the Heritage items schedule does not adequately protect historic heritage nor reflect what Wellingtonians value. Considers that the schedule will not meet objective HH-O1. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports the original point that there are significant weaknesses in the Council's heritage protection regime, and this includes with the process to identify heritage. [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / The Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.103	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports the addition of new places to the schedule but concerned that the lack of public engagement on the review of the schedule will undermine its efficacy as it is unlikely to have the support of the people of Wellington as it does not reflect Wellington's important heritage.	[Inferred decision requested] retain SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter supports the point that there are significant weaknesses in the Council's heritage protection regime, and this includes the Council's engagement and understanding of what the community values. The further submitter has also been disappointed with the Council's engagement. The Council should spend the time and effort to understand how much value the community places on different types of heritage. This work would then inform Council resourcing and support quantitative net benefit assessments of listings as expected under s32 of the RMA. [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / The Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.104	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Does not support the protection of facades only where heritage fabric exists in addition to the facade and considers that this is likely to lead to adverse effects on heritage.	Not specified

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.60	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose in part	Considers The Gordon Wilson flats are an example of where heritage protection has gotten in the way of the city's priorities.	Not specified
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The Heritage Building listing of 28 Robieson Street is opposed. Considers the house is deemed to be in poor condition and remediation work is estimated to cost as much as \$800 - \$1million. Detailed renovations plans from the owners have been provided, which include repurposing the timber from the house and other special aspects of the building. Considers a heritage listing on the property would incur risks, costs and stress to the owners, who wish to renovate the house. It is argued that the heritage value of the building is low, and that the listing would not result in any positive net benefits for society or the owners. It is considered that the listing would instead lead to a worse heritage outcome for the community due to the significant impacts on the owners linked to the condition of the building. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson Street) from SCHED1 - Heritage Building.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.31	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that the Council failed to meet the NZ Treasury's expected standards of good regulatory practice with their proposal, evidence base and evaluation of options to list 28 Robieson Street as a Heritage Building. The New Zealand Treasury sets expectations for good regulatory practice, stating that net benefits need to be considered, that regulated parties should be treated fairly and the Council should seek to meet their objectives in a way that has the least impact on property rights, market competition and individual autonomy. For instance, the Treasury's guidance report 'Best Practice Monitoring and Review' (2019) suggests that 5 to 10 per cent of the total time and budget committed to an intervention should be spent on review, monitoring and evaluation. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Seeks that the Council meets the New Zealand Treasury standards and guidelines on regulatory practice, monitoring and review in regard to listing 28 Robieson Street as a heritage building. [Inferred decision requested]
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.32	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers the evidence base for the historic heritage section of the section 32 evaluation is weak in regard to heritage listing of 28 Robieson Street. Has concerns with low-quality analysis, considers some reports do not exist, some are still draft reports, some are missing content, and some are summer student projects. The low quality of these reports implies the Council was never expecting to be asked to provide evidence. Any evidence used to form proposals of this scale and significance needs to have a level of detail and analytical rigour that is commensurate to the impacts in addition to transparency, and the findings being clearly documented. Considers some reports which form the evidence base are also not publicly available. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Seeks that the evidence base for the historic heritage section of the Section 32 have a level of detail and analytical rigour that is commensurate to the impacts in addition to being transparent, and the findings being clearly documented. [Inferred decision requested]
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.33	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that council has failed to have an effective and unbiased process to identify heritage. Considers the identification process used by Council lacks the detail and rigour that corresponds to the scale and significance of the proposal to list 28 Robieson Street. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.34	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers there is little evidence to support modernist architecture being under-represented in the heritage schedule being used as a reason to list 28 Robieson Street. Considers that there are modernist buildings that are not classified as modernist by Council already listed and that no consideration has been given to modernist representation across the Greater Wellington region.Considers it is unreasonable for the Council to claim the architectural theme of modernism is under-represented, if classification is lacking or undefined. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.35	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that the Pukehinau flats are modernist flats with distinctive round windows at the bottom of Brooklyn hill are easily viewably by the public. The flats are owned and managed by the Council. This imposing building has similarities to other notable architects of the era. The flats are unlisted and unfortunately, they were documented as being in poor condition in 2017. Queries why some buildings and architects attract attention but others do not and notes Burren and Keen largely appear to be ignored in the literary history and heritage of the city. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.36	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	Considers that Toomath house has very low community amenity value and option use value. Since the owners have bought the house in 2014, there has been no requests to visit or tour the house. It is considered that the highest actual use value attained from private homes, and from Toomath house, is from living in them. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.37	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Not specified	A registered valuation of Toomath House (28 Robieson Street) has assessed that the property will have a 29% drop in value as a result of a Heritage Listing, amounting to a loss of \$450,000. This will impact the owners' financial wellbeing, security, and retirement plans. It is also considered that the home is in poor condition, costs to remediate are high and there is uncertainty and list with the property being heritage listed. [Refer to original for full reason, including Appendix A]	Not specified.
Fabric Property Limited	425.111	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Acknowledges the building at 22 The Terrace is recognised as a heritage building. The entire external building envelope is listed.	Retain item 287 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.
Wingnut PM Ltd	428.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that The Former School and Convent have little to no architectural merit, has been altered many times, and is poor build quality. Preservation while developing for future use would be difficult. Considers that expansion of the Post Production Music composing and recording base would be difficult. [See original submission for full reasons]	Amend Item 120 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings to remove The Former School and Convent 1899. [See original submission for map of building]
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.49	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Schedule 1 item 120 (chapel and retreat house) is entered on the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as a category 2 place, and has sufficient heritage value to merit its inclusion in the schedule.	Disallow / Retain as notified (with minor amendment as per the original HNZPT submission)
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.157	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Considers the building has significant heritage value.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.28	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The buildings are entered on the NZ Heritage List/Rarangī Korero as Historic Places. Considers that they are nationally significant.	Disallow
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.173	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The RVA opposes the submission point as it is unclear if the relief sought is consistent with financial contributions regime under the RMA.	Disallow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.173	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Ryman opposes the submission point as it is unclear if the relief sought is consistent with financial contributions regime under the RMA.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Rachel Underwood	458.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports the Council’s proposals for retaining existing, and adding new, listed Heritage Buildings but considers a public process should have been followed to select them with consultation with Heritage Places Wellington and community groups.	Retain SCHED1- Heritage buildings, as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.50	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner’s consent.
Philip Cooke	465.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is highly modified from the original Victorian building and relies on the surrounding buildings for scale and context. Considers that 20 Austin Street's contribution to the townscape is not in isolation nor is it held in high public esteem by the local community without the context of the surrounding buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that Item 471 (20 Austin Street) is only included as a listed Item on SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings if the surrounding buildings are included within the Character Precinct boundary.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The submitter requests removal of 20 Austin Street from the list of heritage buildings IF Claremont Grove is not designated a Heritage Area. We do not believe this should occur, however we agree that Claremont Grove does provide context to this house. Claremont Grove must be made a Heritage Area (refer to our submission on the Proposed DP). Do not remove this house from the list of heritage buildings because, if Claremont Grove is not designated a Heritage Area in this Plan, it may be in future.	Disallow
Philip Cooke	465.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose in part	Considers that 20 Austin Street's contribution to the townscape is not in isolation nor is it held in high public esteem by the local community without the context of the surrounding buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Remove Heritage Building Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in its current form. [inferred decision requested]
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	The submitter requests removal of 20 Austin Street from the list of heritage buildings IF Claremont Grove is not designated a Heritage Area. We do not believe this should occur, however we agree that Claremont Grove does provide context to this house. Claremont Grove must be made a Heritage Area (refer to our submission on the Proposed DP). Do not remove this house from the list of heritage buildings because, if Claremont Grove is not designated a Heritage Area in this Plan, it may be in future.	Disallow
WingNut Films Productions Limited	467.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Oppose the heritage listing of the Bulk Storage Tank at 139 Park Road. Considers that the tank is predominantly a steel structure and has significant rust.The roof has a large number of leaks and significant amounts of water come into the building whenever it rains. The tank also has a condensation problem which makes it unsuitable for the vast majority of activities. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove Heritage listing 511 - 139 Park Road from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.27	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	The further submitter support this submission. If the Council had identified the effects of listing the tank, and its poor state, and weighed the benefits and costs (as required under s32 of the RMA) it seems likely this would not have been proposed for listing. Remedial work to resolve the issues would be significant and only increase if the listing proceeded.	Allow / Seeks that the Council only list buildings or structures with accurate information (i.e., free from errors) and robust evidence is provided to support listing. Seeks that the Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Olympus Apartments	473.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Oppose	Opposes the proposed heritage designation of the Olympus Apartments. Considers that the added cost of any improvements or maintenance if the building is designated historic is concerning, especially as many owners are retired and on fixed incomes. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove Heritage Listing 510 (280 Oriental Parade) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Olympus Apartments	473.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers 280 Oriental Parade does not qualify as a Listed Heritage Building. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove Heritage Listing 510 (280 Oriental Parade) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.
Craig Palmer	492.50	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Amend	Considers that SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings should be amended so that the Item List is aggregated into defined areas of the city. This is to enable the public to readily access a definitive list for the neighbourhood where they live and other areas of interest.	Seeks that the Items List in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings are aggregated into defined areas of the city.
Rita Angus Cottage Trust (formerly Thorndon Trust)	494.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED1 – Heritage Buildings	Support	Supports the inclusion of Item 470 (Cooper's Cottage) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Retain Item 470 as a listed building in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.55	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Oppose in part	Notes that a number of entries in Schedule 1 have incorrect New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero references.	[Inferred Decision requested] Seeks that all SCHED2 - Heritage Structure entries are checked for accuracy in terms of heritage New Zealand Listing number.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.56	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 Item 4 does not have a HNZPT #.	Amend SCHED2 Item 4 (Seatoun Tunnel) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) <u>Historic Place Category 2, 3650</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.57	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 Item 28 has an inaccurate HNZPT #.	Amend SCHED2 Item 28 (Queen Victoria Statue) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) <u>Historic Place Category 2, 28 3663</u>
Tim Bright	75.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that the Mount Victoria Tunnel should be added to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as all other tunnels of a similar era are included.	Add Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures
Judith Graykowski	80.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that the Mount Victoria Tunnel should be added to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as all other tunnels of a similar era are included.	Add Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures
Judith Graykowski	80.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 should be amended to include all other tunnels of a similar era to the Mount Victoria Tunnel.	Add all other tunnels of similar era as the Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.
Joanna Newman	85.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 should be amended to include the Mount Victoria Tunnel. Considers that the Mount Victoria tunnel is not included in the list of heritage structures, while all other early road tunnels in Wellington are, namely Karori, Seatoun, Northland, Hataitai Bus Tunnels. Considers that this tunnel is arguably one of the most 'storied' tunnels in Wellington, whether from the earliest days construction by Depression workers and Government grant, and burial of a murder victim on site during construction to the current history of tooting in the tunnel. Supports evidence from the Mt Victoria Historical Society submission.	Add the Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that Mount Victoria tunnel is unique amongst tunnels in not being a heritage structure. Considers that the tunnel is the most 'storied'.	Add Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.200	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Vivienne Morrell	155.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports the heritage listings in the heritage schedules.	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified, and include the recommendations of Heritage NZ and Historic Places Wellington.
Vivienne Morrell	155.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that the Mount Victoria Tunnel should be added to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as all other tunnels of a similar era are included.	Add Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures
Historic Places Wellington	182.45	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed to the listing of operational infrastructures because of the costs this imposes of maintaining and adapting our infrastructure networks to best serve the communities of today and tomorrow. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Commissioners note the impact of adding heritage restrictions to operational infrastructure and providing for future needs of our communities. The Council does not add any items of operational infrastructure to SCHED2. The Council only list structures where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the effect of listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	SCHED2 should be amended to include the Mount Victoria Tunnel. Considers that the Mount Victoria tunnel is not included in the list of heritage structures, while all other early road tunnels in Wellington are, namely Karori, Seatoun, Northland, Hataitai Bus Tunnels. Considers that this tunnel is arguably one of the most 'storied' tunnels in Wellington, whether from the earliest days construction by Depression workers and Government grant, and burial of a murder victim on site during construction to the current history of tooting in the tunnel.	Add the Mount Victoria Tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.178	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Tyers Stream Group	221.79	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Add Tyers Stream Dam to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.37	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified
Cherie Jacobson	251.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports all historic heritage added to the schedules.	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified
Wellington City Council	266.183	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks to amend Schedule 2 (Heritage structures) to re-order the Schedule alphabetically by street name.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.29	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.184	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers Glenside Milk stand has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add Glenside Milk stand to SCHED2 (Heritage structures) as follows: <u>Address: Middleton Road (corner of Middleton Road and Glenside Road), Glenside Name: Glenside Milk stand</u> <u>Legal Description: Legal Road</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire structure</u> <u>Values: A, C, E, F</u>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.30	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.185	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers The Tram Pole on Jervois Quay has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add Tram Pole to SCHED2 (Heritage structures) as follows: <u>Address: Jervois Quay (corner of Jervois Quay and Wakefield Street)</u> <u>Name: Tram Pole</u> <u>Legal Description: Legal Road</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire structure</u> <u>Values: A, B, C, E, F</u>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.31	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.186	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers Tyers Stream Dam has been identified as having significant heritage values and meets the Councils criteria for listing in the District Plan. The owner has been active in supporting its listing.	Add Tyers Stream Dam to SCHED2 (Heritage structures) as follows: <u>Address: Tyers Stream Reserve, Ngauranga</u> <u>Name: Tyers Stream Dam</u> <u>Legal Description: Fee Simple, 1/1, Lot 4 Deposited Plan 58937</u> <u>Protection Required: Entire structure</u> <u>Values: A, B, E, F</u>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.32	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow
Wellington City Council	266.187	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend SCHED2 (Heritage structures) - 63 as follows: <u>Legal Road</u>
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.33	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Claire Bibby	329.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	<p>Considers that the survey marker used for the Tawa tunnel construction should be added to SCHED2 as a heritage structure. The survey marker was used to assess the centre line of the railway tunnel, and has a view shaft on property 395 Middleton Road. Support for this heritage nomination is attached in Appendix A, B, C, from Glenside Progressive Assn. Inc, the Tawa Historical Society and the Rail Heritage Trust. The survey mark is located on property 395 Middleton Road (Lot 2 DP76164). Approximate location of marker (41.197092, 174.820693).</p> <p>As stated in the 'Historic Heritage Study for the Upper Stebbings and Marshall Ridge Structure Plan' by Elizabeth Cox (2018, p.4): "Preserve the area around the Railway Survey Peg Protection of this site should be considered, plus protection of a view shaft between the tunnel and peg."</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendices]</p>	Add the survey mark used for the construction of the Tawa No.2 tunnel to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.34	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow
Claire Bibby	329.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	<p>Considers that the concrete milk stand on the corner of Glenside and Middleton Road should be considered a Heritage Structure. Approximate location is 41.20574 174.81178.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendices]</p>	Add the concrete milk stand on the corner of Glenside and Middleton Road to SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.35	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow
Claire Bibby	329.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	<p>Considers there should be a property listing on the Reedy block for the area adjacent to Westchester Drive and Te Kahu Road. There should be a comment included in the Property Report and in the District Plan that there is a burial site dating back to about 1841 on this block. This would ensure it is not destroyed accidentally and will enable a proper archaeological investigation to be carried out.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendices]</p>	<p>Seeks that the burial site dating back to about 1841 at 28 Westchester Drive be included in a property listing in SCHED2 - Heritage Structures.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Tawa Historical Society	386.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	<p>Considers that the SCHED2 - Heritage Structures listing of Item 60 (Elsdon Best Memorial) should be amended to include an enlarged area encompassing the Tawa War Memorial at the Northern end of Oxford Street, and the World War I memorial rock (recently moved from Willowbank Park).</p> <p>Considers that it is appropriate to enlarge (or add to) the existing memorial area to include the other memorials now in the area.</p> <p>Considers that the Enlarged Memorial area will meet the following heritage values: A, C, D, E, F</p>	Amend Item 60 (Elsdon Best Memorial) in SCHED2 - Heritage Structures to include an enlarged area encompassing the Tawa War Memorial at the Northern end of Oxford Street, and the World War I memorial rock (recently moved from Willowbank Park).
Wellington Civic Trust	388.121	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support in part	SCHED2 is partially supported and additional Heritage Structures are proposed.	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures with amendment.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.122	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Amend	Considers that SCHED2 should include the City to Sea bridge and Civic Square. It should include all features associated with the City to Sea Bridge, including the decking, the steps, the sculptures: and the paving, steps, sculptures, water features and other items which comprise the original design for the square, including the walkway which links the two levels of the above features.	<p>Amend SCHED2 - Heritage Structures to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The City to Sea Bridge and all associated features, - Civic Square.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.4	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Oppose	The submitter seeks to include the City to Sea bridge and Civic Square as heritage structures. While Willis Bond and Company Limited appreciate the reasons for the submission and are supportive of protecting historic heritage, we agree with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga(sub 70.35) that the proposed Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct provisions adequately address heritage considerations within the area.	Disallow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.36	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage structures in Wellington and these additional structures.	Allow
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.105	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support in part	Support the new additions to the schedule of historic heritage items, but considers that they are not representative of what is distinctive about Wellington, the region, and New Zealand.	Retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified, with amendments
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.106	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	Supports the addition of new structures to the schedule but concerned that the lack of public engagement on the review of the schedule will undermine its efficacy as it is unlikely to have the support of the people of Wellington as it does not reflect Wellington's important heritage.	[Inferred decision requested] retain SCHED2 - Heritage Structures as notified
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Not specified	Considers that 28 Robieson Street may have more heritage protection than the bucket fountain and considers this to be odd. The fountain has high community value and the fact that it is not listed suggests there are issues with the way the Council is identifying and prioritising historic heritage within the city. Queries why some buildings and architects attract attention but others do not and notes Burren and Keen largely appear to be ignored in the literary history and heritage of the city. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Not specified.
Sophie Kahn	FS76.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED2 – Heritage Structures	Support	The Submitters (415) point to the inexplicability of the way structures of infinitely more heritage value to the community are not proposed for listing (such as the bucket fountain) but lowvalue structures are. They (415) also point to the fact that the WCC has removed several public structures of extremely high heritage value to the community from the Plan (eg. Public library) whilst forcing extremely low-value privately owned structures on it. One can only conjecture why. Could it be the WCC recognises the burden listing inflicts on owners and does not wish that on themselves? The Submitters (415) suggest the WCC's process for identifying structures is broken. The further submitter concurs. Kahn House is of extremely low-value to the community and absolutely no evidence exists to suggest any more than a handful of individuals (many of whom do not even reside in this city and who have never actually seen Kahn House) wish Kahn House to be protected.	Amend / Remove item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED 1 - Heritage buildings. Seeks that an independent Body is hired to complete a full review and audit of the the way WCC is identifying which structures require listing on the Plan and which don't. A review to understand why WCC is identifying three times the number of homes requiring heritage status relative to total housing stock as compared to Auckland City Council. Require that the WCC provide full quantitative and qualitative data and evidence to support their forcing private homes on the plan.
Jean Morgan	5.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	The entirety of Porritt Avenue in Mt Victoria should be a Heritage Area to retain the history of the area. It is an unbroken streetscape in the city. (Option A)	Retain Item 45 (Porritt Avenue) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.
Barry Insull	32.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that last names in Item 38 required protections are not up to date. Identification of each of the baches at Mestanes Bay is both unclear and generally reflects earlier times.	Seeks that last names in SCHED3 (Heritage Areas), Item 38 (Mestanes Bay Baches) be updated to reflect current leases.
Barry Insull	32.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that last names in Item 39 required protections are not up to date. identification of each of the baches both at Red Rocks is both unclear and generally reflects earlier times.	Seeks that last names in SCHED3 (Heritage Areas), Item 39 (Red Rocks Baches) be updated to reflect current leases.
Barry Insull	32.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Item 39 (Red Rocks Baches) in SCHED3 fails to include the wording "Historic Area" and should be amended.	Seeks that HNZPT of column, Item 39 (Red Rocks Baches) make mention of Heritage Area.
Barry Insull	32.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of Red Rocks Baches in SCHED3.	Retain as notified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Gregory Webber	33.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that Green Street is given heritage protection to match Coromandel Street and Wilson Street as these have similar era housing	Seeks that Green Street is included as a Heritage Area
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.220	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
E W Limited	45.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the existing building at 241 Tinakori Road may be on the site of an 1870s retail building but extensive modifications have left very little of the original building. As the exterior was completely rebuilt in the 1920s and the interior has also been altered, it does not represent an 1870s retail building or even a heavily modified version. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that 241 Tinakori Road should either be excluded from the SCHED46 - Ascot Street Heritage Area; or be assigned a heritage status of 1, "Neutral impact on heritage area"; or, at most, 2, "Contributes to the values of the heritage area".
Phil Kelliher	58.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports that Porritt Avenue is zoned Heritage Area.	Retain Item 45 (Porritt Avenue) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as a Heritage Area.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.40	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Ellice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow
Phil Kelliher	58.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	The extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should include properties on Tutchen Avenue.	Add the following houses in Tutchen Avenue to Item 45 (Porritt Avenue) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas: 1 Tutchen Avenue (Home of Wellington Harbour Pilot, William Shilling) Built c1896 3 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 5 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 2 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 4 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 6 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 8 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.41	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	HPW supports the addition of heritage areas in Mt Victoria, comprising notified areas of Elizabeth St and Porritt Ave and further new heritage areas in Claremont Grove; addresses in Ellice St; and the addition of 1-6 & 8 Tutchen Ave to the adjacent proposed new Porritt Ave Heritage Area as notified.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.58	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose in part	Opposes SCHED3-Heritage Areas to the extent that the Truby King Historic Reserve is not included on the schedule.	Retain SCHED3-Heritage Areas with amendment.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.27	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	OHS generally supports currently scheduled heritage areas in the wider Wellington area and HNZPTs proposals.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.37	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	HPW supports currently scheduled heritage areas in Wellington and HNZPTs amendment proposals.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.59	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that SCHED3 (Historic Areas) should include the Truby King historic area as it is included in the NZ Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as an historic area (list number 7040). Acknowledges that several individual buildings within this historic area have been included in Schedule 1 (Historic buildings), but considers that the Truby King historic area as a whole, including the gardens, landscaping, and settings of the buildings, has significant heritage values and merits inclusion in SCHED3.	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include a Truby King Heritage Area (HNZPT#) 7040.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.60	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose in part	Opposes SCHED3-Heritage Areas to the extent that there are minor errors and missing New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero references on the schedule.	[Inferred Decision requested] Seeks that all SCHED3 - Heritage Area entries are checked for accuracy in terms of address, legal descriptions and Heritage New Zealand Listing number.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.61	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	The SCHED3 Item 5 HNZPT # should be amended to reflect that the Heritage Area also incorporates the 'Dominion Observatory Historic Area'.	Amend SCHED3 Item 5 (Wellington Botanic Gardens) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Wellington Botanic Gardens Historic Area, 7573 and Dominion Observatory Historic Area, 7033
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.62	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 14 does not have a NZHPT # reference and name should be changed.	Amend SCHED3 Item 14 (Parliamentary Precinct) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Government Centre Historic Area, 7035
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.63	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 19 does not have a NZHPT # reference and name should be changed.	Amend SCHED3 Item 19 (Wright's Hill Gun Emplacement) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Wrights Hill Fortress Historic Place Category 1, 7543
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.64	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 21 does not have a NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 21 (Old Coach Road) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Old Coach Road Historic Place Category 1, 7396
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.65	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 22 does not have a NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 22 (Evans Bay Patent Slip) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Evans Bay Patent Slip Historic Place Category 2, 2895
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.66	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 27 should include both the Cuba Street Historic Area and the Footscray Avenue Historic Area and this should be reflected in the NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 27 (Cuba Street) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Cuba Street Historic Area, 7209 and Footscray Avenue Historic Area, 7209
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.67	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 28 is incorporated by the Government Centre Historic Area (although not all the boundaries correspond exactly in all aspects) and this should be reflected in the NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 28 (Stout Street Precinct) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Government Centre Historic Area, 7035
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.68	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 39 has an incorrect NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 39 (Stout Street Precinct) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Red Rocks Baches Historic Area, 7509
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.69	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	SCHED3 Item 40 has an incorrect NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED3 Item 40 (Stout Street Precinct) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Remains, Historic Place Category 2, 9032
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	Opposes Armour Avenue (Item 41 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area. Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city. Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.	Delete Item 41 (Armour Avenue) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Doctors' Common Heritage Area (Item 42 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area.</p> <p>Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city.</p> <p>Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.</p>	Delete Item 42 (Doctors' Common Heritage Area) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Elizabeth Street Heritage Area (Item 43 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area.</p> <p>Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city.</p> <p>Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.</p>	Delete Item 43 (Elizabeth Street Heritage Area) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Moir Street Heritage Area (Item 44 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area.</p> <p>Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city.</p> <p>Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.</p>	Delete Item 44 (Moir Street Heritage Area) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.
Lucy Telfar Barnard	72.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (Item 45 of SCHED3) being scheduled as a Heritage Area.</p> <p>Considers that nothing about this area makes it more worthy of protection than many other areas of the city.</p> <p>Its presence on this list indicates a privileging of a small number of wealthy property owners over other current and future city residents' needs for more effective residential use of land so close to the central city. In particular, there is nothing about this area that means it should be given "Heritage Area" protection.</p>	Delete Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in its entirety.
Phil Kelliher	F557.4	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Supports evidence provided by the WCC for the inclusion of Porritt Ave into new Heritage Area (45)</p> <p>This addition recognises the importance of heritage to Wellington's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>Porritt Avenue recognised by experts as an important example of an intact late 19th / early 20th century streetscape. There are unlikely to be few others in Wellington from the same period that can match its overall integrity.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Turi & Jane Park	73.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Seeks that 134 Brougham Street is removed from the Moir Steet Heritage Area.	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage Areas) to remove 134 Brougham Street from item 44 (Moir Street Heritage Area), with the following changes to Item 44 required: 1. Column 4 (Legal Descriptions) - delete the legal description for 134 Brougham Street as follows: Brougham Street 134 (PT SEC 294 TOWN OF WELLINGTON)... 2. Column 5 (Protections Sought) add 134 Brougham Street to the exclusions as follows: ... <u>134 Brougham Street</u>
Tim Bright	75.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should be increased to include properties on Tutchen Avenue.	Amend the Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED 3 - Heritage Areas include Tutchen Avenue.
Tim Bright	75.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that a new Heritage Area should be created for Claremont Grove.	Amend SCHED3 to add a Heritage Area for Claremont Grove.
Judith Graykowski	80.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the extent of Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include Tutchen Avenue.
Joanna Newman	85.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	The extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should include properties on Tutchen Avenue. Considers that Tutchen Avenue is an integral part of the Porritt Avenue surrounds, in terms of history, building type and height and streetscape. The street was created by the Tutchen, on their estate, before being taken over by the Council. Council is also proposing to add the building which was the original Tutchen home, backing onto Tutchen Avenue, to the District Plan heritage list. Tutchen Avenue is included in the 'primary/contributory' pre-1930 character area in the Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review commissioned by Wellington City Council. Housing on the street is just as 'primary/contributory' to character as the overall housing stock of Porritt, Armour and Albany Avenues. There is only one building (No. 10 and 12) which is not original. An important figure in Wellington's history – Wellington Pilot, William Shilling – lived at No. 1 Tutchen Avenue for many years. It is topographically a prominent site in this part of Mt Victoria and in the middle of the proposed Porritt Avenue and Armour Avenue heritage areas. To allow a large concentration of four-storey, mixed-use apartments in the middle of this heritage area would destroy the character of both. The narrowness of the street – barely more than a drive-width – reflects its origins as a private way created by the Tutchen, who accessed the stables behind their Pirie Street residence via it. Supports evidence submitted by Mt Victoria Historical Society.	Add the following houses in Tutchen Avenue to the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (No 45): 1 Tutchen Avenue (Home of Wellington Harbour Pilot, William Shilling) Built c1896 3 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 5 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 2 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 4 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 6 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 8 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 12 Tutchen Avenue Built 1926, Rear of the listed building at 56 Pirie St.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Quayside Property Trust	104.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that 115 Brougham Street should not be included in Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as this site is not currently listed as a historical building within the operative District Plan or from Heritage New Zealand.</p> <p>The site is not accessible from Porritt Avenue and is generally cut off, so cannot allow for the enjoyment of historical architecture values.</p> <p>The site has undergone various types of work to alter the building.</p> <p>The people who might have stayed at the property is not significant.</p> <p>The site has no street scape bonus and low level of design integrity.</p> <p>The site does not meet physical and social values.</p> <p>The site does not meet representativeness because this building was constructed and used as a private school by the McDonnell family, and likely funded by the profits of land wars that have been damaging to the Māori culture.</p> <p>The site has no visual connection to Porritt Avenue.</p> <p>WCC will manage designs and alterations because it is within a character precinct.</p>	Amend Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to remove 115 Brougham Street.
Quayside Property Trust	104.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that 115 Brougham Street (The site) not currently listed as a historical building within the operative district plan or from Heritage New Zealand.</p> <p>Considers that the site is not accessible from Porritt Avenue and is generally cut off, so cannot allow for the enjoyment of historical architecture values.</p> <p>Considers that the site has undergone various types of work to alter the building.</p> <p>Considers that the people who might have stayed at the property is not significant.</p> <p>Considers that the site has no street scape bonus and low level of design integrity.</p> <p>Considers that the site does not meet physical and social values.</p> <p>Considers that the site does not meet representativeness because this building was constructed and used as a private school by the McDonnell family, and likely funded by the profits of land wars that have been damaging to the Māori culture.</p> <p>Considers that the site has no visual connection to Porritt Avenue.</p> <p>Considers that WCC will manage designs and alterations because it is within a character precinct.</p>	<p>Seeks that 115 Brougham Street has it's Contributing Building status removed.</p> <p>Amend Item 45 as follows:</p> <p>Brougham Street – 115 (PT LOT 2 DP 12250 LOT 1 DP 34813 – ROWENA HOSTEL)</p>
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>115 Brougham Street should not be removed from the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area because of its historical significance, it can be seen from there, and the former school also had a connection with a small school and building still extant in Porritt Avenue.</p> <p>Do not remove 115 Brougham Street from the Heritage Area.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that Tutchen Avenue is integral to Porritt Avenue surrounds.</p> <p>Considers that Tutchens created the street.</p> <p>Considers that Tutchen Avenue is included in the Boffa Miskell report.</p> <p>Considers that William Shilling lived at Tutchen Avenue.</p> <p>Considers that allowing high development in Tutchen Avenue would impact character of surrounding character areas.</p> <p>Considers that the narrow nature of the street is evidence that it was a private way created by Tutchens.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add the following houses in Tutchen Avenue to Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas:</p> <p>1 Tutchen Avenue 3 Tutchen Avenue 5 Tutchen Avenue 2 Tutchen Avenue 4 Tutchen Avenue 6 Tutchen Avenue 8 Tutchen Avenue 12 Tutchen Avenue</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.201	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that Claremont Grave represents the Victoria Bowling Club.</p> <p>Considers that Claremont Grove and Victoria Bowling Club were a hub for Mt Vic in early days.</p> <p>Considers that houses of many founders still exist around Mt Vic.</p> <p>Considers that two of the houses in the area are on the District Plan Heritage Building list already and high development of surrounding properties would destroy heritage value of those two properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to add a new Heritage Area for Claremont Grove that includes the following properties:</p> <p>1 Claremont Grove 3 Claremont Grove 5 Claremont Grove 7 Claremont Grove 9 Claremont Grove 15 Claremont Grove 16 Austin Street 18 Austin Street 20 Austin Street 22 Austin Street 11 Austin Street 13 Austin Street 17 Austin Street</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.202	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Alan Oliver & Julie Middleton	111.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that lower Ellice Street is composed of significant Victorian houses.</p> <p>Considers that the relative integrity of the houses, their homogeneity and shared history and picturesque qualities mark this as an area of high heritage value.”</p> <p>Considers that two houses on the southern side of Ellice St, no.28 & 32, compliment the houses on the northern side of the street.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to add a new Heritage Area for lower Ellice Street that includes the following properties:</p> <p>21 Ellice Street 23 Ellice Street 25 Ellice Street 27 Ellice Street 28 Ellice Street 31 Ellice Street 32 Ellice Street 33 Ellice Street 35 Ellice Street 37 Ellice Street 39 Ellice Street 41 Ellice Street</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for a map of the area].</p>
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.203	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers’ assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter’s table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Vivienne Morrell	155.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the heritage listings in the heritage schedules.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified, and include the recommendations of Heritage NZ and Historic Places Wellington.
Vivienne Morrell	155.20	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the extent of Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage Area) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include Tutchen Avenue.
Vivienne Morrell	155.21	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new SCHED3 - Heritage Area for Claremont Grove.
Vivienne Morrell	155.22	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new SCHED3 - Heritage Area for lower Ellice Street as detailed in Michael Kelly’s Mt Victoria Heritage Study (2017).
Historic Places Wellington	182.46	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED3- Heritage Areas as notified.
Historic Places Wellington	182.47	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that Te Ngākau Civic Square should be included on SCHED2 - Heritage areas.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Add Te Ngākau Civic Square to SCHED2 - Heritage Areas.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.5	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitters seek to include Te Ngākau Civic Square as a heritage area. While Willis Bond and Company Limited appreciate the reasons for the submissions and are supportive of protecting historic heritage, we agree with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga(sub 70.35) that the proposed Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct provisions adequately address heritage considerations within the area.	Disallow / For clarity, we support the inclusion of Wellington Central Library as a heritage building within SCHED1.
Historic Places Wellington	182.48	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria	<p>Retain Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Historic Places Wellington	182.49	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Supports the Thorndon Heritage Area (DP ref #46) but considers it is too small and should be extended north to the motorway intersection opposite Harriett Street and along the west side of Tinakori Road.	Retain Item 46 (Ascot Street) of Schedule 2 - Heritage Areas, but extend north to the motorway intersection opposite Harriett Street and along the west side of Tinakori Road.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Craig Forrester	210.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the Heritage area over Moir Street. Identified in SCHED3- Heritage Areas	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage areas (#44)
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>The extent of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area should include properties on Tutchen Avenue.</p> <p>Considers that Tutchen Avenue is an integral part of the Porritt Avenue surrounds, in terms of history, building type and height and streetscape.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add the following houses in Tutchen Avenue to the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (No 45) as follows:</p> <p>1 Tutchen Avenue (Home of Wellington Harbour Pilot, William Shilling) Built c1896 3 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 5 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 2 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 4 Tutchen Avenue Built c1894 6 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 8 Tutchen Avenue Built c1896 12 Tutchen Avenue Built 1926, Rear of the listed building at 56 Pirie St.</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.179	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Jane O'Loughlin	FS98.1	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	The Porritt St Heritage Area should include Tutchen avenue. Agree that Tutchen Avenue is an integral part of the Porritt Avenue surrounds, in terms of history, building type and height and streetscape. If it remained outside the heritage area and was developed to up to 6 stories, this would significantly impact the surrounding heritage and character areas.	Allow
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Supports the addition of a new Heritage Area at Claremont Grove.</p> <p>Considers that Claremont Grove is historically important due to the Victoria Bowling Club.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add a new Heritage Area to SCHED3 - Heritage Areas for Claremont Grove, with the following properties (Significance of properties on original submission) as follows:</p> <p>1 Claremont Grove 3 Claremont Grove 5 Claremont Grove 7 Claremont Grove 9 Claremont Grove 15 Brougham Street 16 Austin Street 18 Austin Street 20 Austin Street 22 Austin Street 11 Austin Street 13 Austin Street 17 Austin Street</p>
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.180	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Sam Stocker & Patricia Lee	216.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that far too much historic character areas have been left out of the Newtown and Berhampore areas which will destroy quality of life for their community.</p> <p>The land is not needed to help cope with Wellingtons increasing population.</p> <p>Land values will soar and will lead to unpayable rates bills and loss of sunlight access.</p> <p>New builds more than three storeys high are expensive and won't provide low-cost housing.</p> <p>Average residents will either be forced away or live in ghetto conditions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that SCHED3 - Heritage Areas is amended to include any areas that contain pre-1935 buildings.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.51	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports submission that seeks character precinct extensions in Newtown.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.38	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that evidence from the Hay Street Heritage Report (July 2021) supports Hay Street being a Character Precinct and/or a Heritage Area.</p> <p>[Refer to Hay Street Heritage Report (July 2021) provided with submission for details].</p>	Seeks that Hay Street area is amended to be a Character Precinct and/or a Heritage Area.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.39	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED3- Heritage Areas as notified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that Te Ngākau Civic Square should be included on SCHED2 - Heritage areas [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Te Ngākau Civic Square to SCHED2 - Heritage Areas
Adam King	246.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose in part	Oppose the Inclusion of 12A Parliament Street, Thorndon, Wellington in the Ascot Street Heritage Area. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain as notified with amendment below.
Adam King	246.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers Historic Heritage Area Evaluation report provided refers to properties within the proposed heritage area as having characteristics which are not consistent with that of 12A Parliament Street.	Seeks to remove 12a Parliament St (Legal Description Part Lot 8 DP 632 and Part Section 522 Town of Wellington) from Heritage Area 46 - Ascot Street, Hill Street, Glenbervie Terrace, Parliament Street, Sydney Street West, Tinakori Road.
Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of Bolton St Cemetery as a heritage area.	Retain Item 2 (Bolton Street Cemetery) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.
Cherie Jacobson	251.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports all historic heritage added to the schedules.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.
Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that when Salisbury Garden Court was designated a heritage area, at the initiative of owners and residents, the key heritage feature sought to be protected was historic connectedness.</p> <p>The heritage controls imposed are, in practice, too heavy and go well beyond what is sought to be protected.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that if Salisbury Garden Court is not exempt from all Heritage Zone Controls except HH-P14 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), HH-R13 (New buildings and structures within heritage areas), HH-P16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures) and HH-R16 (Total demolition of contributing buildings and structures), then Item 24 (Salisbury Garden Court) is deleted from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas.
Wellington City Council	266.188	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks to amend Schedule 3 (Heritage areas) to re-order the Schedule alphabetically by street name.
Wellington City Council	266.189	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – 20 as follows: F, C, A, B, C, E, F

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.190	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – 21 as follows: Includes all above and below ground features associated with the Old Coach Road including - pathway and original track formation that underlies the road; original earthworks cuttings. Exclusions – TBC
Wellington City Council	266.191	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend SCHED 3 (Heritage structures) to remove 50, 52, 61 and 63 Elizabeth Street from Item 43 - Elizabeth Street Heritage area.
Wellington City Council	266.192	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers 134 Brougham Street should be retained within the Moir Street heritage area as this adds to the collective heritage values of the context, however, exclude the rear addition from the extent of 134 Brougham Street.	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 44 as follows: Exclusions - the following buildings or structures have been identified as non-heritage 2, 2a Moir Street <u>134 Brougham Street (rear addition only)</u> 33 Moir Street existing accessory buildings and minor residential units as at 18 July 2022
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Although modified, 134 Brougham Street is very important to the Moir Street Heritage Area because it is the house of Rev Moir and is at the main 'gateway' to the area. We do not support removal of 33 Moir Street from the Heritage Area, however.	Allow / Allow submission in part. Clarify that: - 33 Moir Street is not proposed for removal - What exactly is meant by "the rear" of 134 Brougham Street because the way it is set out in the submission is not clear.
Wellington City Council	266.193	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers it necessary to remove 12A Parliament Street as a contributing building and instead identify this as a non-heritage building in SCHED3 to reflect mapping change – SCHED3-46.	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 as follows: Exclusions - the following buildings or structures have been identified as non-heritage -6, 8, 19, 19C, 19D, 19E, 19F, 21, 23 Glenervie Tce <u>12A Parliament Street</u> 111 Hill Street existing accessory buildings and minor residential units as at 18 July 2022 N.B.: 119 Hill St and 2 and 4 Parliament St are the same property. 9 Ascot St and 206 Sydney St W are the same property.
Wellington City Council	266.194	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 as follows: (...) Parliament Street - 1 (PT SEC 522 TOWN OF WELLINGTON), 2 (PT SEC 522 TOWN OF WELLINGTON), 4 (PT SEC 522 TOWN OF WELLINGTON), 6 (ALL PLAN A 1230), 8 (LOT 1 DP 60215 - UNIT PLAN 60755), 9 (LOT 1 DP 5571 - 14 M2 CARPAD ON ROAD RESERVE), 10 (LOT 1 DP 85326), 11 (LOT 1 DP 303746 LOT 2 DP 5571 - 16 M2CARPAD & LAND ON ROAD RESERVE), 12 (LOT 2 DP 85326 - 13 M2 DOUBLE GARAGE ON ROAD RESERVE), 12A (Part Lot 8 DP 632) , 13 (LOT 2 DP 303746), 14 (PT SEC 522 TOWN OF WELLINGTON - 12 M2CARPAD ON ROAD RESERVE), (...)
Wellington City Council	266.195	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	16 Parliament Street is not currently listed as an exclusion (non-heritage) property in SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – 46.	Amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 to list 16 Parliament Street as an exclusion (non-heritage) property.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council	266.196	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	8 Glenbervie Terrace is currently listed as an exclusion (non-heritage) property in SCHED3 – 46 but should be a Heritage Area listed building.	Seeks to amend SCHED3 – Item 46 to include 8 Glenbervie Terrace as a Heritage Area contributing building.
Wellington City Council	266.197	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	8 Glenbervie Terrace is currently listed as an exclusion (non-heritage) property in SCHED3 – 46 but should be a Heritage Area listed building.	Seeks to amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 to remove 8 Glenbervie Terrace from the exclusion (non-heritage building) list.
Wellington City Council	266.198	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers 11 Glenbervie Terrace is not currently a Heritage Area listed building in SCHED3 – Item 46.	Seeks to amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 to include 11 Glenbervie Terrace as a Heritage Area contributing building.
Wellington City Council	266.199	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers 21 Glenbervie Terrace is listed as a Heritage Area listed building and an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but should only be an exclusion.	Seeks to amend SCHED3 (Heritage structures) – Item 46 to remove 21 Glenbervie Terrace as a Heritage Area contributing building.
Wellington City Council	266.200	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers 21 Glenbervie Terrace is listed as a Heritage Area listed building and an exclusion (non-heritage building) in SCHED3 – 46 but should only be an exclusion.	Seeks to retain 21 Glenbervie Terrace as an exclusion (nonheritage) property in SCHED3 (Heritage structures)
Wellington City Council	266.201	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers 23 Glenbervie Terrace is 6 flats, but in the exclusion list it is only listed as 23 Glenbervie Terrace.	Amend the exclusion (non-heritage building) list in SCHED 3 – Item 46 as follows: (...) 23 Glenbervie Terrace <u>23/1, 23/2, 23/3, 23/4, 23/5, and 23/6 Glenbervie Terrace</u>
Everard Aspell	270.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Mount Victoria.
Everard Aspell	270.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Mount Cook.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Everard Aspell	270.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Thorndon.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.113	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>Part of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p>	Allow
Everard Aspell	270.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Aro Valley.
Everard Aspell	270.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Newtown.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Everard Aspell	270.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Opposes any reduction in heritage protection in the suburbs zoned Inner Residential Area in the ODP.</p> <p>Considers that intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage.</p> <p>Considers that the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook.</p> <p>There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks amendment to the Proposed District Plan to maintain the heritage areas within Berhampore.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.52	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that the area has special historical qualities.</p>	<p>Seeks that the following sites are added as a new heritage area:</p> <p>Emmett St 6, 8, 10A, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20.</p> <p>Green St 1, 5, 7, 7A, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 2, 2A, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20.</p> <p>Donald Maclean St 16, 24, 28, 30, 36, 38, 17, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37.</p> <p>Normanby St 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 30, 32, 34, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41.</p>
Marilyn Powell	281.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that Hobson Street area has many housing examples of the Victorian merchant-class.</p> <p>Hobson street is a suggested tourist walking trail to visit Katherine Mansfield House, amongst other notable buildings.</p> <p>Pre-covid tour buses included Hobson Street on their route.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to add the area of High Density Residential Zone at Hobson Street.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.75	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	<p>TRA support these submissions insofar as they underpin the reasons to change the Hobson residential are from HDZ to MDZ and to create a Character Precinct over the block.</p>	Allow
Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that the rows of cottages and villas to the west of Epuni Street have heritage value and should be scheduled as heritage, as these are a significant factor in the attractiveness of the area, and the HRZ zoning will destroy this.</p>	<p>Seeks that the rows and cottages to the west of Epuni Street are included as a heritage area.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Richard Tyler	357.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that 34 Hawker Street should no be included in SCHED3-Heritage Areas. The submitter notes that the property was purchased with no classification and a classification will now significantly reduce the value, enjoyment, and usage of the property. The adjacent property has a proposed 21m height, which will significantly increase its value. There is a big disparity in property values of adjacent properties due to the classification process.</p>	Amend SCHED3-Heritage Areas to remove 34 Hawker Street from Item 42 (Doctors' Common Heritage area).
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>This house has high historical and architectural significance, as detailed in Wellington City Council's Mt Victoria Heritage Study Report, June 2017, and should therefore not be removed from the Doctor's Common Heritage Area.</p> <p>We acknowledge the owner's concern, however, that allowing 21m development right next door may devalue his property and re-iterate that such zoning is completely inappropriate for Mt Victoria.</p> <p>Retain 34 Hawker Street in the Doctor's Common Heritage Area.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Herbert	360.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Tawa Cemetery should be classified as a Historic Reserve in SCHED3. This area should be classified as a Heritage Area, in keeping with other historic cemeteries of Wellington; Bolton Cemetery, Mount Street Cemetery and Johnsonville Cemetery. In a recent review of the WCC Cemeteries Management Plan (adopted June 2021) (Ref Chapter 4.1.2 Heritage recognition and protection) a proposed action was to “Consider scheduling the Tawa Cemetery as a heritage area in the district plan.” This Amendment to the Proposed District Plan would give effect to that action point of the earlier review of Cemeteries Management Plan.	Add a new Item in SCHED3 - Heritage Area for the Tawa Cemetery, as follows: Address - 307 Main Road, Tawa Name - Tawa Cemetery Legal Descriptions – PT SEC 52 PORIRUA DISTRICT-CLOSED CEMETERY Protection required – Includes all above and below ground features Values – A, B, C, E, F
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the overlay boundaries at Albion Battery and Mine Remains should be redefined. No part of the Albion Battery and mine remains are located on Te Kamaru Station. The Albion Battery is located to the west of the boundary with Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd's land.	Delete Item 40 (Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains) from SCHED3 - Heritage Areas. [Inferred decision requested]
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that HNZPT#1 (Aro Valley Cottages) in SCHED3 should be amended to include some of the oldest and most significant addresses in this area that have not been included. For example, 43 Palmer Street and the cottages on either side (39, 41 and 45 Palmer Street) are part the same original lot that corresponds to the Aro Street cottages at 32-38 Aro Street, which back onto the Palmer Street properties. Significant properties on Aro Street have been designated High Density. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the Item 1 (Aro Valley Cottages) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include the adjacent properties on Palmer Street.
Margaret Cochran	382.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Thorndon Historic Area should be extended to retain its existing boundaries as the new boundaries in the PDP are arbitrary and make no sense.	Seeks to amend Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas with respect to how the Thorndon Historic Area is defined and to retain the existing boundaries. [Inferred decision sought]
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.292	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.128	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose in part	For the reasons set out for the former State Insurance building (Ref 181), Argosy also opposes the Athfield addition being included in the Stout Street Precinct heritage area.	Amend Schedule 3, DP Ref 28 as follows: Exclusions - The following buildings, structures and sites are identified as non-heritage: - Façade (above second floor), Courts Building, cnr, Stout and Whitmore Sts. - 1998 three storey addition designed by Athfield architects to former State Insurance Building
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.129	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Argosy's property at 360-366 Lambton Quay is recognised as part of the BNZ / Head Offices heritage area	Retain listing for Ref 30 as notified.
Tawa Historical Society	386.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that SCHED3 - Heritage Areas should be amended to include the Tawa Cemetery (Main Road, Linden). Notes that other cemeteries are included as Heritage Areas. The submitter understands that the Tawa cemetery is currently on the WCC's radar for recognition but wish to formally recommend its addition. Considers that the Tawa Cemetery will meet the following heritage values: A, B, C, D, E, F	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include Tawa Cemetery as a listed Item.
Tawa Historical Society	386.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that SCHED3 - Heritage Areas should be amended to include the former Tawa Flat Railway Station site on Duncan Street. The former Tawa Flat Railway Station site was a major communications route through the area (since superseded) and part of Tawa's link to the outside world during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Considers that the former Tawa Flat Railway Station site will meet the following heritage values: A, B, C, E, F	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include the former Tawa Flat Railway Station as a listed Item.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Supports the new Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon.	Retain the SCHED3 - Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon as notified, subject to increasing the extent of the area encompassed by Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon.
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon should be expanded in spatial extent to better reflect the heritage of Mount Victoria and Thorndon.	Amend the extent of the Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon by expanding the spatial areas.
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon should be expanded in spatial extent to better reflect the heritage of Mount Victoria and Thorndon.	Amend the mapping to expand the spatial areas of the Heritage Areas in Mount Victoria and Thorndon.
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that SCHED3 - Heritage Areas should be amended to include a new Heritage Area in Newtown around Emmitt Street, Green Street and Wilson Street to reflect the heritage of Newtown.	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include a Heritage Area around Emmitt Street, Green Street and Wilson Street.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.96	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the Doctors Common Heritage area. The submitter considers that the Doctors Common Heritage area is a visible and memorable part of the cityscape because of its buildings, streets (including steps) layout and position on Mt Victoria. The submitter considers that it still has a strong relationship to the early/historical layout of Wellington. The submitters are landowners in the area and support the recognition in the Plan of this area's significance to the city and the provisions that will retain that significance.	Retain Item 42 (Doctors' Common Heritage area) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as a Heritage Area.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.24	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the current extent The current overlay is far too broad, and covers significant area of land not associated with the Albion Battery and Mine Remains.	Retain the Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains Heritage area (#40) with amendment.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.25	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers the current extent The current overlay is far too broad, and covers significant area of land not associated with the Albion Battery and Mine Remains.	Amend the Albion Gold Mining Company Battery and Mine Remains Heritage Area (#40) description to more accurately define the heritage features.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.107	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Support the new additions to the schedule of historic heritage items, but considers that they are not representative of what is distinctive about Wellington, the region, and New Zealand.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified, with amendments
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.108	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the addition of new areas to the schedule but concerned that the lack of public engagement on the review of the schedule will undermine its efficacy as it is unlikely to have the support of the people of Wellington as it does not reflect Wellington's important heritage.	[Inferred decision requested] retain SCHED3- Heritage areas as notified
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.109	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers the character areas will meet the criteria for listing.	Seeks that the character areas are assessed for inclusion in the district plan as heritage areas.
Fabric Property Limited	425.112	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Acknowledges the building at 1 Grey Street is in scheduled heritage area, identified as Post Office Square. The building is listed as a non-heritage building.	Retain item 16 in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.
Peter Fordyce	431.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Heritage areas are supported, but should be extended.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas, with amendment.
Anna Kemble Welch	434.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Considers that the Newtown Shopping Centre includes a small number of Historic Buildings of significance that should be retained as closely as feasible to their historic presence. However, the rest of the Newtown shopping centre is identified as a Historic Area (Part 4, Schedule 3, Heritage Areas, DP reference #33, Newtown Shopping Centre)	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas, with amendment. [Inferred decision requested]
Anna Kemble Welch	434.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the Newtown Shopping Centre includes a small number of Historic Buildings of significance that should be retained as closely as feasible to their historic presence. However, the rest of the Newtown shopping centre is identified as a Historic Area (Part 4, Schedule 3, Heritage Areas, DP reference #33, Newtown Shopping Centre)	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to remove buildings of less heritage significance in the Newtown Shopping Centre (Item 33). [Inferred decision requested]
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.62	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Oppose	HPW supports the retention of the Newtown heritage shopping area, since it allows for 21/22m height limits for sites to the rear of the shop frontages. The interface between this proposal and that of The Urban Activation Lab needs resolution. [Interred reference to submission 434.13]	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Lee	454.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports the Elizabeth St Heritage Area (DP Ref 43) in Schedule 3 - Heritage Areas.	Retain DP Ref 43 in Schedule 3 - Heritage Areas as notified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.205	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
David Lee	454.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	considers that Tutchen Avenue should be included in the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (DP Ref 43) in Schedule 3 - Heritage Areas. It is a strange anomaly that this charming little cul-de-sac, bearing the name of the original dairy farm there, has been left out.	Add Tutchen Avenue to the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area (DP Ref 43) in Schedule 3 - Heritage Areas.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.206	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
David Lee	454.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	Supports all Heritage Areas in the PDP.	Retain SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as notified.
Christina Mackay	478.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support in part	Submitter supports the proposed heritage area designations in Mt Victoria and Thorndon	Retain Heritage areas in Thorndon and Mount Victoria with amendment.
Christina Mackay	478.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that Heritage Areas in Thorndon should be amended to include the 'thorndon areas' in the operative district plan.	Amend SCHED3- Heritage areas to include the 'Thordon Areas' of the operative district plan.
The Thorndon Society Inc	487.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that Item 46 (Ascot Street) should be extended to include the adjoining areas of Upton Terrace and St Mary Streets as they are of similar age and design to those in the heritage area.	Amend Item 46 (Ascot Street) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include the adjoining areas of Upton Terrace and St Mary Streets.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.45	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Support	HPW supports the addition of those identified heritage areas.	Allow
David Wu	489.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that the PDP allows height limits twice as high (21m vs 11m) in Tutchen Avenue as the immediate street around it (such as Porritt Avenue) and should be added to the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area.	Amend Item 45 (Porritt Avenue Heritage area) in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to include Tutchen Avenue.
Helen Heffernan	491.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas, as Item 46 (Ascot Street) and Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) are adjacent, these should be combined.	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas by combining the area of Item 46 (Ascot Street) with Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) to create a combined Heritage Area named the "Thorndon Heritage Area".
Helen Heffernan	491.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Considers that in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas, as Item 46 (Ascot Street) and Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) are adjacent, these should be combined.	Amend SCHED3 - Heritage Areas by combining the area of Item 46 (Ascot Street) with Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) to create a combined Heritage Area named the "Thorndon Heritage Area".
Helen Heffernan	491.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	Opposes the name of Item 46 "Ascot Street Heritage Area" in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas as there are several other streets included in this area.	If Item 46 (Ascot Street) and Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) are not combined as suggested by this submission; Amend the name of Item 46 in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to the "Thorndon Heritage Area" or "Thorndon Residential Heritage Area".
Helen Heffernan	491.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED3 – Heritage Areas	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	If Item 46 (Ascot Street) and Item 35 (Thorndon Shopping Centre) are not combined as suggested by this submission; Amend the name of Item 35 in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas to the "Tinakori Road Village Heritage Area".

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.70	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED4 – Scheduled Archaeological Sites	Oppose in part	Opposes SCHED4 - Scheduled Archaeological Sites to the extent that there is incorrect or inconsistent information in the schedule.	Retain SCHED4 - Scheduled Archaeological Sites with amendment.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.71	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED4 – Scheduled Archaeological Sites	Amend	SCHED4 Item 1 has an incorrect NZHPT # reference.	Amend SCHED4 Item 1 (Proposed Kau Point Battery, Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula) HNZPT # as follows: (HNZPT #) Kau Point Battery Category 1 Historic Place <u>Category 1, No. 7542</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.72	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED4 – Scheduled Archaeological Sites	Amend	The SCHED4 Item 3 name should be amended as the Item relates particularly to the gold mining remains, not the Karori Dam.	Amend SCHED4 Item 3 (Karori Goldmining and Dam Remains) HNZPT # as follows: (Name) Karori Goldmining and Dam Remains
Historic Places Wellington	182.50	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED4 – Scheduled Archaeological Sites	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED4 - Scheduled Archaeological Sites as notified.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.41	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED4 – Scheduled Archaeological Sites	Support	Supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).	Retain SCHED4 - Scheduled Archaeological Sites as notified.
Tawa Historical Society	386.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED4 – Scheduled Archaeological Sites	Amend	Considers that SCHED4 - Archaeological Sites should be amended to include all the old rail line through the Tawa valley (pre-1937). Considers that the old rail line through the Tawa valley (pre-1937) will meet the following heritage values: A, B, C, E, F [Refer to original submission for detailing of the exact routing of the rail line].	Amend SCHED4 - Archaeological Sites to include all the old rail line through the Tawa valley (pre-1937) as a listed item.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.110	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED4 – Scheduled Archaeological Sites	Support	Supports the addition of 3 archaeological sites and considers more should be added	Retain SCHED4 - Scheduled Archaeological Sites with amendment.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.111	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED4 – Scheduled Archaeological Sites	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks the more Scheduled Archaeological sites are added, as well as being maori and non maori
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.73	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Oppose	Opposes SCHED5-Schedule of Viewshafts to the extent that Viewshaft 21 of the Operative District Plan is not included.	Retain SCHED5-Schedule of Viewshafts with amendment.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.28	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	Viewshafts of significant heritage buildings are important for cultural and historic heritage townscape and Wellington's heritage landscape.	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.296	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.63	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	Considers that viewshafts of significant heritage buildings are important for cultural and historic heritage townscape and Wellington's heritage landscape.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.74	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	SCHED5 should be amended to include Viewshaft 21 Central Area Viewshafts Appendix 11 of the Operative District Plan (from the former National Art Gallery and Museum). Considers that this viewshaft is important in maintaining the integrity of views to and from the museum/war memorial site, and the wider Pukeahu area.	Reinstate Viewshaft 21 (Central Area Viewshafts Appendix 11 of the Operative District Plan) to SCHED5 - Viewshafts.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.29	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	Viewshafts of significant heritage buildings are important for cultural and historic heritage townscape and Wellington's heritage landscape.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.64	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	Considers that viewshafts of significant heritage buildings are important for cultural and historic heritage townscape and Wellington's heritage landscape.	Allow
Historic Places Wellington	182.51	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support in part	Supports the viewshafts of significant cultural heritage.	Retain SCHED5 - Viewshafts, with amendment. [Inferred decision requested]
Historic Places Wellington	182.52	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	Considers the viewshaft is important public heritage anchoring people in place and identity.	Add a new viewshaft to protect views of the Carillon at Pukeahu National War Memorial Park.
Historic Places Wellington	182.53	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	Considers the viewshaft is important public heritage anchoring people in place and identity.	Add a new viewshaft to protect views of St Paul's Church.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.107	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	All inner Residential suburbs should be MDZ Exemption from upzoning Importance of character areas Character Precincts, rules & design regime Extended Character Precincts in line with Boffa Miskell Demolition be a restricted activity for pre-1930 buildings New viewshaft for views of St Paul's	Allow
Historic Places Wellington	182.54	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	Considers the viewshaft is important public heritage anchoring people in place and identity.	Seeks a new viewshaft that protects the view towards Oriental Bay from the top of Parliament Steps
Historic Places Wellington	182.55	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	Considers the viewshaft is important public heritage anchoring people in place and identity.	Seeks a new viewshaft that protects the view towards Oriental Bay from the top of the Cable Car.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Walmsley	229.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Oppose	<p>Considers that the site at 1 Carlton Gore Road is at the very end of the view shaft and that any development within this residential area will have no effect on the views out from the Cable Car location to the hill.</p> <p>Correspondence with WCC officers have indicated that they support the decision to reduce the viewshafts to the centre area zone and waterfront zones.</p> <p>Considers that as the viewshafts did not apply to the residential zones in the ODP this cannot be the case for the residential zones.</p> <p>Considers there is very little evidence to support the fact that view shafts are a qualifying matter for the property, or any properties subject to the MDRS.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason and correspondence]</p>	Remove the viewshaft from 1 Carlton Gore Road.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.42	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	Considers that viewshafts are an important part of Wellingtons Character and should be preserved.	Retain SCHED5 - Viewshafts as notified, with regard to viewshafts within the CCZ (City Centre Zone).
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.97	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	<p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>10min walkable catchment</p> <p>Specific heritage identification and assessment</p> <p>Views contributing to sense of place and identity</p> <p>Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell</p> <p>Boffa Miskell streetscapes</p> <p>Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings</p> <p>CCZ encroachment on residential zones</p> <p>Old St Pauls height controls</p> <p>Preserve viewshalfs</p>	Allow
Eldin Family Trust	287.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support in part	<p>Supports retention of viewshaft VS1 (The Beehive) with amendment.</p> <p>Considers The Beehive in particular is an internationally recognisable symbol of New Zealand. The outlooks towards the Beehive from the corners of Bunny/Featherston Streets and Whitmore/Featherston Streets are significant contributors to Wellington's sense of place and identity.</p>	Retain viewshaft VS1 (The Beehive) with minor amendments to the descriptions of the viewshaft.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.3	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	<p>The concept of viewshafts is important for anchoring people in place and identity.</p> <p>Te Ahumairangi Hill is the significant feature of Thorndon which flanks the western side of the suburb. This visual backdrop is particularly striking from residential properties situated on the eastern side of the urban motorway. It's part of the experience of being in historic Thorndon and connects the community (in spite of the chasm (motorway) that fractured the suburb in the 1960's).</p> <p>The Hill is part of the experience of being in residential Thorndon. The mood of the day in Thorndon can be marked by the mood of the weather on and around Te Ahumairangi Hill (wind, fog, etc).</p>	Allow / Seeks that the concept of viewshafts to Te Ahumairangi Hill also be considered from both the Hobson Street and Portland residential areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Eldin Family Trust	287.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	Considers that amendments should be made to the Descriptions of VS1 to place greater recognition on the international significance of the Beehive as well as the contributing role of the Te Ahumairangi Hill (Tinakori Hill) backdrop.	Amend the description of Viewshaft VS1 (The Beehive) as follows: “A view of the Beehive <u>against the backdrop of Te Ahumairangi Hill</u> from a major thoroughfare for commuters. This is one of two significant viewshafts (the other being VS4) which, when combined, promote the image of Wellington as a capital city in views from key points within the northern end of the City Centre Zone. The Beehive and Parliament Buildings are two of the emblems of New Zealand’s capital and key landmarks in the Wellington townscape. <u>They are internationally recognised symbols of New Zealand</u> . VS1, located on a major pedestrian route for commuters leaving the Wellington Rail Station, enhances wayfinding and contributes to Wellington’s sense of place. <u>The backdrop of Te Ahumairangi Hill adds striking contrast and visual interest.</u> ”
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.4	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	The concept of viewshafts is important for anchoring people in place and identity. Te Ahumairangi Hill is the significant feature of Thorndon which flanks the western side of the suburb. This visual backdrop is particularly striking from residential properties situated on the eastern side of the urban motorway. It’s part of the experience of being in historic Thorndon and connects the community (in spite of the chasm (motorway) that fractured the suburb in the 1960’s). The Hill is part of the experience of being in residential Thorndon. The mood of the day in Thorndon can be marked by the mood of the weather on and around Te Ahumairangi Hill (wind, fog, etc).	Allow / Seeks that the concept of viewshafts to Te Ahumairangi Hill also be considered from both the Hobson Street and Portland residential areas.
Eldin Family Trust	287.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support in part	Supports the retention of Viewshaft VS4 (The Beehive and The Cenotaph – Whitmore Street) with amendment. Considers The Beehive in particular is an internationally recognisable symbol of New Zealand. The outlooks towards the Beehive from the corners of Bunny/Featherston Streets and Whitmore/Featherston Streets are significant contributors to Wellington’s sense of place and identity.	Retain Viewshaft VS4 (The Beehive and The Cenotaph – Whitmore Street) with minor amendments to the descriptions of the viewshaft
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.5	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Support	The concept of viewshafts is important for anchoring people in place and identity. Te Ahumairangi Hill is the significant feature of Thorndon which flanks the western side of the suburb. This visual backdrop is particularly striking from residential properties situated on the eastern side of the urban motorway. It’s part of the experience of being in historic Thorndon and connects the community (in spite of the chasm (motorway) that fractured the suburb in the 1960’s). The Hill is part of the experience of being in residential Thorndon. The mood of the day in Thorndon can be marked by the mood of the weather on and around Te Ahumairangi Hill (wind, fog, etc).	Allow / Seeks that the concept of viewshafts to Te Ahumairangi Hill also be considered from both the Hobson Street and Portland residential areas.
Eldin Family Trust	287.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	Considers that amendments should be made to the Descriptions of VS4 to place greater recognition on the international significance of the Beehive as well as the contributing role of the Te Ahumairangi Hill (Tinakori Hill) backdrop.	Amend the description of Viewshaft VS4 (The Beehive and The Cenotaph – Whitmore Street) as follows: “VS4 is one of two viewshafts (the other being VS1) focused on the Beehive from the south and east as set against the backdrop of Te Ahumairangi Hill. Along with the Beehive this viewshaft includes the Cenotaph as an additional focal element. Both of these viewshafts are individually and collectively significant and promote the image of Wellington as NZ’s ‘seat of government’ and capital city in views from key points. Additionally, as the Beehive and Cenotaph are important physical reminders of Wellington’s rich history the views to and from them, as provided by VS4, contribute to the city’s sense of place. <u>The Beehive is an internationally recognised symbol of New Zealand. The backdrop of Te Ahumairangi Hill adds striking contrast and visual interest.</u> ”

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Eldin Family Trust	287.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	<p>Considers that Viewshaft VS3 from the Operative District Plan should be added to SCHED5-viewshafts.</p> <p>The viewshaft is from further back and captures some of the Old Government Buildings that now house the Victoria University Law Faculty. The Old Government Buildings are historically significant, and the outlook of them in contrast with the Beehive is a symbolic link between the past and present homes of New Zealand’s Government.</p> <p>Considers that the Waterloo/Bunny viewshaft captures more of the Tinakori Hill/Te Ahumairangi Hill backdrop. This striking green bush backdrop is visually significant.</p>	Add a viewshaft to SCHED5 from the corner of Bunny Street and Waterloo Quay as provided in the operative district plan.
Claire Bibby	329.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	<p>Considers that the survey mark used for the construction of the Tawa tunnel has a view worthy of preservation as a viewshaft.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendices]</p>	Seeks that the view from the survey marker used for the centre line of the railway tunnel in Tawa be recognised as a viewshaft in SCHED5 - Schedule of Viewshafts. [Inferred decision requested].
Sarah Walker	367.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Oppose	<p>Opposes the removal of Viewshaft 21 from the Operative District Plan from SCHED5 -Schedule of Viewshafts in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Considers that walking along the streets of Jessie street and seeing the Carillon is one of the things that makes Te Aro feel a part of the city's fabric.</p>	Seeks that Viewshaft 21 of the operative district plan be added to SCHED5 - Schedule of viewshafts
Sarah Walker	367.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	<p>Opposes the removal of Viewshaft 21 from the Operative District Plan from SCHED5 -Schedule of Viewshafts in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Considers that walking along the streets of Jessie street and seeing the Carillon is one of the things that makes Te Aro feel a part of the city's fabric.</p>	Seeks that Viewshaft 21 of the operative district plan be added to SCHED5 - Schedule of viewshafts
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.130	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Oppose in part	A small part of 7 Waterloo Quay is subject to VS3: North Queens Wharf and Inner Town Belt – Whitmore Street.	Retain SCHED5 - Schedule of viewshafts VS3 as notified. OR Review the extent of VS3 so it does not extend onto 7 Waterloo Quay.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.131	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Oppose in part	A small part of 360 Lambton Quay is subject to VS9: Lambton Quay/Grey Street	Retain VS9 as notified OR Review the extent of VS9 so it does not extend onto 360 Lambton Quay.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.769	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	Considers that it is an option to create and identify a viewshaft managing significant public views to the monastery and the maunga (Mt Victoria) as an alternative to MRZ-PREC03.	Seeks to create and identify a viewshaft managing significant public views to the monastery and the maunga (Mt Victoria).
Thomas John Broadmore	417.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	<p>Opposes the removal of Viewshaft 21 (in the Operative District Plan).</p> <p>Considers that purchasers of apartments in Il Casino did so on the assumption of the continued existence of a viewshaft.</p> <p>Construction of high rise apartments in the area covered by the viewshaft would deprive the apartments of afternoon sun and views.</p> <p>Considers that the best use of the viewshaft space is greenspace.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend SCHED5 - Viewshafts to add Viewshaft 21 from the Operative District Plan (National War Memorial, out across the central city).
Il Casino Apartment Body Corporate	426.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	<p>Considers many buildings have been built with the viewshaft in mind and designed accordingly.</p> <p>Considers tha the views to the memorial connects residents to the history of the city and promotes remembrance of those who gave their lives in the wars.</p>	Amend SCHED5 - Viewshafts to add Viewshaft 21 from the Operative District Plan (National War Memorial, out across the central city).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Harish Ravji	427.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	Considers that many (multi-level) buildings in Te Aro have been designed and constructed around the View Shaft 21. Most multi-level buildings around Te Aro have been marketed and reference the view shaft, giving owners & residents a unique of the harbour and town belt. The viewshaft gives the City Centre a unique look and feel. This decision would also have a direct impact on owners property value.	Amend SCHED5 - Viewshafts to add Viewshaft 21 from the Operative District Plan (National War Memorial, out across the central city).
Juliet Broadmore	471.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Oppose in part	Oppose the removal of viewshaft VS21 (from the Operative District Plan) within the Prososed District Plan.	Opposes SCHED5- Schedule of Viewshafts as notified, with amendments.
Juliet Broadmore	471.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Amend	Considers that the Viewshaft (VS21) from Te Aro to the National War Memorial Carillon retained in this District Plan from the Operative District Plan.	Amend SCHED5 - Schedule of Viewshafts to include VS21 (Central Area Viewshaft) from the Operative District Plan.
Jonathan Markwick	490.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED5 – Schedule of Viewshafts	Not specified	Considers that six storey high density residential buildings should be allowed in all of Kelburn (with a viewshaft protection from the top of the cable car).	Seeks that a viewshaft protection is retained from the top of the cable car.
David Fisher	125.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose	Opposes Notable Tree listing 21 at 127 Grafton Road, Roseneath. The Pinus radiata trees adjacent to this area pose a risk to pedestrians and reduces light to nearby properties. The tree is also no longer fit for listing due to its position on the road reserve bank, proximity to nearby houses and consequent ongoing management required.	Opposes Item 21 - SCHED6 (Notable Trees).
David Fisher	125.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	Opposes Notable Tree listing 21 at 127 Grafton Road, Roseneath. The Pinus radiata trees adjacent to this area pose a risk to pedestrians and reduces light to nearby properties. The tree is also no longer fit for listing due to its position on the road reserve bank, proximity to nearby houses and consequent ongoing management required.	Amend SCHED6 (Notable Trees) to remove Item 21 (Radiata Pine at 127 Grafton Road, Roseneath).
Wellington City Council	266.202	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks to amend SCHED 36 (Notable trees) to re-order the Schedule alphabetically by street name.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.410	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose in part	Opposes inclusion of monkey apple Syzygium smithii. This species is listed on MPI's Pest Plant Accord and is a listed Harmful Organism (called Acmena smithii) on Greater Wellington's Regional Pest Management Plan, a statutory document under the Biosecurity Act 1993. This is a serious weed and vector of myrtle rust and is within the definition of pest in the proposed District Plan. Delete lilly pilly/monkey apple reference 112 and 306 from SCHED6.	Delete the following references from SCHED6 (Schedule of Notable Trees): 112: 151 Abel Smith St, Te Aro, Lilly pilly/ monkey apple, Syzygium smithii, () 41.294749, 174.768768 306: 13 Myrtle Crescent, Mt Cook, Wellington, Lilly pilly/ monkey apple, Syzygium smithii, () 41.302522, 174.777944
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.342	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose	Considers Notable Tree classification for these trees inappropriate. These species are listed as Harmful Organisms in the Greater Wellington Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2039. Legally protecting these trees permits ongoing seed source and hinders Greater Wellington's efforts to improve the biodiversity of the region.	Remove reference 112 from SCHED6 – Notable Trees.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.343	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose	Considers Notable Tree classification for these trees inappropriate. These species are listed as Harmful Organisms in the Greater Wellington Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2039. Legally protecting these trees permits ongoing seed source and hinders Greater Wellington's efforts to improve the biodiversity of the region.	Remove reference 261 from SCHED6 – Notable Trees.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.344	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose	Considers Notable Tree classification for these trees inappropriate. These species are listed as Harmful Organisms in the Greater Wellington Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2039. Legally protecting these trees permits ongoing seed source and hinders Greater Wellington's efforts to improve the biodiversity of the region.	Remove reference 306 from SCHED6 – Notable Trees.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Herbert	360.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	Considers that the suburb of Tawa is currently underrepresented in the list of Wellington Notable Trees and that SCHED6 should include specific trees from the suburb. In particular the Tawa Tree located in Redwood Bush behind approximately 2 St Held as Glade and featured on the cover of the book publication “Tawa the Tree, the Community and its Reserves” as it is possibly the largest Tawa tree in the Wellington area. Other trees that should be included are Kauri trees from the kauri plantation in Willobank Reserve (2 The Drive and 269 Main Road) and other trees recommended by Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves Inc. [Refer to original submission for full list of trees]	Add new Items to SCHED6 - Notable Trees from the Tawa suburb as follows: 1. A selection of significant Tawa trees located in Tawa – as representatives of the tree that gave the suburb its name. 2. A selection of Kauri trees in Wellington – as representatives of a significant NZ tree that may well become species survival plantations; including those at Willowbank Reserve, at 2 The Drive, Tawa, and at 269 Main Road, Tawa. 3. Other examples of substantive trees in Tawa which might be recommended by the Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves Inc. [Refer to original submission for full list of recommendations].
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Not specified	Considers that one of the properties at 45-45 Palmer Street includes a recently listed 'Notable Tree', a copper birch in its back garden, which once again backs onto the Community Centre and Aro park area.	Not specified.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.132	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Oppose in part	Notes that the property at 7 Waterloo Quay is identified as being subject to notable trees 242, 243 and 244, which are Pohutukawa. These trees are all stated to have condition, amenity and notable values. It is not known why the trees are considered to have notable (historic / scientific) values. This needs to be considered, and if the identification of these values are correct.	Review the values applying to trees 242, 243 and 244, and remove the tree(s) from the schedule if the re-evaluation does not pass the test for scheduling.
Jonathan Anderson	397.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	Considers that greater emphasis in the SCHED6 - Notable Trees listings should be given to another category of trees. These are the older individuals of indigenous species (i.e. grow naturally in Wellington City) that are slow growing and survive in low numbers, specifically kahikatea, matai, miro, rimu, and totara; plus nikau and northern rata. These species are of huge ecological significance. Considers that the current SCHED6 - Notable Trees is an ad hoc collection of trees proposed by individuals to WCC over the years. The proposed trees were evaluated under the STEM (Standard Tree Evaluation Method) method. The submitter generally supports the use of STEM to evaluate trees for scheduling, however notes that STEM tends to favour large, impressive trees that can be said to contribute to the character of a suburb. As a result, the proposed schedule is dominated by relatively fast growing (there are more of them because they grow faster) and large sized individuals such as pohutukawa and Norfolk Island pine. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the STEM criteria for evaluating Notable Trees is used to add indigenous trees to SCHED6 - Notable Trees. This may be possible through conscious use of the existing STEM criteria such or through the Council adding an addition criterion to give greater weighting to certain species of indigenous tree.
Jonathan Anderson	397.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	Considers that in giving greater emphasis in SCHED6 - Notable Trees to a new category of indigenous species (i.e. grow naturally in Wellington City), the submitter has provided a list of individual trees for consideration to be added as listed trees under SCHED6 - Notable Trees. [Refer to original submission for Excel spreadsheet list of individual trees for evaluation].	Seeks that the list of indigenous trees in the submission's Excel spreadsheet are evaluated for inclusion as listed trees in SCHED6 - Notable Trees. [Refer to original submission for Excel spreadsheet list of individual trees for evaluation. Includes 37 Kahikatea, 11 Matai, 17 Miro, 75 Rimu, and 108 Totara trees].
Catharine Underwood	481.40	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	Considers that the Pohutukawa on the corner of St Michaels Cres and Upland Road be noted as a protected tree.	Add an Item to SCHED6 - Schedule of Notable Tress for the pohutukawa tree on the corner of St Michaels Crescent and Upland Road.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.66	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Support	Supports the provisions to protect notable trees. Considers that these are an important part of the quality of the public space and protect genetic resources.	Retain SCHED6 - Notable Trees as notified. [Inferred decision requested].
Craig Palmer	492.51	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED6 – Schedule of Notable Trees	Amend	Considers that SCHED6 - Notable Trees should be amended so that the Item List is aggregated into defined areas of the city and that the letter code values are set out on each page. This is to enable the public to readily access a definitive list for the neighbourhood where they live and other areas of interest.	Seeks that the Items List in SCHED6 - Notable Trees are aggregated into defined areas of the city and that the letter code values are set out on each page.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Barry Insull	32.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	Item 157 in SCHED7 does not mention the cliff at Red Rocks is under Historic Reserve designation and should be amended.	Seeks that SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori), Item 157 have a reference to the site's Historic Reserve designation.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.1	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	The submitter seeks for SCHED7 (sites and areas of significance to Māori) Item 157 has reference to the site's Historic Reserve designation. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission as this schedule is specifically for sites and areas of significance to Māori and Historic Reserves can be provided for in other parts of the plan.	Disallow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.75	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support in part	Supports the significant sites and areas being included in SCHED7.	Retain SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) with amendments.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.76	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Considers that it may be beneficial for plan users that the places entered in Schedule 7 are cross-referenced (where applicable) with recorded New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Sites and/or List numbers from the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Add an additional column to SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) headed <u>HNZPT List number and/or NZAA site record number</u> .
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.13	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	The submitter seeks for an additional column to be added to SCHED7 (sites and areas of significance to Māori) to cross-reference sites that are recorded in the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Sites and/or List numbers from the New Zealand Heritage List/ Rārangī Kōrero. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because this cross referencing can be found in schedules for sites and areas of significance in other plans. It is useful to see what sites are recorded under HNZPT or NZAA and which are not.	Allow
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.77	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	Considers that it may be beneficial for plan users that the places entered in Schedule 7 are cross-referenced (where applicable) with recorded New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Sites and/or List numbers from the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero.	DP Reference 14 – Ōhau Kāinga 2 – <u>HNZPT List # 6143, NZAA reference R27/1</u>
Historic Places Wellington	182.56	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Supports the existing sites and areas of significance to Māori and supports proposed additional sites and areas of significance to Māori.	Retain SCHED7 - (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]
Tyers Stream Group	221.80	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Supports the Iwi's wish that Tyers Stream (Waitohi Steam) become a "Line of Significance" to Māori.	Retain item 168 (Waitohi Stream) in SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori as notified.
Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	Supports the inclusion of Item 144 as a Site of Significance to Māori.	Retain Item 144 (Tutaenui Awa) in SCHED7 - Sites of Significance to Māori as notified.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.42	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support in part	Supports site #76 being recognised as Category C in Schedule 7, but requests that this is expanded to reflect the submitter's current land holding and areas of importance.	Retain schedule 7 listing of site 76 (Tapu te Ranga Marae) categorisation of CAT C, with amendment.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.43	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	Seeks the extension of the existing map extent for site #76 in the PDP, as it doesn't accurately reflect their existing land holding and aspirations for Marae redevelopment. Following the fire, whilst the existing Marae was burnt down, the Trust have aspirations and value associated with land as indicated in the map below, and would like to extend the site of significance extent to incorporate this land and include the existing area.	Seeks extent of site of significance to Māori be expanded for Site 76 (Tapu te Ranga Marae) of SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori to reflect existing land holdings and future development.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Richard Murcott	322.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	<p>Considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. The stream flowed through a partially surveyed gully across the Thorndon Flat. Stilt foundations, retaining walls and the topography below the houses at 60 & 62 Hobson St are evidence that the houses were built on fill of a gully through which the Tiakiwai Stream flowed. Drainage plans from 1915 as well as the current drainage point on the eastern side of Hobson Street provide further evidence of the former location of the stream. Any qualifying matters that arise from knowing the feature's actual location should be identified.</p> <p>A publication is provided in the submission to show evidence of the stream's accurate location, as well as a map in attachments.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	<p>Seeks that the location of the historic Tiakiwai Stream, Item 60 (Tiakiwai) of SCHED8 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori is more correctly represented.</p> <p>[Inferred decision sought]</p>
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.23	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that Tiakiwai Stream's bed is not adequately recorded in the PDP. They request for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori overlay to be amended to adequately represent the flow bed of the Tiakiwai Stream. They also seek for the significance of Tiakiwai Stream to mana whenua to be considered. They also seek that the chapter should consider any seismic and other vulnerabilities that will arise when building. They consider that the location of the stream, item 60 of SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) is more correctly represented. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission as this site is adequately recorded in the PDP, and its significance to mana whenua is considered as it is recorded in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori schedule.</p>	Disallow
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	<p>Considers that the Waimapihi stream flowing through/beneath properties on Aro Street may be of environmental and cultural significance to the area.</p>	<p>Retain Item 147 (Waimapihi) in SCHED7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori).</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.72	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	<p>Considers that there are inconsistencies between Schedule 7 and the representation of sites in the District Plan map.</p> <p>Southern Cross' site at 82-88 and 90 Hanson Street is subject to a site and area of significance to Māori. The map identifies that this is the Waitangi line DP ref 145, but DP ref 145 is Kumutoto Awa.</p>	<p>Amend schedule 7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori) to match the District Plan Reference 145 with the map</p>
Investore Property Limited	405.144	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support in part	<p>The Korokoro - Takapū Ara is identified as a category B Site and Area of Significance to Māori (SASM). This SASM has a very small encroachment into a built-up part of the submitter's Tawa site at 5 William Earp Place, before extending several kilometres to Korokoro. While the submitter generally supports the identification of this SASM, the submitter seeks clarification that this SASM is mapped at a level of detail, to provide sufficient certainty that it is intended to encroach into 5 William Earp Place.</p>	<p>Retain SCHED-7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori) and seeks clarification.</p>
Investore Property Limited	405.145	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	<p>The Korokoro - Takapū Ara is identified as a category B Site and Area of Significance to Māori (SASM). This SASM has a very small encroachment into a built-up part of the submitter's Tawa site at 5 William Earp Place, before extending several kilometres to Korokoro. While the submitter generally supports the identification of this SASM, the submitter seeks clarification that this SASM is mapped at a level of detail, to provide sufficient certainty that it is intended to encroach into 5 William Earp Place.</p>	<p>Seeks that the SASM extent identified in SCHED-7 (Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori) for Korokoro - Takapū Ara is clarified, provided in further detail with the identification on planning maps amended if necessary.</p>
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.112	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	<p>Supports the acknowledgement of SASMs in the plan, acknowledging both their tangible and in-tangible significance to mana whenua.</p>	<p>Retain SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance as notified.</p>
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.113	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED7 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support	<p>Supports the addition of new sites and areas of significance.</p>	<p>Retain SCHED7 - Sites and Areas of Significance as notified.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
David Edmonds	1.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Considers that the extent of the SNA overlay is incorrect and should be amended. The land covered by the SNA is in fact part of the built environment - the trees cover footpaths, driveways, garages and a cable car landing area. The remaining part of the SNA very small and consists of poor quality scrub and weeds. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].	Retain as notified with no Significant Natural Area overlay in residential areas.
David Edmonds	1.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that the extent of the SNA overlay is incorrect and should be amended. The land covered by the SNA is in fact part of the built environment - the trees cover footpaths, driveways, garages and a cable car landing area. The remaining part of the SNA very small and consists of poor quality scrub and weeds. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].	Remove Significant Natural Area overlay from the legal road outside 2 & 4 Governor Rd and 6 & 8 The Rigi, Northland (WC092)
Aaron Chester	6.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Considers that the Northern part SNA on 215 Takapu Road does not meet any of the 5 criteria used to assign SNA's. The area is manmade. The land has high human impact and has never had livestock excluded from it. There is no original or significant native flora in the area. [Refer to original submission for full details of current vegetation]. The SNA will prevent the construction of a planned disabled access to the house for elderly relatives and the intended planting of natives.	Seeks that 215 Takapu Road is retained as notified - with no Significant Natural Area.
Aaron Chester	6.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Considers that the Southern part SNA on 215 Takapu Road does not meet any of the 5 criteria used to assign SNA's. The area is manmade. The land has high human impact and has never had livestock excluded from it. There is no original or significant native flora in the area. The SNA will prevent the construction of a planned disabled access to the house for elderly relatives and the intended planting of natives.	Seeks that 215 Takapu Road is retained as notified - with no Significant Natural Area.
Peter Kelly	16.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Considers that it will not fragment the SNA area if the area at 170 Parkvale Road is not classified as a SNA. [Refer to original submission for SNA coordinates]. The cleared area is flat and suitable for residential purposes.	Seeks that 170 Parkvale Road is retained as notified - with no Significant Natural Area.
Barry Insull	32.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	WC144 (Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland) makes no mention of the Red Rocks Historic Reserve designation and should be amended.	Seeks that WC144 (South Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland) have a reference to the site's Historic Reserve designation.
Barry Insull	32.10	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Not specified	Considers that in WC144 (Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland), Sinclair Head could comprise two reserves depending on what defines the feature. [refer to original submission]	Not Specified.
Barry Insull	32.11	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	The Site Summary in WC144 (Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland) does not describe the purpose of specialist reserves in the area, namely Pariwhero / Red Rocks and Sinclair Head / Te Rimurapa Scientific Reserves and should be amended.	Seeks that WC144 (South Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland) have a reference to the purpose of specialist reserves.
Barry Insull	32.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	The Site Summary in WC122 does not list bird species similarly to WC144 and should be amended to match WC144.	Seeks that WC122 (Tongue Point coastal platform) make mention of bird species in the area to match WC144 (South Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Barry Insull	32.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	The Site Summary in WC146 does not list bird species similarly to WC144 and should be amended to match WC144.	Seeks that WC146 (Karori Stream estuary) make mention of bird species in the area to match WC144 (South Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland).
Barry Insull	32.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports that credit is being given to the Wellington Cross Country Vehicle Club in WC144 in relation to their conservation input to protect and enhance the covenanted Kinnoull dunes. The club has been active in a number of like activities for many years.	Not specified.
Barry Insull	32.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Cliffs East of Karori Stream Estuary does not qualify as a historic habitat for Long Bay Beach Weevil.	Seeks that language in Site Summary of WC144 (South Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland) be amended to remove mention of "the only known North Island population of speargrass weevil (<i>Lyperobius huttonii</i>)". [Inferred decision requested]
Ian Law	101.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Opposes any attempts to reinstate Significant Natural Areas on private land.	Retain SCHED8 (Significant Natural Areas) as notified - with no SNA's on private land.
Janice Young	140.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Opposes the reinstatement of Significant Natural Areas on private land.	Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas as notified (with no Significant Natural Areas on private land).
Sarah Packman and Simon Fern	150.1	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the removal of the SNA on 65A Holloway Road, Aro Valley. The submitter would like to have options available in the future to build or garden on this area.	Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas as notified (with no SNA on 65A Holloway Road).
David Stevens	151.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports no SNAs on private residential land as notified. Considers that most SNAs, which rightly need to be protected, are not on private residential land. Reinstating SNAs on private land would impinge on homeowners' rights to enjoy their property as they wish and would be a disincentive to further protection of native flora. Many parts of the proposed SNAs on private land are not significant native bush areas but just happen to show up green in aerial photographs.	Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas as notified (with no SNAs on private residential land).
David Stevens	151.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Opposes reinstatement of SNAs on private residential land. Considers that most SNAs, which rightly need to be protected, are not on private residential land. Reinstating SNAs on private land would impinge on homeowners' rights to enjoy their property as they wish and would be a disincentive to further protection of native flora. Many parts of the proposed SNAs on private land are not significant native bush areas but just happen to show up green in aerial photographs.	Seeks that Significant Natural Areas are not included on residential land.
M&P Makara Family Trust	159.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that the area of SNA WC042 should be amended by removing a portion of gully land to the south of the stream running uphill (refer to submission for illustration). The gully in question can not justifiably be included as an SNA, and no ecological study that would suggest it should be has been provided. The gully has been partially fenced in recent years so it can regenerate and it has a pond or wetland area that was created when a residential and farm access road was constructed, but it is not of a standard that would warrant inclusion, largely consisting of manuka, mahoe and punga, as are many scrub areas in Makara that are not otherwise included as SNA's. The submission does not object to the majority area of land in this SNA being included. The s32 report on the previous submission concerning this location misrepresents the objection as being to the inclusion of all SNA areas on the property.	Amend the area covered by SNA WC042 (Scrub along Makara Stream tributary Quartz Hill No2) by removing a portion of gully land to the south of the stream running uphill. [Refer to submission for illustration of area].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thomas Brent Layton	164.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>Considers that the WCC should abandon the SNA overlay and instead enter into negotiations. This will focus WCC and the community's mind on what value they place on conserving areas.</p> <p>Considers that If the council thinks that there is a net benefit to society from an SNA it should negotiate with the current owners over the imposition of controls and impose the costs of preservation on all ratepayers. If they don't think the community will bear the costs sought by the landowner, then, clearly, the community (which includes the landowner) will be better off if the land is not subject to an SNA.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Remove the Significant Natural Area overlays from the Proposed District Plan.
Trelissick Park Group	168.27	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that Heke Reserve (in Ngaio) should be included in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.</p> <p>Considers that the degradation of the streams in the Kaiwharawhara catchment from stormwater and slips like the recent Wilton Park slump, causing downstream silting is a concern. Mitigation following increasingly frequent storm water events needs to be a priority to maintain the stream ecosystem.</p>	Amend SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas to include Heke Reserve (in Ngaio).
Helen Grove	197.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	<p>Supports the removal of SNAs on private property from urban land.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, with respect to not having Significant Natural Areas on private residential land.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Helen Grove	197.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that SNAs should be removed from private rural land.</p>	Amend SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, to remove Significant Natural Areas from private rural land.
Boston Real Estate Limited	220.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that the planning and Environment Committee deemed that the SNAs will apply to public and rural land. As this land is currently held in private ownership and zoned business and outer residential, the SNA cannot apply to this property.</p> <p>Relatedly considers that the area zoned Natural Open Space should be rezoned as medium density residential zone. As such the SNA should be removed from this part of the property.</p> <p>Considers that the information base for the Councils approach to SNAs is flawed and inaccurate.</p> <p>Considers that the site does not have significant ecological value.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove Significant Natural Area overlay from 62 Kaiwharawhara Road (WC079).
Tyers Stream Group	221.81	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	<p>Supports the classification of WC114 (Tyers Stream) as an SNA.</p> <p>Considers that the description of the SNA includes the significance of the Tyers Stream Reserve SNA for both land and instream flora and fauna.</p>	Retain the significant natural area WC114 (Tyers Stream) as notified.
Tyers Stream Group	221.82	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that the neighbouring SNA's protect the increasingly important habitat and biodiversity of the Wellington area.</p> <p>The Reserve and those parts of the SNA on private land adjoining the reserve and stream, form an important part of the ecological corridor from Wellington Harbour to Khandallah Park, and beyond including Huntleigh Park, Otari/Wilton's Bush and Zealandia.</p> <p>The SNAs on private property also provide an ecological buffer and increase the area of continuous vegetation thereby increasing the biological carrying capacity of the area and its biodiversity potential.</p>	Amend SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas to include significant natural areas on privately owned residentially zoned properties.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.2	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules /SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>Notes that original submitter states that “SNAs on residential private property adjoining Tyers Stream should be reinstated as they protect increasingly important habitat and biodiversity of the Wellington area. Considers that this would then enable those residents and the community to be supported in efforts to enhance those values.” The original submitter also infers that without SNAs on private urban land, Wellington’s indigenous biodiversity would be worse.</p> <p>Opposes the reinstatement of SNAs on residential private property in the Proposed District Plan (including around Tyers Stream) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indigenous biodiversity in Wellington has increased significantly over the last 20 years, without any need for SNAs. Rather voluntary conservation efforts have been hugely successful in Wellington City. - Considers that instead of supporting residents, creating SNAs on private urban land in the district plan will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner value and goodwill in the process. There is real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish over time should SNAs be created on private urban land. 	Disallow
Russell Taylor	224.5	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Opposes SNAs on private land	<p>Only apply SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas to publicly owned land.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Karepa Dell Developments	241.4	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	<p>Considers that the imposition of a Significant Natural Area over the property at 11 Makomako Road is an unreasonable means of meeting Council’s obligation to recognise and provide for significant areas under Section 6 of the RMA. Considers that reliance on the Wildlands report is not justified given the high-level nature of the report, and no on-site audits have occurred to ground truth the classification. Considers there is no evidence to show the listed plant types and birds are located on the site, and as no site-specific assessment has been completed, then the status quo (i.e. no SNA) should prevail. Considers the SNA is unreasonable as it follows property boundaries rather than physical realities, the SNA is located in an urban area, data discontinuities exist. Notes the Wildlands report states that the significance is likely, but further work to confirm this is required. Considers that other ecological analysis do not place the same importance on the area as the Wildlands report (cites Park and MWH NZ). Considers the Darroch valuation report to justify approach to SNAs, which is considered flawed due to redaction, adoption of social benefit approach, Darroch being property valuers and therefore not being within their area of expertise, reliance on overseas data, the report being out of date (2019), and the wide range of valuation outcomes. Considers the SNA removes property rights from owners and sends a signal that native bush is a liability in the future and will have the unintended effect of promoting the removal of bush prior to an SNA being imposed. Considers there are anomalies in the analysis e.g. the SNA covers a road and bridge, significant bush removal has been undertaken in some areas including earthworks and retaining walls, the SNA covers sewer lines that will require bush clearance to maintain, it encompasses known areas of weeds and pests, and covers a stormwater detention pond that has likely resulted in some measure of contamination.</p>	Retain SCHED8 as notified - with no Significant Natural Area applying to 11 Makomako Road.
Dominic Hurley	260.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>Considers that site owners will lose control and value of their land due to SNA’s.</p> <p>SNA’s on land will drive owners to remove the native bush to avoid SNA status, having the opposite effect.</p> <p>Incentives should be offered instead.</p>	Remove the Significant Natural Areas overlays from the PDP.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.93	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Opposes the extent of WC109 and seeks amendment to the boundary of SNA area WC109. [Refer to Figure 6 of the original submission for detail of the amended SNA boundary sought].</p> <p>Considers that the removal of these areas from the wider SNA would not remove any value special to this area or diminish in a meaningful way the size or viability of the WC109 SNA, or faunal resource. It also does not change or affect buffering or connectivity.</p>	<p>Amend extent of WC109 (Coast escarpment broadleaved forest, Hutt Road between Ngauranga and Horokiwi) in SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for attachments, including Figure 6 showing detail of the amended SNA boundary sought].</p>
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.94	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that there is a restrictive policy and rule framework that would apply to SNAs (and in particular where the sites are within a Coastal Environment overlay) and wishes to ensure any sites that are identified are in fact warranted as significant areas. Horokiwi does have concerns with particular areas on both its site and on the adjoining land to the west, in terms of whether the biodiversity values merit the specific areas being identified as SNAs. Based on the independent ecological assessment, Horokiwi seeks amendment to the SNA area identified. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	<p>Seeks that the Significant Natural Area overlay be amended as it relates to the Horokiwi quarry site including to remove the SNA from the Horokiwi site which is subject to the existing use certificate reference 1048648.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission, including figure and attachments]</p>
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	<p>Considers that significant Natural Areas on residential land can risk property owners removing the native bush to avoid status as an SNA.</p> <p>There are very few SNA's on residential land and the amount protected does not outweigh the loss to property value and further loss to biodiversity.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas as notified (with no Significant Natural Areas on private residential land).</p>
Jane Hurley	286.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	<p>Opposes significant natural area controls in residential areas and seeks that are not applied in residential areas as per the Council decision to notify the plan.</p> <p>Considers that SNAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - go against the principles of natural justice and are unconstitutional. - penalise people who have taken care of bush and incentivises clearing. -are a form of theft <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Retain Proposed District Plan as notified with no Significant Natural Area overlay in residential areas.</p>
Tawa Community Board	294.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that there are a number of currently zoned rural areas which under the Proposed District Plan will become residential type areas and the SNA protections will then not apply. These areas include the Upper Stebbings Valley Development area (including the area above Redwood Bush currently in private hands), and a number of large lot properties that were previously rural and are proposed to be designated as large lot residential zone, which includes those sections above the Peterhouse Street, Westhaven Drive and Westwood Road on the western hills of Tawa, and also Gladys Scott, Bing Lucas Drive and Woodburn Drive properties on the eastern hills of Tawa.</p> <p>The removal of the SNA designations on these properties puts at risk the removal of a large proportion of the green space landscape outlook that Tawa residents enjoy. It also risks being a pathway to allowing further intensive development on these sections. Such development would also place these steeper slope areas at risk to greater erosion effects, slippages (both from rain and seismic effects), and lead to even more flooding and sediment of the Porirua Stream and Porirua Harbour.</p>	<p>Seeks that residential properties that were zoned as Rural under the Operative District Plan but have been rezoned to a Residential Zone in the Proposed District Plan retain their Significant Natural Areas.</p>
Paul Blaschke	FS129.6	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	<p>Agrees this important rider for sites rezoned from Rural to Residential in the PDP. These particular sites not only have the important amenity and landscape and other values identified in the submission but have important ecological and connectivity values that are critical to retain within this expanding residential area.</p>	<p>Allow</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Marama Ltd	337.15	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that SNAs should not be on private property.	Amend SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas to not include SNAs on private property. [Inferred decision requested].
Te Marama Ltd	337.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Item WC054 (Makara Peak) should be removed from SCHED8 as it imposes an SNA on Te Marama property. WC054 states "Much of the site is WCC public land" and SNAs being imposed on public land is not opposed.	Amend SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas to remove, Item WC054 (Makara Peak to not include 171 South Makara Road (Part Section 16 Makara DIST) and Lot 6 DP477282.
Yvonne Weeber	340.140	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	SCHED8 is generally supported.	Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas as notified
Paul Blaschke	FS129.14	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Support submission points made by a significant number of individuals and groups that essentially support the same proposition "Reinstate the overlay of all properly delineated SNAs or part SNAs on all relevant residential zoned properties".	Allow
Yvonne Weeber	340.141	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC144 - South Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland in SCHED8. Considers that these cliffs represent the most significant coastal habitat of Wellington City.	Retain WC144 - South Wellington coastal cliffs scrub and shrubland in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.142	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC147 - Owhiro Bay and shore platform in SCHED8.	Retain WC147 - Owhiro Bay and shore platform in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.143	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC148 - Island Bay foreshore including Sirens Rock and Island Bay dunes in SCHED8.	Retain WC148 - Island Bay foreshore including Sirens Rock and Island Bay dunes in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.144	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC149 - Houghton Bay foreshore including Elsdon Point, Princess rock stacks and Princess Bay dunes in SCHED8.	Retain WC149 - Houghton Bay foreshore including Elsdon Point, Princess rock stacks and Princess Bay dunes in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.145	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC150 - Te Raekaihau Point Princess Bay in SCHED8.	Retain WC150 - Te Raekaihau Point Princess Bay in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.146	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC151 - Waitaha Cove duneland in SCHED8.	Retain WC151 - Waitaha Cove duneland in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.147	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC152 - Dorrie Leslie Park rocky coast in SCHED8.	Retain WC152 - Dorrie Leslie Park rocky coast in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.148	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC153 - Strathmore coastal shrubland in SCHED8.	Retain WC153 - Strathmore coastal shrubland in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.149	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC154 - Moa Point coastal platform and shrubland in SCHED8.	Retain WC154 - Moa Point coastal platform and shrubland in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Yvonne Weeber	340.150	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC155 - Palmer Head rocky coast and Tarakena Bay duneland in SCHED8.	Retain WC155 - Palmer Head rocky coast and Tarakena Bay duneland in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.151	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC156 - Breaker Bay coastal scrub and forest remnants in SCHED8.	Retain WC156 - Breaker Bay coastal scrub and forest remnants in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.152	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC157 - Point Dorset coastal shrubland and duneland in SCHED8.	Retain WC157 - Point Dorset coastal shrubland and duneland in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.153	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC174 - Taputeranga Island in SCHED8.	Retain WC174 - Taputeranga Island in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.154	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC153 - Moa Point gravel dunes in SCHED8. These gravel dunes have a mix of plants and animal species living in this area that will be protected through this inclusion.	Retain WC153 - Moa Point gravel dunes in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Yvonne Weeber	340.155	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of WC176 - Lyall Bay dunes in SCHED8. These dune system have substantially increased since past practices of sand removal and sculpturing have stopped and dune planting and management have increased. Both plants such as pingao and spinifex have enable the dune to be stable for a number of years. Ongoing restoration planting and management is required to increase the distribution of dune planting between Maranui Surf Club building and the children's playground by Onepu Road.	Retain WC176 - Lyall Bay dunes in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.411	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports this schedule.	Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.345	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>Though Greater Wellington supports WCC's identification of SNAs in line with RPS Policy 23, we oppose the omission of SNAs on private residential land from the Proposed District Plan (PDP) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the removal of identified SNAs from the PDP contradictory to national direction for indigenous biodiversity protection. Section 6(c) of the RMA 1991 states that 'the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is a matter of national importance, and that this matter must be 'recognised and provided for' by all persons exercising functions and powers under the RMA, including local authorities under Sections 30 and 31. the removal of SNAs on private residential land from the PDP is contrary to Policy 24 of RPS. Policy 24 directs district councils to include in their district plans policies, rules and methods to protect the indigenous ecosystems and habitats identified in accordance with policy 23. Policy 24 requires district councils to protect all areas identified in accordance with policy 23 through provisions in their district plans. the removal of identified SNAs on private residential land from the PDP to be inconsistent with WCC's vision and aspirations for protecting and restoring the city's indigenous biodiversity. The Our Natural Capital: Wellington's Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2015[1] states that WCC will protect biodiversity by 'focussing on the protection of priority biodiversity sites on public and private land and rare, threatened, or locally significant species', and that it will build natural capital by 'respect[ing] the importance of indigenous biodiversity to New Zealand and its intrinsic right to exist'. We do not consider the exclusion of SNA on private residential land to align with this direction. 	Seeks to apply SNAs to all zones as intended by section 6 of the RMA and Policy 24 of the RPS.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.13	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>Do not agree that reinstatement of SNAs on residential private property in the PDP is required for WCC to meet its obligations under section 6(c) of the RMA and policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neither the RMA or RPS prescribe in detail how a council might give effect to the requirement to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The 2015 Environment Court case between Forrest & Bird and New Plymouth District Council the Environment Court concluded Councils might conceivably meet RMA Section 6(c) duties through methods other than identification and rules, but in this case the non-regulatory methods relied on by the Council were insufficient to provide protection. - Indigenous biodiversity in Wellington (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years, including Zealandia and Predator Free, along with voluntary conservation efforts without any need for SNAs. - Creating SNAs on private urban land will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner goodwill and value in the process. Real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish should SNAs be created on private urban land, and as a result would see both GWRC and WCC failing to meet their regulatory obligations, including under the RMA. - Specifically for Captain Edward Daniell Drive, indigenous biodiversity is already protected under Section 3 of the Land Covenant registered on the records of title. <p>Policies 23/24 are flawed, when applied to Wellington city, particularly the 'representativeness' criteria. To explain: Wellington is part of the MF6 ecosystem, described as a Kohekohe and Tawa forest with only 16% remaining. Also in this ecosystem are Kawakawa, Mahoe, Nikau, Supplejack. Wellington is a compact region of around 29,000 hectares, of which ~40% is urban, compared to the regional average of ~25%, yet there is no specific criteria provided for Wellington City to reflect its greater proportion of urban land. By using the GWRC criteria of 30% remaining for Wellington City, rather than a specific criteria, areas of native bush with any of the listed plants, including secondary trees like Mahoe will trigger representativeness criteria, despite none of these trees being listed as threatened species. Mahoe is commonly found across Wellington city, in the town belt, council reserves and on private urban land. As a result, urban land with few notable features other than some Mahoe, has become ensnared in the SNA assessments. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed and that already protected land (such as Captain Edward Dainell Drive) be removed from Schedule 9, should residential SNAs be reinstated.</p> <p>Seeks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WCC engages with GRWC to establish appropriate criteria in the RPS for Wellington City, so indigenous biodiversity that is actually significant is identified, rather than capturing vast areas with commonly found bush. - SNAs on private urban land remain excluded from the Proposed District Plan.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.346	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	Supports WCC's identification and scheduling of SNAs in the PDP as per Policy 23 and 24 of the RPS.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.347	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that based on Greater Wellington's analysis, several additional areas within WCC's jurisdiction meet one or more of the criteria in Policy 23.	<p>Seeks the inclusion of the following sites as SNAs in the PDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • areas of significant bird habitat in parts of Island Bay, Lyall Bay, Owhiro Bay, Tongue Point, Makara Estuary and Pipinui Point South; and • active and stabilised dunelands in Worser Bay (southern end), Seatoun Beach, Churchill Park, Island Bay (north area, playground, south end), Owhiro Bay (southeast end), Waiariki Stream and Makara Beach (east end).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.192	Part 4 / t Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Considers that it is known that Lyall Bay is a significant habitat for birds in particular the western end (non dog area) of Lyall Bay where redbill gulls and oyster catchers are daily visitors in good numbers.	Disallow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.185	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Considers that it is not possible to determine whether the areas referred to should be included in SCHED8 without any detail in the submission of the geographical extent proposed to be defined.	Disallow / In the absence of specific detail, disallow the requested additions to SCHED8.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.348	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Seeks that several site summaries for SNAs incorrectly refer to a Greater Wellington 'Biodiversity Management Area'. The correct term is 'Key Native Ecosystem' site.	Seeks to amend site descriptions for SNAs so that 'Key Native Ecosystem sites' are referred to instead of 'Biodiversity Management Areas', e.g., "Parts of this site are included in a GWRC Biodiversity Management Area Key Native Ecosystem area".
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.349	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Seeks that several site summaries for SNAs incorrectly refer to a Greater Wellington 'Biodiversity Management Area'. The correct term is 'Key Native Ecosystem' site.	Seeks for WCC to consider capturing all areas identified as, or overlapping with, Key Native Ecosystem (KNE) as SNAs in Appendix 8 (Quantitative wind study and qualitative wind assessment - modelling and reporting).
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.350	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Seeks that several site summaries for SNAs incorrectly refer to a Greater Wellington 'Biodiversity Management Area'. The correct term is 'Key Native Ecosystem' site.	Seeks for SNA sites name should, where possible, align with the KNE site that they are within.
Richard Herbert	360.12	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	Supports the provision of significant natural areas to protect the residual indigenous ecosystems and green areas in the context of the wellbeing of the wider population of the city build landscape, and the mitigation of climate change effects.	Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas with amendment.
Richard Herbert	360.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that SNAs should be reinstated on residential zones as originally proposed in earlier drafts of the Proposed District Plan, and prior to the Councillor Amendment to remove SNAs from Residential zones in June 2022. SNAs on Medium Residential Zones and Large Lot Residential Zones are supported. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Reinstate Significant Natural Areas in Medium Density Residential Zones and Large Lot Residential Zones.
Paul Blaschke	FS129.9	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Support submission points made by a significant number of individuals and groups that essentially support the same proposition "Reinstate the overlay of all properly delineated SNAs or part SNAs on all relevant residential zoned properties".	Allow
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.20	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that SNAs should not be on private property.	Amend SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas to remove Significant Natural Areas on private property in both urban and rural environments. [Inferred decision requested].
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.21	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Item WC037 (Side gully off Shepherds Gully, Terawhiti Station) should be removed from SCHED8 as it is arbitrarily imposed. The imposition of SNAs will put at risk the voluntary and co-operative conservation programme Te Kamaru Station has made with Capital Kiwi. The programme works to ensure the rural landscape is fit for the return of kiwi. Negative impacts from this SNA may lead Te Kamaru Station to withdraw from the programme, should the legislative risk remain or worsen.	Delete Item WC037 (Side gully off Shepherds Gully, Terawhiti Station) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.22	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Item WC042 (Scrub along Makara Stream tributary Quartz Hill No2) should be removed from SCHED8 as it is arbitrarily imposed. The imposition of SNAs will put at risk the voluntary and co-operative conservation programme Te Kamaru Station has made with Capital Kiwi. The programme works to ensure the rural landscape is fit for the return of kiwi. Negative impacts from this SNA may lead Te Kamaru Station to withdraw from the programme, should the legislative risk remain or worsen.	Delete Item WC042 (Scrub along Makara Stream tributary Quartz Hill No2) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.23	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Item WC047 (Terawhiti Station shrubland) should be removed from SCHED8 as it is arbitrarily imposed. The imposition of SNAs will put at risk the voluntary and co-operative conservation programme Te Kamaru Station has made with Capital Kiwi. The programme works to ensure the rural landscape is fit for the return of kiwi. Negative impacts from this SNA may lead Te Kamaru Station to withdraw from the programme, should the legislative risk remain or worsen.	Delete Item WC047 (Terawhiti Station shrubland) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.24	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Item WC049 (Terawhiti Farm Road forest remnants) should be removed from SCHED8 as it is arbitrarily imposed. The imposition of SNAs will put at risk the voluntary and co-operative conservation programme Te Kamaru Station has made with Capital Kiwi. The programme works to ensure the rural landscape is fit for the return of kiwi. Negative impacts from this SNA may lead Te Kamaru Station to withdraw from the programme, should the legislative risk remain or worsen.	Delete Item WC049 (Terawhiti Farm Road forest remnants) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.25	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Item WC050 (Oteranga Bay Road forest remnant) should be removed from SCHED8 as it is arbitrarily imposed. The imposition of SNAs will put at risk the voluntary and co-operative conservation programme Te Kamaru Station has made with Capital Kiwi. The programme works to ensure the rural landscape is fit for the return of kiwi. Negative impacts from this SNA may lead Te Kamaru Station to withdraw from the programme, should the legislative risk remain or worsen.	Delete Item WC050 (Oteranga Bay Road forest remnant) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.26	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Item WC119 (Nikau stand in side gully off Oteranga Strm, Terawhiti Strn.) should be removed from SCHED8 as it is arbitrarily imposed. The imposition of SNAs will put at risk the voluntary and co-operative conservation programme Te Kamaru Station has made with Capital Kiwi. The programme works to ensure the rural landscape is fit for the return of kiwi. Negative impacts from this SNA may lead Te Kamaru Station to withdraw from the programme, should the legislative risk remain or worsen.	Delete Item WC119 (Nikau stand in side gully off Oteranga Strm, Terawhiti Strn.) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.27	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Item WC120 (Nikau and broadleaf forest side gully of South Karori golf course) should be removed from SCHED8 as it is arbitrarily imposed. The imposition of SNAs will put at risk the voluntary and co-operative conservation programme Te Kamaru Station has made with Capital Kiwi. The programme works to ensure the rural landscape is fit for the return of kiwi. Negative impacts from this SNA may lead Te Kamaru Station to withdraw from the programme, should the legislative risk remain or worsen.	Delete Item WC120 (Nikau and broadleaf forest side gully of South Karori golf course) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Te Kamaru Station Ltd Ratings	362.28	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Item WC121 (Tawa forest remnant Karori Golf Course, South Makara Road) should be removed from SCHED8 as it is arbitrarily imposed. The imposition of SNAs will put at risk the voluntary and co-operative conservation programme Te Kamaru Station has made with Capital Kiwi. The programme works to ensure the rural landscape is fit for the return of kiwi. Negative impacts from this SNA may lead Te Kamaru Station to withdraw from the programme, should the legislative risk remain or worsen.	Delete Item WC121 (Tawa forest remnant Karori Golf Course, South Makara Road) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.517	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	Generally supportive but oppose the removal of residential SNAs.	Seeks to retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas with amendments.
Paul Blaschke	FS129.12	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Support submission points made by a significant number of individuals and groups that essentially support the same proposition "Reinstate the overlay of all properly delineated SNAs or part SNAs on all relevant residential zoned properties".	Allow
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.518	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that Schedule 8 should include all the SNAs identified in the draft district plan version provided to the Council's environment committee from officers. "Wellington, wild at heart" is what our unique capital city trades upon - and as the population grows and urban areas densify, preserving and enhancing significant natural areas will become increasingly important. Research shows that access to natural areas, and 'biophilic' environments are keys to human health and well-being and are a critical part of protecting biodiversity. On this matter, Wellington as a city is playing a critical role in providing refuge for formerly at risk native birds, e.g. kaka, and with efforts such as the Halo Project and Predator Free initiatives being undertaken by thousands of Wellingtonians, it is important our city's district plan provides legal and policy support to this. The failure to include SNA areas in residential zones means that the district plan is not in accordance with section 6 of the RMA, nor is it giving effect to relevant provisions of GWRC's regional policy statement and regional plan.	Amend SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas to add all the SNA areas in the residential zones recommended by officers in the draft district plan version provided to the Council's environment and planning committee on June 23 2022.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.19	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules /SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The original submitter seeks that Schedule 9 of the draft district plan be reinstated (adding back SNAs on private residential land), citing this exclusion is contradictory to both section 6(c) of the RMA and Policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Steve West does not agree that reinstatement of SNAs on residential private property in the Proposed District Plan is required for WCC to meet its obligations under section 6(c) of the RMA and policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neither the RMA or RPS prescribe in detail how a council might give effect to the requirement to protect of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. On note, in the 2015 Environment Court case between Forrest & Bird and New Plymouth District Council the Environment Court concluded Councils might conceivably meet RMA Section 6(c) duties through methods other than identification and rules, but in this case the non-regulatory methods relied on by the Council were insufficient to provide protection. - In any case, indigenous biodiversity in Wellington (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years, including through activities like Zealandia and Predator Free, along with voluntary conservation efforts without any need for SNAs. These activities have contributed significantly to the recovery of birds like the Kaka, and proves the current voluntary conservation efforts are working well. - Creating SNAs on private urban land in the district plan will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner value and goodwill in the process. So rather than providing legal protection for our flora and fauna, there is real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains achieved over the last two decades will diminish over time should SNAs be created on private urban land. <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that SNAs on private urban land remain excluded from the Proposed District Plan.
Paul Blaschke	FS129.13	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Support submission points made by a significant number of individuals and groups that essentially support the same proposition "Reinstate the overlay of all properly delineated SNAs or part SNAs on all relevant residential zoned properties".	Allow
Director-General of Conservation	385.88	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the Council to identify, map and protect the 177 identified Significant Natural Areas under SCHED8, in line with section 6 of the RMA.	Supports Council's efforts to identify, map and protect the 177 identified Significant Natural Areas under SCHED8.
Director-General of Conservation	385.89	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose in part	Considers that there are likely to be significantly more wetland SNAs identified if the Policy 6 of the NPS-FM, Policy 23 of the RPS, and section 6(a) of the RMA were applied. The SNA report prepared for the Wellington City Proposed District Plan does not reference the NPS-FM. There are six SNAs that reference wetlands out of the notified 177 within the Plan.	Seeks that all wetlands within Wellington City's boundaries should be properly identified and protected in accordance with the NPS-FM 2020.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.13	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Greater Wellington consider that the Proposed District Plan needs to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on wetlands in order to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow / Supports the submission in part and seeks provisions that ensure urban development is located and designed in a way that protects wetlands in accordance with the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS change 1 FW 3.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.2	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Wetlands that meet the definition of SNA should be protected at the District level.	Allow
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.29	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Agree with the Director-General of Conservation that the proposed district plan needs to better reflect Policy 6 of the NPS-FM; Policy 23 of the RPS; and seek to protect wetlands within Wellington City Council's boundaries.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Director-General of Conservation	385.90	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Considers that there are likely to be significantly more wetland SNAs identified if the Policy 6 of the NPS-FM, Policy 23 of the RPS, and section 6(a) of the RMA were applied. The SNA report prepared for the Wellington City Proposed District Plan does not reference the NPS-FM. There are six SNAs that reference wetlands out of the notified 177 within the Plan.	Seeks amendment within schedule 8. Requests that all wetlands within Wellington City's boundaries should be properly identified and protected in accordance with the NPS-FM 2020.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.3	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Wetlands that meet the definition of SNA should be protected at the District level.	Allow
Director-General of Conservation	385.91	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Oppose Council decision on 23 June 2022 at the Planning and Environment Committee on significant natural areas applying to residential land. Considers actions to be contrary to section 6(c) of the RMA and Policies 23 & 24 of the RPS. The SNAs on private land were originally proposed to be included in SCHED9 as 'Urban Environment Allotments' in accordance with the requirements of section 76 of the RMA. The section 32 report for Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity still refers to SCHED9 as 'Urban Environment Allotments', though in the Proposed District Plan, SCHED9 is instead listed as 'Indigenous Tree Sizes'. Considers that the removal of SNAs on private residential land will also be contrary to the exposure draft for the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. It is noted that this document has no legal effect, however, it is expected to come into effect in December 2022 during the further submissions and hearing process for the Proposed District Plan. It is considered effective and efficient to align the review of the Proposed District Plan provisions with the policy direction and requirements anticipated under the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity.	Opposes significant natural areas not applying to residential land, seeks amendment.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.16	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support this submission and agree that excluding SNAs from residential land, particularly without any other protections, does not achieve Part 2 of the RMA or give effect to the Operative RPS.	Allow
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.55	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Further clarification is needed to understand the implications on land use opportunities of applying significant natural areas. Kāinga Ora supports the protection of the values of SNAs but seeks that these are mapped and identified in the District Plan.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve West	FS110.21	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>Steve West does not agree that reinstatement of SNAs on residential private property in the Proposed District Plan is required for WCC to meet its obligations under section 6(c) of the RMA and policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 5 of the RMA requires balancing of physical and natural resources, as well as enabling persons to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being, and for their health and safety. By narrowly quoting section 6(c) the context of needing to balance outcomes has been lost. - Neither the RMA or RPS prescribe in detail how a council might give effect to the requirement to protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. On note, in the 2015 Environment Court case between Forrester & Bird and New Plymouth District Council the Environment Court concluded Councils might conceivably meet RMA Section 6(c) duties through methods other than identification and rules, but in this case the non-regulatory methods relied on by the Council were insufficient to provide protection. - Parts of policies 23/24 of the Regional Policy Statement are flawed for Wellington City, these matters are addressed in the further response to submission 351 above. - Indigenous biodiversity in Wellington (including on private urban land) has increased significantly over the last 20 years, including Zealandia and Predator Free, along with voluntary conservation efforts without any need for SNAs. - Creating SNAs on private urban land will turn native bush into an expensive and unwanted burden for many private urban landowners, destroying landowner value and goodwill in the process. Real risk that indigenous biodiversity gains over the last two decades will diminish over time should SNAs be created on private urban land. - Specifically for Captain Edward Daniell Drive, indigenous biodiversity is already protected under Section 3 of the Land Covenant registered on the records of title. <p>Steve West supports the requirement for WCC to correctly identify SNAs by undertaking ground truthing of the ecosystem to confirm the status and boundaries of the SNA. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that the submission be rejected in part and seeks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When identifying (ground truthing) individual SNAs that WCC is required to provide accurate cadastral markings of the SNA boundary and set individual land policies and rules in conjunction with each landowner in a way that will limit landowner losses while providing the required indigenous biodiversity protection. - SNAs on private urban land remain excluded from the Proposed District Plan. - Already protected land (such as Captain Edward Daniell Drive) be removed from Schedule 9, should residential SNAs be reinstated.
Paul Blaschke	FS129.7	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	<p>Support submission points made by a significant number of individuals and groups that essentially support the same proposition "Reinstate the overlay of all properly delineated SNAs or part SNAs on all relevant residential zoned properties".</p>	Allow
Director-General of Conservation	385.92	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>Oppose Council decision on 23 June 2022 at the Planning and Environment Committee on significant natural areas applying to residential land.</p> <p>SNAs are considered a 'qualifying matter' under the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD), meaning that the intensification requirements of the NPS-UD should not apply in these areas. The new Medium and High Density Residential Zones of the Proposed District Plan include enabling standards to provide for intensification and increased housing opportunities in accordance with the requirements of the NPS-UD8, however SNAs have been removed from the private land in these zones.</p> <p>The submitter holds concerns that the NPS-UD rules will have legal effect or become operative, before the missing SNAs are incorporated into the District Plan which could lead to the inappropriate removal of significant indigenous vegetation and the loss of significant habitats of indigenous fauna. Even without the consideration of the NPS-UD rules, there is concern that inappropriate development will take place in residential areas that should be protected by the SNA status.</p>	Opposes significant natural areas not applying to residential land, seeks amendment.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.56	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>Further clarification is needed to understand the implications on land use opportunities of applying significant natural areas.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora supports the protection of the values of SNAs but seeks that these are mapped and identified in the District Plan.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.30	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Agree with the Director-General of Conservation that there is a very real risk of inappropriate development in residential areas in new medium and high density zones (in accordance with the NPS-UD) by SNAs in residential areas not being included: this reflects that SNAs are a 'qualifying matter' under the NPS-UD.	Allow
Paul Blaschke	FS129.8	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Support submission points made by a significant number of individuals and groups that essentially support the same proposition "Reinstate the overlay of all properly delineated SNAs or part SNAs on all relevant residential zoned properties".	Allow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.549	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Opposes the mapped extent of the Lyall Bay and Moa Point Dunes. [See paragraphs 4.50 to 4.53 of original submission for full reason]	Delete item WC175 (Moa Point Gravel Dunes) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.188	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers these are significant natural areas of Wellington City. The local community have undertaken significant coastal restoration of the sand dunes at Lyall Bay and predator control of both areas. The sand dunes on Lyall Bay are a significant barrier to sea level rise and coastal inundation for both the community and the airport. The Moa Point dunes also protect the road, coastal community and airport. Removal from any zone in this area should not occur.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.550	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Opposes the mapped extent of the Lyall Bay and Moa Point Dunes. [See paragraphs 4.50 to 4.53 of original submission for full reason]	Delete item WC176 (Lyall Bay Dunes) from SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas.
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.189	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers these are significant natural areas of Wellington City. The local community have undertaken significant coastal restoration of the sand dunes at Lyall Bay and predator control of both areas. The sand dunes on Lyall Bay are a significant barrier to sea level rise and coastal inundation for both the community and the airport. The Moa Point dunes also protect the road, coastal community and airport. Removal from any zone in this area should not occur.	Disallow
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.551	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	There are two SNAs identified in the vicinity of the Airport. These are WC175 and WC176. The analysis of the site acknowledges that the assessment was based on a desktop analysis and these sites require site visits. The submitter considers that the presence of the SNA in such close proximity to the runway poses a potential risk to aircraft due to some of the bird species that reside in this area. While WIAL has mechanisms in place to actively manage such threats to aircraft safety, WIAL considers it is more appropriate to avoid enhancing habitats that have the potential to create a risk to aircraft in close proximity to the Airport and instead encourage them to locate elsewhere within the coastal environment.	Requests that the following SNAs are deleted in their entirety from SCHED8: - The Moa Point Gravel Dunes (WC175); and - The Lyall Bay Gravel Dunes (WC176). The submitter notes that a site visit is needed for these sites if they are to be included in the SCHED8. (Option A).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.190	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers these are significant natural areas of Wellington City. The local community have undertaken significant coastal restoration of the sand dunes at Lyall Bay and predator control of both areas. The sand dunes on Lyall Bay are a significant barrier to sea level rise and coastal inundation for both the community and the airport. The Moa Point dunes also protect the road, coastal community and airport. Removal from any zone in this area should not occur.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.552	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>There are two SNAs identified in the vicinity of the Airport. These are WC175 and WC176. The analysis of the site acknowledges that the assessment was based on a desktop analysis and these sites require site visits.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the presence of the SNA in such close proximity to the runway poses a potential risk to aircraft due to some of the bird species that reside in this area. While WIAL has mechanisms in place to actively manage such threats to aircraft safety, WIAL considers it is more appropriate to avoid enhancing habitats that have the potential to create a risk to aircraft in close proximity to the Airport and instead encourage them to locate elsewhere within the coastal environment.</p>	Should the SNAs remain in the plan, the submitter seeks that the relevant infrastructure provisions of the Proposed Plan provide a potential consenting pathway for the potential removal of vegetation within these SNAs where necessary to protect the safe operation and functioning of regionally significant infrastructure. (Option B).
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.191	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that Significant Natural Areas should be in close vicinity of the airport. The airport in the 'vicinity' of the SNA's should not be a reason for their removal. Measures such as bird control should be the method of reducing bird strike rather than requiring the removal of a SNA.	Disallow
Cheryl Robilliard	409.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	<p>Retain SCHED8 - Significant natural areas as notified.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.26	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Oppose SNAs on private property.</p> <p>Considers that sites have been incorrectly identified.</p> <p>Considers that a regulatory regime puts voluntary conservation programmes at risk.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Seeks that SNA overlays WC030, WC031, WC033, WC172, WC121 are removed from the following title:</p> <p>Fee Simple, 1/1, Lot 4 Deposited Plan 375401 and Section 1-4, 8, 10-13, 13A, 14-16, 19-26, 26, 29-32, 51-52, 55-59, 94, 17, 17, 17, 98, 98, 98, 98 Terawhiti District and Part Section 9, 33, 50, 54, 60-64, 73, 75 Terawhiti District and Lot 3 Deposited Plan 5864 and Lot 3 Deposited Plan 5864 and Lot 3 Deposited Plan 5864 and Lot 3 Deposited Plan 5864 and Lot 3 Deposited Plan 5864 and Lot 3 Deposited Plan 5864 and Lot 3 Deposited Plan 5864, 26,748,701 m2</p>
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.27	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Oppose SNAs on private property.</p> <p>Considers that sites have been incorrectly identified.</p> <p>Considers that a regulatory regime puts voluntary conservation programmes at risk.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that significant natural areas do not apply to privately owned land.
Penny Griffith	418.6	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the removal of SNA's from residentially zoned land.	Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas as notified (With no Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land).
Johnsonville Community Association	429.43	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	<p>Considers that unilaterally taking over of private property is a major intrusion on rights of the property owners, and may lead to removal of major natural areas on urban property.</p> <p>Opposes SNA's on private urban or rural land.</p>	<p>Retain SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, with respect to not having Significant Natural Areas on private urban property.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Johnsonville Community Association	429.44	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that unilaterally taking over of private property is a major intrusion on rights of the property owners, and may lead to removal of major natural areas on urban property.</p> <p>Opposes SNA's on private urban or rural land.</p>	Amend SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas, to remove Significant Natural Areas from private rural land.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul M Blaschke	435.13	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that the Council should allow SNAs on residentially zoned properties. The Council should be consistent with its overall policy objectives and let its original decisions on SNAs stand on their merits. The decision from Council's Planning & Environment Committee to remove SNAs from all residentially zoned properties on 23 June 2022 is opposed. This decision renders the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity section much less effective than it could and should be.</p> <p>It greatly hinders the achievement of Council's Te Atakura blueprint and other moves towards sustainability and resilience.</p> <p>It disadvantages the great majority of the city's residents except for a tiny number of suburban residential landowners who become privileged over all others including other suburban residential landowners with portions of SNAs within their properties and who have welcomed or not objected to the provisions.</p> <p>It overturns the very good process adopted by the council team and consultants who have planned and undertaken the SNA survey and policy development. Finally, it renders ECO-O1, ECO-P1, ECO-P2, and ECO-P3, and the rules supporting these objectives and policies, incapable of being properly implemented, and perpetuates the uncertainty caused by lack of a comprehensive statutory process around significant areas and indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks to extend Significant Natural Areas to residentially zoned properties.
Paul M Blaschke	435.14	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	SCHED8 is strongly supported for its general direction.	Retain SCHED8 -Significant Natural Areas as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.99	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion WC153 Strathmore coastal shrubland in Schedule 8 of the significant natural areas.	Retain WC153 Strathmore coastal shrubland in Schedule 8 of the significant natural areas as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.100	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion WC154 Moa Point coastal platform and shrubland in Schedule 8 of the significant natural areas.	Retain WC154 Moa Point coastal platform and shrubland in Schedule 8 of the significant natural areas as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.101	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion WC153 Moa Point gravel dunes in Schedule 8 of the significant natural areas.	Retain WC153 Moa Point gravel dunes in Schedule 8 of the significant natural areas as notified.
Guardians of the Bays	452.102	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion WC176 Lyall Bay dunes in Schedule 8 of the significant natural areas.	Retain WC176 Lyall Bay dunes in Schedule 8 of the significant natural areas as notified.
Grant and Marilyn Griffiths, Griffiths Family Trust	460.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	Opposes Significant Natural Areas on Private land.	Seeks to remove all Significant Natural Areas from Private Land.
Smith Geursen	475.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Not specified	Considers that it could be argued that an area of land should not have special environmental protections (SNA) based on aspirational outcomes (possible regeneration of certain species) unless it had been carefully assessed by an ecologist to confirm that it was desired native species that would likely become dominant (rather than invasive ones).	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Smith Geursen	475.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas fit the description in WC135 and should be protected as a SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that some parts of the site have been cleared recently, as a complying activity, and as such do not represent the habitat that would benefit from protection. These areas should be excluded from the SNA as the ecological value is now largely lost.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full detail, including diagrams].</p>	<p>Seeks that the extent of the area encompassed by WC135 (Carey Gully scrub and shrubland, South Coast) in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas is altered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encompass the 3m+ vegetation that is north and west of the loop shaped farm track; and - Also encompass the stand of 3m+ vegetation in the centre to the south of the site. <p>[The new boundaries suggested for WC135 (Carey Gully scrub and shrubland, South Coast) are approximated in Figure 8 in the submission]</p>
John Mulholland	497.3	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED8 – Significant Natural Areas	Amend	<p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas fit the description in WC135 and should be protected as a SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that parts of the area encompassed by WC135 in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas appear to have not met the description in WC135 for decades and should not be protected as a part of the SNA.</p> <p>Considers that some parts of the site have been cleared recently, as a complying activity, and as such do not represent the habitat that would benefit from protection. These areas should be excluded from the SNA as the ecological value is now largely lost.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full detail, including diagrams].</p>	<p>Seeks that the extent of the area encompassed by WC135 (Carey Gully scrub and shrubland, South Coast) in SCHED8 - Significant Natural Areas is altered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encompass the 3m+ vegetation that is north and west of the loop shaped farm track; and - Also encompass the stand of 3m+ vegetation in the centre to the south of the site. <p>The new boundaries suggested for WC135 (Carey Gully scrub and shrubland, South Coast) are approximated in Figure 8 in the submission.</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.412	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED9 – Indigenous Tree Sizes	Oppose in part	<p>Seeks reinstatement of SCHED 9 – Urban Environment Allotments that was included in the draft plan as at 20 April 2022, so that all areas of significant biodiversity in residential areas are identified and listed appropriately in the plan, to meet the requirements of s6(c) and s76.</p>	<p>Reinstate SCHED9 - Urban Environment Allotments from the Draft District Plan.</p>
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.159	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED9 – Indigenous Tree Sizes	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes amendments as this may impact on residential intensification outcomes.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.61	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED9 – Indigenous Tree Sizes	Amend	<p>Considers Significant Natural Areas are important in order to protect our environment and native plantlife.</p> <p>Considers that while the city is built denser, the environment and our wildlife should be protected.</p> <p>Considers that it is ironic that the argument for being anti-density is to protect the ‘character’ of our housing but yet there is no consideration for the ‘character’ of our nature, which is arguably much harder to restore than the character amenity gained from what the Council deems as character housing.</p>	Seeks that significant natural areas provisions apply to residentially zoned sites.
Barry Insull	32.16	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>The title "Te Rimurapa Sinclair Head/Pipinui Point Pariwhero Red Rocks" is confusing and should be amended.</p> <p>The inclusion of Pipinui point adds an excess of 30 kilometres of coastline to the area.</p>	Amend the title of title of Te Rimurapa Sinclair Head/Pipinui Point Pariwhero Red Rocks. To remove Pipinui Point.
Barry Insull	32.17	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>Amend the title "Te Rimurapa Sinclair Head/Pipinui Point Pariwhero Red Rocks" as it is likely incorrect.</p> <p>Sinclair Head / Te Rimurapa is the official name.</p>	Amend the title of Te Rimurapa Sinclair Head to Sinclair Head / Te Rimurapa.
Barry Insull	32.18	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>Amend Site Summary in Te Rimurapa Sinclair Head/Pipinui Point Pariwhero Red Rocks to fix the typo in the first sentence.</p> <p>"Te Rimurapa" should be changed to Te Rimurapa.</p>	Amend language in the Site Summary of Te Rimurapa Sinclair Head/Pipinui Point Pariwhero Red Rocks to "Te Rimurapa" instead of "Te Rimurapa".
Barry Insull	32.19	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>The Site Summary for Te Rimurapa Sinclair Head/Pipinui Point Pariwhero Red Rocks does not make reference to the Historic Reserve in the area.</p>	Seeks that the Site Summary of Te Rimurapa Sinclair Head/Pipinui Point Pariwhero Red Rocks in SCHED10 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes) be amended to mention the Historic Reserve in the area.
Barry Insull	32.20	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>Considers that there is only one seal colony in the Pariwhero / Red Rocks Sinclair Head / Te Rimurapa area. The term "colonies" in the site summary is incorrect.</p>	Amend language in site summary of Te Rimurapa Sinclair Head/Pipinui Point Pariwhero Red Rocks to "colony" instead of "colonies".
Barry Insull	32.21	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>Considers that the site summary for Taputeranga Island could provide a distorted picture of the species inhabiting the sites due to lack of wider information.</p> <p>The Marlborough "mini" gecko may have been seen near the two named points. The existing text fails to add balance by stating the species also inhabits other sites between Makara and Island Bay including Taputeranga Island.</p> <p>The officers' response failed to address the identification and distribution of the bird species. Banded dotterel (Conservation Status- declining) have been seen in this area and greater numbers can be found elsewhere on the coast. It is possible coastal trapping established as part of the Capital Kiwi programme will lessen the effects of predation on rare and threatened species.</p>	Seeks that the Site Summary of Taputeranga Island under SCHED10 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes) be clarified to list threatened and rare species of birds and lizards that have been accurately identified in the area.
Barry Insull	32.22	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	<p>Considers that the appropriate name for the water body between North Island and South Island, as determined by the New Zealand Geographic Board, is "Cook Strait". The name "Raukawa Coast Cook Strait" in SCHED10 should be amended to "Cook Strait Coast".</p>	Amend title of "Raukawa Coast Cook Strait" to "Cook Strait Coast" under SCHED10 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.2	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	The submitter seeks for the title of “Raukawa Coast Cook Strait” to be amended to “Cook Strait Coast” under SCHED10 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes). Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this part of the submission because the name for the Cook Strait in Te Reo Māori is Raukawa Moana and we would like this name to be upheld and recognised throughout planning documents.	Disallow
Barry Insull	32.23	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	Considers that the phrasing “Known as Wellington’s wild coast” in Raukawa Coast Cook Strait’s site summary is not adequate and should be amended.	Seeks that language in the Site Summary of Raukawa Coast Cook Strait’s be amended to remove “Known as Wellington’s wild coast”.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.123	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose in part	Considers the text description is incomplete because it fails to acknowledge the visible presence of the existing turbines and other built structures in the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms which are visible, along with this natural landscape, from long distances away (on land and at sea).	Retain SCHED10 - Raukawa Coast Cook Strait’ with amendment.
Meridian Energy Limited	228.124	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	Considers the text description is incomplete because it fails to acknowledge the visible presence of the existing turbines and other built structures in the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms which are visible, along with this natural landscape, from long distances away (on land and at sea).	Amend the description by inserting the following (or similar) text acknowledging the existing turbines and other built structures in the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms which form part of the backdrop to the coastal escarpments: <u>“The backdrop to this natural landscape includes the wind turbines, roads and structures in the West Wind and Mill Creek wind farms, including turbines within the mapped coastal environment”</u> [Refer to original submission for map sought for inclusion].
Yvonne Weeber	340.156	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	Supports the inclusion of Hue tē Taka Peninsula/Rangitatau Palmer Head in SCHED10. It is an important environmental, landscape and cultural southern headland of Wellington City. It is supported that this outstanding natural feature is being recognised as high and very high natural features and sensory factors.	Retain Hue tē Taka Peninsula/Rangitatau Palmer Head in SCHED10 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.413	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Support in part	Opposes the values as written. The identified values of ONFLs in the coastal environment are insufficient to give effect to Policy 15 of the NZCPS. Furthermore, the “Relevant values under Policy 25 of the RPS” as identified in SCHED10 are uncertain and do not provide the level of information required to determine whether the effects of an activity can be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated. Seek inclusion of the values of each ONFL in SCHED10 to give effect to the RPS and NZCPS. “High” for example, is not a value.	Amend SCHED10 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes to include values of each ONFL.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.186	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	Meridian agrees that the descriptions of values in SCHED10 are not helpful in guiding the policy framework.	Not specified / Seeks that any amendments to the SCHED10 descriptions be made available to submitters for consideration before inclusion in the Plan.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.414	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Support in part	Seek inclusion of Boom Rock/Pipinui Point Escarpment ONF and/or clarify in the planning maps whether Boom Rock/Pipinui Point Escarpment is instead contained within the Raukawa Coast Cook Strait ONL.	Amend SCHED10 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes to include new ONF Boom Rock/Pipinui Point Escarpment.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.187	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart /Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that in the absence of any detail about the geographic extent of the requested addition, it is not possible to evaluate whether it should be included in SCHED10.	Disallow / Seeks that request is disallowed, pending an opportunity to review and comment on the detail of the proposed additional item.
Director-General of Conservation	385.93	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	Supports the Council to identify, map and protect Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes in line with Policy 25 of the RPS and Policies 13 & 15 of the NZCPS.	Retain schedule 10 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes) as notified.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.28	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	Opposes Terawhiti being listed as an Outstanding Natural Feature. Considers the provisions are overly restrictive	Delete Terawhiti from SCHED10 as an outstanding natural feature.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.29	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Oppose	Opposes Raukawa Coast Cook Strait being listed as an Outstanding Natural Feature. Considers the provisions are overly restrictive	Delete Raukawa Coast Cook Strait from SCHED10 as an outstanding natural feature.
Guardians of the Bays	452.103	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED10 – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	Supports Hue tē Taka Peninsula/Rangitatau Palmer Head being recognised as an outstanding natural feature.	Retain Hue tē Taka Peninsula/Rangitatau Palmer Head on SCHED10- outstanding natural feature as notified.
John Tiley	142.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	Considers that the lack of inclusion of the ridgelines and hilltops in the schedules and the title of NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) demonstrates that ridgelines and hilltops are not protected to any significant degree. Considers that it is extraordinary that policies NFL-P3 to P7 set out how ONFL and SAL areas are subject to development, defying any reasonable expectation that such areas would be highly valued by the city and developments would be prohibited.	Seeks that the 18 ridgelines and hilltops (and Marshalls Ridge) are listed in either SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes and/or SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.188	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart /Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that there is no basis supplied for including the 18 identified ridgelines and hilltops as 'specialamenity landscapes' in SCHED11.	Disallow
Thomas Brent Layton	164.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that the WCC should abandon the adoption of the Special Amenities Landscape as its application to all the "outer green belt" shows that its purpose is to constrain the urban development of the city. Considers that it is not about landscapes with special amenities as there is nothing special or unusual about the amenity the "outer green belt" provides. The landscape of flattish tops punctuated by streams in steep valleys is very common in the region; it is not special. Considers that the green belt idea stops the expansion of the city to areas where housing would be suitable and economic because of proximity to infrastructure. It tells those interested in capital gains from land holding within the urban boundary that they need not worry about much expansion in supply. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Remove the Special Amenities Landscape overlays from the Proposed District Plan. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Thomas Brent Layton	164.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Opposes the application of the Special Amenities Landscape overlay to 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.	Remove the Special Amenities Landscape overlay from 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.
Churton Park Community Association	189.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	Considers that the lack of inclusion of the ridgelines and hilltops in the schedules and the title of NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) demonstrates that ridgelines and hilltops are not protected to any significant degree. Considers that it is extraordinary that policies NFL-P3 to P7 set out how ONFL and SAL areas are subject to development, defying any reasonable expectation that such areas would be highly valued by the city and developments would be prohibited.	Seeks that the 18 ridgelines and hilltops (and Marshalls Ridge) are listed in either SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes and/or SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.189	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart /Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that there is no basis supplied for including the 18 identified ridgelines and hilltops as ‘specialamenity landscapes’ in SCHED11.	Disallow
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.95	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support in part	Considers that, in relation to objectives and policies in the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter, while the values for particular sites are outlined in Schedule 11, the characteristics are not. Clarification on the characteristics would assist with plan interpretation and application.	Clarify what characteristics of special amenity landscapes are in the PDP, and in particular the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.73	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	Considers that development within the MDRZ area of the Submitters land can contribute to the existing urban form, providing land resources that can facilitate quality development. However, the proposed SAL overlay which the MRZ area that the land is subject to will restrict the potential medium density development of the land. Similar to the proposed SNA mapping of the land, the SAL overlay should not include the proposed MRZ area of the Submitters land.	Amend Schedule 11 to remove special amenity landscape from submitter's land zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.
Andy Foster	FS86.63	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that it is reasonable to uplift the Special Amenity Landscape over the residential part of the land. However Andy Foster suggests that the hearings panel find a way of ensuring that development is sympathetic to the landform and to the ecological values on the lower part of the land. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.73]	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.74	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support	Supports that Mount Kaukau and the Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape are Special Amenity Landscapes.	Retain Mount Kaukau as an Special Amenity Landscape in Schedule 11 as notified
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.75	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support	Supports that Mount Kaukau and the Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape are Special Amenity Landscapes.	Retain Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape as an Special Amenity Landscape in Schedule 11 as notified
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.76	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose in part	Considers that there is a conflict between these provisions and the SAL overlay provisions which make residential development on this land restrictive and adds uncertainty. Notes that NFL-R11 requires buildings and structures within the SAL overlay to be no more than 8m in height. The MRZ height restriction is 11m. The proposed MRZ over the Submitters land is appropriate to support the strategic direction of the PDP.	Seeks that submitter's land zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, be removed from Schedule 11.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.64	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules /SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is reasonable to uplift the Special Amenity Landscape over the residential part of the land. However Andy Foster suggests that the hearings panel find a way of ensuring that development is sympathetic to the landform and to the ecological values on the lower part of the land.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.76]</p>	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.77	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	<p>Considers that the MDRZ area of the land should not be included in this SAL schedule 11.</p> <p>Considers the inclusion MDRZ land within the SAL overlay, it restricts the land from being efficiently utilized for medium density residential development. Furthermore, the zoning layout has principal support from GWRC both in terms of policy direction (i.e. Policy 27) and the consented layout.</p> <p>The landscape identified to be ‘distinctive and widely recognised by the community for the contribution to the amenity and quality of the environment’ is predominantly located within the balance land which includes Crows Nest and the Skyline Walkway Trailhead.</p>	Seeks that submitter’s land zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, be removed from Schedule 11.
Andy Foster	FS86.65	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules /SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is reasonable to uplift the Special Amenity Landscape over the residential part of the land. However Andy Foster suggests that the hearings panel find a way of ensuring that development is sympathetic to the landform and to the ecological values on the lower part of the land.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.77]</p>	Disallow
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.78	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	<p>Considers that the MDRZ area of the land should not be included in this SAL schedule 11.</p> <p>Considers that to fully realise the objectives and policies of the proposed zoning, the SAL overlay should be removed. This portion of the land has always been zoned for residential development, and this potential should be maintained as part of this planning process.</p>	Seeks that submitter’s land zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, be removed from Schedule 11.
Orienteering Wellington	FS32.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support	<p>Submitter has restricted this submission to areas of relevance to Orienteering Wellington, and does not feel competent to reflect on some of the wider aspects of the plan and submission 290. It is their understanding that the submission includes a proposal to build medium density housing within the original submitters land interest, and retain a further block designated as an NOSZ. The area being proposed to be an NOSZ includes land that they have been provided access to for orienteering events by Kilmarston Developments. This area, which is adjacent to the Huntleigh Reserve has high value to our organisation in its natural state. It has potential to be a significant asset to the local community. Submitter notes the “Reasons” (section B, page 6 of the submission) text recognises the value of linkages in this area and a Willingness to enter dialogue over mechanisms to support both the NOSZ and residential uses of this land. They support this. Arrangements that allow for careful development, enhancement of linkages to other public land and tracks, and retention of the natural value of the reserve-adjacent land would benefit the community, and specifically ourselves as an orienteering club providing outdoor experiences to residents of the area. Submitter notes that the submission also includes a request to provide for installation of a water reservoir within the land identified as NOSZ. The specifics of the land designations that permit or hinder this are not within my competency. Considers that use of the proposed NOSZ area is unlikely to be unduly compromised by the presence of such a reservoir, and to note that with appropriate design, there may be access and linkage benefits from track infrastructure required for installation and maintenance of the reservoir. The reaching of agreement as described in “Reasons” section B (page 6 of submission) is far preferable to our organization that the alternative proposed in section C (bottom of page 6).</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.66	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that it is reasonable to uplift the Special Amenity Landscape over the residential part of the land. However Andy Foster suggests that the hearings panel find a way of ensuring that development is sympathetic to the landform and to the ecological values on the lower part of the land. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.78]	Disallow
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.415	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support in part	Opposes the values as written. The identified values of SALs in the coastal environment are insufficient to give effect to the NZCPS. Furthermore, the “Relevant values under Policy 28 of the RPS” as identified in SCHED11 are uncertain and do not provide the level of information required to determine whether the effects of an activity can be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated. Seek inclusion of the values of each SAL in SCHED11 to give effect to the RPS and NZCPS.	Amend SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes to include values of each SAL.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.416	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support in part	Include Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape in SCHED11 as identified using criteria set out in Policy 27 of the RPS, and those areas of SAL identified in accordance with the adopted amendment by the Planning and Environment Committee on 23 June 2022.	Amend SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes to include new SAL Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.140	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	Considers that overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.	Seeks that SAL schedule be amended to reflect historical and current built development over the Wellington Prison site (Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035).
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.36	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Submission 389 states: “Taranaki Whānui’s RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the ‘Watts Peninsula’ sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land.” Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park. Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389’s attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states “Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui’s RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi,” Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389’s request for “The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone.”	Disallow
Penny Griffith	418.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support	Supports the inclusion of the Outer Green Belt as a Special Amenity Landscape.	Retain SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes as notified (With the Outer Green Belt locations included).
Barry Insull	32.24	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Amend	The subtitle under SCHED12 (Sinclair Head / Te Rimurapa) is non-compliant with official dual English/Māori name legalised in 2008 and should be amended. The Te Reo name for Sinclair Head is "Te Rimurapa" and should be included in the subtitle.	Amend language in SCHED12 (High Coastal Natural Character Areas) to "Sinclair Head/ Te Rimurapa" instead of "Sinclair Head".

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Barry Insull	32.25	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Cliffs East of Karori Stream Estuary does not qualify as a historic habitat for Long Bay Beach Weevil. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that language in Key Values of Coastal Cliffs East of Karori Stream Estuary be amended to remove mention of "a historic habitat for Long Bay Beach Weevil". [Inferred decision requested]
John Tiley	142.31	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Amend	Considers that the lack of inclusion of the ridgelines and hilltops in the schedules and the title of NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) demonstrates that ridgelines and hilltops are not protected to any significant degree. Considers that it is extraordinary that policies NFL-P3 to P7 set out how ONFL and SAL areas are subject to development, defying any reasonable expectation that such areas would be highly valued by the city and developments would be prohibited.	Seeks that the 18 ridgelines and hilltops (and Marshalls Ridge) are listed in either SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes and/or SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas.
Andy Foster	FS86.34	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.31].	Allow
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.190	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Considers that there is no basis supplied for including the 18 identified ridgelines and hilltops as 'high coastal natural coastal character areas' in SCHED12.	Disallow
Churton Park Community Association	189.31	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Amend	Considers that the lack of inclusion of the ridgelines and hilltops in the schedules and the title of NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) demonstrates that ridgelines and hilltops are not protected to any significant degree. Considers that it is extraordinary that policies NFL-P3 to P7 set out how ONFL and SAL areas are subject to development, defying any reasonable expectation that such areas would be highly valued by the city and developments would be prohibited.	Seeks that the 18 ridgelines and hilltops (and Marshalls Ridge) are listed in either SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes and/or SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.191	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Considers that there is no basis supplied for including the 18 identified ridgelines and hilltops as 'high coastal natural coastal character areas' in SCHED12.	Disallow
Yvonne Weeber	340.157	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Support	Supports the inclusion of the Lyall Bay connection between Te Raekaihau and Hue tē Taka Peninsula/ Mōa Point in SCHED12, as it is ranked as an important environmental, cultural and social connection, even with the disruption of the airport reclamation. Te importance of the southern coastline and the connections and the ranking of the high status of Hue tē Taka Peninsula / Mōa Point is supported.	Retain the Lyall Bay connection between Te Raekaihau and Hue tē Taka Peninsula/ Mōa Point in SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.417	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Support in part	Considers the schedule does not give effect to Policy 13 of the NZCPS. The "Relevant values under Policy 13 of the NZCPS" as identified in SCHED12 are uncertain and do not provide the level of information required to determine whether the effects of an activity can be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated. "High" and "Moderate" are not values.	Amend SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas to give effect to policy 13 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.192	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Meridian agrees that the descriptions of values in SCHED12 are not helpful in guiding the policy framework. In the absence of any specific detail, it is not possible to comment further on the requested amendments.	Not specified / Seeks that any amendments to the SCHED12 descriptions be made available for consideration before inclusion in the Plan.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.418	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Support in part	It is unclear what the relationship is between the sections "Relevant values under Policy 13 of the NZCPS" and "Key values" for each identified area. If these are connected, then it needs to be stated explicitly. Seek inclusion of the values of each High and Very High Coastal Natural Character Area in SCHED12 to give effect to Policy 13 of the NZCPS.	Clarify relationship in SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas between "relevant values under policy 13 of the NZCPS" and the "key values" between each area.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.193	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart /Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Meridian agrees that the descriptions of values in SCHED12 are not helpful in guiding the policy framework. In the absence of any specific detail, it is not possible to comment further on the requested amendments.	Not specified / Seeks that any amendments to the SCHED12 descriptions be made available for consideration before inclusion in the Plan.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.419	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Support in part	Seek inclusion of the values of each High and Very High Coastal Natural Character Area in SCHED12 to give effect to Policy 13 of the NZCPS.	Amend SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas to include the values of each High and Very High Coastal Natural Area.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.194	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart /Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Meridian agrees that the descriptions of values in SCHED12 are not helpful in guiding the policy framework. In the absence of any specific detail, it is not possible to comment further on the requested amendments.	Not specified / Seeks that any amendments to the SCHED12 descriptions be made available for consideration before inclusion in the Plan.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.351	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Amend	Considers that the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) Policy 13(1)(a) requires that for areas of outstanding natural character, adverse effects are avoided. NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b) requires that for natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment, significant adverse effects are avoided, and all other adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Seeks to amend SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character to the area identified in the 2016 Boffa Miskell coastal natural character assessment.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.195	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart /Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Meridian agrees that the descriptions of values in SCHED12 are not helpful in guiding the policy framework. In the absence of any specific detail, it is not possible to comment further on the requested amendments.	Not specified / Seeks that any amendments to the SCHED12 descriptions be made available for consideration before inclusion in the Plan.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.352	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Support in part	Supports the work undertaken to identify and schedule sites of high natural character in the PDP.	Retain SCHED12 (High Coastal Natural Character Areas), subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.353	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Amend	Considers the primary function of mapping area scale natural character ratings (low – high) in the PDP is to ensure applicants do not have to undertake this work as part of applications for resource consent, to give effect to NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b). It would not be efficient or effective to require applicants for resource consent to undertake this step as part of a consent process, especially when the work has already been commissioned by WCC, presumably to be included in the PDP. Mapping the full range of natural character areas in the PDP also provides more certainty to applicants/developers on areas that are more suitable/less suitable for development based on an improved understanding of the natural character values present.	Seeks to schedule natural character ratings at all levels (low, moderate, high) at the wider area scale in Schedule 12, as undertaken in the 2016 Boffa Miskell natural character assessment.
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.196	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart /Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Meridian agrees that the descriptions of values in SCHED12 are not helpful in guiding the policy framework. In the absence of any specific detail, it is not possible to comment further on the requested amendments.	Not specified / Seeks that any amendments to the SCHED12 descriptions be made available for consideration before inclusion in the Plan.

General Points - Other

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.354	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter is concerned that the wider area scale natural character assessment has not been scheduled in the PDP. Adverse effects on natural character cannot be managed at a site of high natural character (referred to in the 2016 Boffa Miskell natural character assessment as 'components') in isolation. They need to be considered in the broader context of the coastal environment, at the area scale in which the site of high natural character is located. This wider area-scale natural character rating should be at all natural character ratings levels (low-high) to provide the appropriate context to a site.</p> <p>A proposed activity in the site of high natural character needs to consider potential effects on both the specific site (what the PDP already contains in SCHED12) and the overall area scale rating, to give effect to NZCPS Policy 13(1)(b). This is because there also needs to be an assessment of whether there will be 'significant adverse effects' on natural character outside of the mapped sites of high natural character in the PDP. Undertaking this assessment would be best informed by an understanding of whether the broader area has been assessed as having low, moderate or high natural character. Conversely, for an activity not in a site of high natural character (as currently scheduled), the potential effects only need to be assessed on the overall area scale rating.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the title of Schedule 12, so it refers to all coastal natural character areas, rather than areas of high natural character in isolation as follows:</p> <p>(SCHED 12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas)</p>
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.198	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart /Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Considers that the objectives and policies that pertain to SCHED12 do not support deletion of 'high' from the title of the Schedule.	Disallow / Disallow the deletion of 'high'
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.355	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Considers the proposed mapping approach is not appropriate to achieve CE-O1, does not fully incorporate the 2016 Boffa Miskell assessment, and will be less effective in giving effect to NZCPS 13(1)(b).	Map area scale natural character ratings (in addition to the sites of high and very high natural character already included in the proposed approach) identified in Boffa Miskell's natural character assessment (2016).
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.197	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart /Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Meridian agrees that the descriptions of values in SCHED12 are not helpful in guiding the policy framework. In the absence of any specific detail, it is not possible to comment further on the requested amendments.	Not specified / Seeks that any amendments to the SCHED12 descriptions be made available for consideration before inclusion in the Plan.
Director-General of Conservation	385.94	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Support	Supports the Council to identify, map and protect the natural character of the coastal environment in line with Policy 13 of the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 12 (High Coastal Natural Character Areas) as notified.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Opposes the High Coastal Natural Character overlay as it relates to the submitter's property, but considers it more appropriate in terms of its scale, impact to the property, and view shafts from Cook Strait.	Delete Ōteranga Head / Outlook Hill from SCHED12 as an area of High Coastal Natural Character.
Terawhiti Farming Co Ltd (Terawhiti Station)	411.31	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Oppose	Opposes the High Coastal Natural Character overlay as it relates to the submitter's property, but considers it more appropriate in terms of its scale, impact to the property, and view shafts from Cook Strait.	Delete Terawhiti / Ohau Point from SCHED12 as an area of High Coastal Natural Character.
Guardians of the Bays	452.104	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Support	Supports supports the Lyall Bay connection between Te Raekaihau and Hue tē Taka Peninsula/ Moa Point being ranked as an important environmental, cultural and social connection	Retain Hue tē Taka Peninsula/ Moa Point on SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas.
Guardians of the Bays	452.105	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED12 – High Coastal Natural Character Areas	Support	Supports the importance of the southern coastline and the connections and the ranking of the high status of Hue tē Taka Peninsula / Moa Point	Supports the importance of the southern coastline and the connections and the ranking of the high status of Hue tē Taka Peninsula / Moa Point
Kay Larsen	447.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that summary of submission on Draft District Plan was insufficient.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mark Jones	13.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the Council shouldn't assume Wellington residents want population growth and engages with residents about this.	Not Specified.
Simon Cocks	20.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Downtown Wellington is unsafe. Poneke Promise is insufficient. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council improve public safety in Wellington.
Simon Cocks	20.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Wellington Water lacks competency and accountability. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks better governance and accountability for Wellington Water.
Simon Cocks	20.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Social housing is not a core competency of council. Private organisations administer this role better. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council exits its role as a social housing provider.
Simon Cocks	20.4	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	WCC is unable to successfully manage basic infrastructure assets. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council supports the Three Waters proposal.
Simon Cocks	20.5	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Buses in Northland don't come frequently enough. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council improve Northland suburb public transport by increasing frequency.
Simon Cocks	20.6	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Risk of bike theft in the city reduces incentive to use cycleways. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council take measures to reduce bike theft in the city.
Mark Tanner	24.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the beautification of Wellington with LGWM and the new parks.	Not specified.
Abby and Amos Leota	27.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the current demographics (Census, 2018) for the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) have not been considered. [refer to original submission for full reason].	Not specified.
Sharon Grealley	29.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No reasons given other than decision]	Supports Mount Victoria Historical Society's submission. [refer to submission 214]
Peter Preston	42.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Grant Birkinshaw	52.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the submission form for public consultation does not provide the detail of what is written when printed out.	Not specified.
James Barber	56.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Property developers will benefit most from densification and should contribute. Civic spaces are much needed with densification.	Seeks that a levy is introduced on property developers to contribute to civic spaces with densification.
Phil Kelliher	58.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Phil Kelliher	58.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	The lack of adequate infrastructure needs to be regarded as a qualifying matter precluding high density development in Mount Victoria and other inner city suburbs.	Seeks that development potential is not increased in Mount Victoria as there is inadequate infrastructure.
Juliet Cooke	68.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that their position is supported by the Boffa Miskell Report and that as Moir Street will be Heritage Area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites.	Not specified.
Tracey Paterson	74.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report with respect to the interface between Moir Street and the CCZ.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Tracey Paterson	74.2	Other / Other / Other	Support in part	Supports density done well and the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ, but does not support density at all costs.	[Not specified]
Tim Bright	75.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Submission is made in conjunction with the Wellington Historical Society Documents	[Not specified]
Judith Graykowski	80.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there are benefits in retaining carbon by keeping old wooden houses rather than producing emissions from the activities needed for new builds.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Ann Mallinson	81.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the assumption that Wellington will have 80,000 extra residents in the coming years is based on research done before the Covid epidemic. It is now generally agreed that these figures no longer apply.	Not Specified.
Amanda Wang	93.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Concerned about rates. Refer to original submission for further detail]	[Not specified]
Susan Birch	94.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Concerned about rates. Refer to original submission for further detail]	[Not specified]
John Liu	95.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Concerned about rates. Refer to original submission for further detail]	[Not specified]
Interprofessional Trust	96.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that owners wanting to use neighbour's land for daylighting purposes should be able to do so by private treaty.	[Not specified]
Tim Brown	97.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that Mayor Foster and CEO should resign for the stale state of the city.	Seeks that Mayor Foster and CEO resign.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Victoria University is a significant property owner in Wellington and has a planned programme of works to revitalise university buildings over the next 10 years, called the Campus Development Plan (CDP). Considers that the controlled activity status in the Operative District Plan that has applied to such works has ensured good design outcomes for major campus projects to date. The CDP proposes to connect the Kelburn campus with 320 and 320A The Terrace, and to conserve and repurpose the McLean Flats. There is no ability, appetite or available resource to repurpose the Gordon Wilson Flats. Considers that, due to the state of disrepair, any heritage values associated with the Gordon Wilson Flats are now significantly undermined.	Not specified.
Tawa Business Group	107.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the proposed intensification of the Tawa town centre and surrounding residential areas, facilitated by the increased building height and density within the proposed Medium Density Residential/High Density Residential and Neighbourhood Centre/Local Centre zones.	Seeks that the Tawa town centre and surrounding residential areas are intensified. [Inferred decision requested].
Oliver Sangster	112.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that Johnsonville Mall and the surrounding carparks is highly inefficient and that it has huge development potential as flat sunny land right next to the Johnsonville railway, numerous open space parks and Waitohi library.	Seeks that the Council consult with Kainga Ora and the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development over the use of powers under the Urban Development Act 2020 to acquire the Johnsonville Mall site in the event that development of the site does not occur.
Oliver Sangster	112.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the road is steep and vehicles frequently speed. Has witnessed a number of vehicle crashes taking place on this road. Considers that an increase in vehicle traffic from the Upper Stebbings/Glenside West Development area is likely to increase crashes creating more hazards for road users and pedestrians.	Seeks that the Council consider methods to reduce traffic speed down Westchester Drive between Melksham Drive and Middleton Rd roundabout.
Candy Cheung	115.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Submission in opposition - no details supplied.	Not specified.
Summerset Group Holdings Limited	118.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Supports the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand in its entirety.	Supports the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand submission in its entirety.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the protection of heritage buildings, character housing, private space, skylines, and aesthetics should not compromise the more important functions of the city. Student's sense of place in Pōneke Wellington is determined by our ability to live here well, and what we're able to do here. The vibrancy, accessibility and functionality of the city are some of its most important aspects for students.	Seeks that the City's "identity" is promoted through prioritising affordability, accessibility, well-being, functionality, arts, nature, and public space.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Supports actions taken by the PDP to support the WCC's Te Atakura - First to Zero policy.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that climate resilience should require a holistic approach.	Seeks that housing and city areas should have a people-centred design.
Airbnb	126.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that local districts and councils should take the opportunity to support efforts to streamline and simplify Residential Visitor Accommodation regulation at the central government level. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that local districts and councils take the opportunity to support efforts to streamline and simplify Residential Visitor Accommodation regulation at the central government level.
Airbnb	126.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. The NSW Code of Conduct is an example of a standardised approach with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that a similar mechanism to the NSW Code of Conduct is employed as part of a national framework.
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support and do not don't undermine the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested]
Anne Lian	132.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Anne Lian	132.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested]
Ingo Schommer	133.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Ingo Schommer	133.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Ingo Schommer	133.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].
Olivier Reuland	134.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Olivier Reuland	134.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Olivier Reuland	134.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Grant Buchan	143.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that one of the biggest drivers of carbon emissions in relation to transport has been increases in private car use and this reliance on cars has much to do with Wellington's detached housing development of land at the city fringes.</p> <p>This low density has generally made it uneconomic for business providing necessary goods and services, such as groceries, within walking and cycling distance. Similarly any amenities in these areas such as schools, recreation facilities etc are largely only accessible to sufficient numbers of people to justify the expense of their construction and upkeep if they are serviced by car. This car infrastructure tends to crowd out cycling and walking as ways to access local amenities in these areas.</p>	Not specified.
Grant Buchan	143.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Generation Zero submission in its entirety.	Not specified. (Submission 254 Generation Zero Inc.)
Grant Buchan	143.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the A City For People submission in its entirety.	Not specified.
Braydon White	146.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Braydon White	146.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the PDP.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Braydon White	146.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	<p>Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Matthew Gibbons	148.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the submissions process favours established Wellington residents who have time to wade through a long District plan, and who don't personally experience most of the disadvantages of not allowing densification.	Not specified.
Vivienne Morrell	155.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Boffa Miskell 2019 report on character areas.	Supports the Boffa Miskell 2019 report on character areas.
Vivienne Morrell	155.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there are benefits in retaining carbon by keeping old wooden houses rather than producing emissions from the activities needed for new builds.	Not specified.
Dr Briar E R Gordon and Dr Lyndsay G M Gordon	156.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Hon Sir Douglas White submission in its entirety.	Supports the Hon Sir Douglas White submission in its entirety. [Refer to submission 287]
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.66	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	These submissions align with the Association's submissions for the Hobson precinct, the Portland/Hawkestone precinct, and the Selwyn precinct.	Allow
James and Karen Fairhall	160.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/ circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.
Sophie Kahn	161.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that commissioners must be capable of considering and assessing the Jewish perspective.	Seeks that a commissioner capable of understanding a Jewish perspective be appointed to the hearings panel for the Proposed District Plan.
Ian Attwood	FS16.10	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>The Jewish perspective is very relevant to the historical contexts of the building the Khan House.</p> <p>It is well-documented in several sources but is not perse illuminated in the house's architecture.</p> <p>It is also a very sensitive 'context', and the Kahn family and Jewish community should have the sole right to determine how they wish to manage the home's heritage and future.</p>	Allow / Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.25	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>The further submitter is supportive of the submission and believe the same right should apply to all cultures and the Jewish community should choose how their heritage is protected.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Allow / Seeks that the Council engage with cultural groups with respect to their heritage, and the protection of it, rather than deciding for them or dictating to them how it will be protected.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.
Jill Ford	163.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that developers have the opportunity to have reduced development fees if there is low cost accommodation included.
Trelissick Park Group	168.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that with housing intensification and more extreme weather events due to climate change, the problems caused by stormwater in Trelissick Park are becoming worse. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.
Amos Mann	172.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that lifts in multi-storey developments are incentivised.
Amos Mann	172.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Council works with central government to improve accessibility and building performance requirements in the Building Code.
Amos Mann	172.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that WCC work with Waka Kotahi to make a more liveability-focused and climate-focused road and street network, especially where intensification is happening.
Amos Mann	172.4	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Amos Mann	172.5	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].
Patrick Wilkes	173.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Patrick Wilkes	173.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Patrick Wilkes	173.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].
Patrick Wilkes	173.4	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers this important so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel be prioritised for access to public transport.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.
Pete Gent	179.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Pete Gent	179.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Pete Gent	179.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].
James Harris	180.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
James Harris	180.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that state highways operated by Waka Kotahi should respond to city council needs so that (for example) they support cycleways and other traffic intersections with local roads.	Seeks that state highways operated by Waka Kotahi should respond to city council needs.
James Harris	180.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
James Harris	180.4	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].
Historic Places Wellington	182.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission from Wellington Heritage Professionals. [refer to submission 412]	Supports the Wellington Heritage Professionals submission on the PDP. [Refer to submission 412]
Ros Bignell	186.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the site by site character analysis proposal by the Boffa Miskell character report 2019.	Supports the Boffa Miskell character report 2019.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.19	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow
Ros Bignell	186.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Supports the Newtown Character Protection Group submission in its entirety.	Not specified.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.20	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Boffa Miskell Report 2019.	Supports the Boffa Miskell Report 2019.
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Mount Victoria Historical Society Submission.	Supports the Mount Victoria Historical Society Submission. [Refer to submission 214]
Chris Howard	192.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Opposes changes to the RMA, considering it a blanket approach to densification and over simplistic. Considers that densification for Wellington needs to be highly tailored to the city's existing and considerable widespread special character.	Not specified.
Chris Howard	192.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Concerned by the level of polarisation that is evident in the housing debate.	Not specified.
Chris Howard	192.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that decision making needs to be take a balanced view, considering the nuanced benefits of how much-needed housing intensification can be achieved.	Not specified.
Chris Howard	192.4	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that stronger leadership is exerted by those Chairing the WCC debate on the PDP to ensure that the process is impartially driven more by technical merit rather than by polarised agendas	Seeks that debate on the Proposed District Plan is impartial and driven by technical merit.
Chris Howard	192.5	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the PDP should not be rushed to ensure the best long-term outcomes, extending this process may be needed, including, another public iteration of the spatial plan, that includes greater transparency as to how public feedback is being actioned.	That further public consultation is undertaken on the plan and it is not rushed to meet RMA implementation timeframes. [Inferred decision requested]
Chris Howard	192.6	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Supported the Draft Spatial Plan and considered that detailed consideration had gone into its development, through a local process that appreciated the Wellington specific trade-offs.	Seeks that the Spatial Plan is updated to ensure compliance with the RMA, with qualifying matters regarding Wellington's widespread special character further analysed and documented instead of the Proposed District Plan as notified.
Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there is a valid risk in the future from ratepayers, who are unable to attain house insurances for council consented houses that have been built in known flood and tsunami prone areas, taking future class actions against the Council.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that transport infrastructure investment in the Eastern Suburbs is much needed.	Not specified.
Peter Nunns	196.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Peter Nunns	196.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the WCC needs to tackle the issue of water/wastewater/stormwater capacity and upgrades, especially as new housing development may cause some further pressures.	Seeks that appropriate resources are allocated to identifying water/wastewater/stormwater infrastructure capacity and upgrade costs.
Peter Nunns	196.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there is a need to ensure adequate in-house staffing to process resource and building consents quickly and at an affordable cost.	Seeks that appropriate resources are allocated to ensure resource consent and building consent processing is done as efficiently and transparently as possible, including good internal or external reviews.
Andrew Flanagan	198.9	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Andrew Flanagan	198.10	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Andrew Flanagan	198.11	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the original Draft Spatial Plan, prior to the Government relaxing planning rules for developers, which had a much more holistic and well-considered approach to densification across the entire city, and appeared to give consideration all potential affected parties i.e. building higher in urban centres, and gradually tapering off building height as distance from urban/suburb centre increases.	Supports the Draft Spatial Plan, with regard to its densification approach.
Angus Hodgson	200.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Angus Hodgson	200.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the submission put forward by Mt Cook Mobilised.	Supports the submission put forward by Mt Cook Mobilised.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers the role of tangata whenua of Aotearoa as kaitiaki over the land. Considers that Land use by Crown institutions such as Council has often been in conflict with the holistic nature of the Māori world view and has not allowed tangata whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga over their ancestral lands and to carry out customary activities.	Seeks that Council repairing injustices and work to ensure that the institutional barriers restricting tangata whenua from exercising their rights are removed and repaid.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.35	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.15	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	The submitter seeks that Council repairing injustices and work to ensure that the institutional barriers restricting tangata whenua from exercising their rights are removed and repaid. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because removing institutional barriers and repairing injustices will create better partnership between Council and tangata whenua. This will also support tino rangatiratanga.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington City Youth Council	201.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that well-functioning three-waters infrastructure has often evaded Wellington. Considers that the renewal and replacement of aging infrastructure with a growing population and the impacts of climate change considered is essential. Supports investment into three waters infrastructure for te mana o te wai and the health and wellbeing of Wellingtonians.	Seeks that investment is made to three waters infrastructure.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks reduction in cost and disruption through coordination of different sub-street-level utility replacement or renovation projects.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.4	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that council can facilitate City Centre accessibility by considering accessibility when making decisions around parking and drop off zones which can be part of ensuring CBD access to people with disabilities.	Seeks that council consider disability accessibility when making decisions around parking and drop off zones.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.5	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that non-car parking such as for E-Bike and e-scooter 'Locky Docks' should be incorporated into city design, incentivizing the use of alternative and green modes of transport.	Seeks that non-car parking be incorporated into city design.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.6	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Submitter emphasises the role of maintaining high efficiency, high volume and accessible public transport in the process of increasing urban space density.	Not specified.
Avryl Bramley	202.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the number of residents living in the city centre is capped and reduces over time.
Avryl Bramley	202.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks a whole of city and a suburb by suburb earthquake and Tsunami risk assessment around existing and proposed buildings to ensure that sufficient resources are likely to be available in the event of a major earthquake.
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Bidy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.6	Other / Other / Other	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the submission put forward by [Inferred] Newtown Residents Association	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Dougal and Libby List	207.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.
Craig Forrester	210.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.
Glen Scanlon	212.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that It is highly unlikely that the country will return to previous immigration levels in the near future and that contributions to growth from mount Victoria is small.	Seeks that the plan I made more flexible rather than having one-size-fits-all approach. [Inferred decision requested]
Robert Murray	213.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that cycle lanes should be able to be used by motorcycles.
Sam Stocker & Patricia Lee	216.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that far too much historic character areas have been left out of the Newtown and Berhampore areas which will destroy quality of life for their community. The land is not needed to help cope with Wellingtons increasing population. Land values will soar and will lead to unpayable rates bills and loss of sunlight access. New builds more than three storeys high are expensive and won't provide low-cost housing. Average residents will either be forced away or live in ghetto conditions. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council proactively work to make empty and unused land become housing or mixed commercial land rather than land banked.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.46	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission that seeks character precinct extensions in Newtown.	Allow
Sam Stocker & Patricia Lee	216.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that we live in a society that relies on cars and taking away street parking will make the historic area unliveable. The simple answer to making our neighbourhood more cycle and walking friendly is to lower the speed limit across the city. Considers that the neighbourhood needs to retain its carparks. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that residents parking in historic areas is protected.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.47	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission that seeks character precinct extensions in Newtown.	Allow
Jill Wilson	218.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the inner city lacks greenspace. Considers that the Green Network Plan should be a mandated component of green space and amenity planning for the city, with a transparent and integrated set of criteria, rather than being a non-statutory document. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Green Network Plan become a statutory component of the Proposed District Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Jill Wilson	218.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that green spaces in the City Centre should be designed for families and the people living in the area rather than lunchtime workers.	Seeks that green spaces in the City Centre should be designed for families and the people living in the area rather than lunchtime workers. [Inferred decision requested]
Tyers Stream Group	221.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the existing three waters infrastructure has suffered from lack of maintenance and renewals, and shows signs of significant failure, causing ongoing and significant contamination (water and air), erosion events and other problems in Tyers Stream. Opposes further development and intensification until significant upgrading of three waters capacity can be ensured and is put in place.	Land use intensification and all development (e.g., residential growth) to only occur if there is a fully functional and resilient Three Waters Infrastructure in place prior to development.
Tyers Stream Group	221.2	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the existing three waters infrastructure has suffered from lack of maintenance and renewals, and shows signs of significant failure, causing ongoing and significant contamination (water and air), erosion events and other problems in Tyers Stream. Opposes further development and intensification until significant upgrading of three waters capacity can be ensured and is put in place.	Seeks no urban intensification in the Tyers Stream catchment until the Three Waters Infrastructure has the capacity, the upgrades, the resilience, and appropriate monitoring and maintenance to manage the growth, without causing damage to, and contamination of the stream, the catchment's biodiversity, and its airshed.
Tyers Stream Group	221.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks appropriate monitoring and maintenance of infrastructure to ensure retention of capacity, necessary upgrades, resilience, and avoidance of adverse environmental effects.
Tyers Stream Group	221.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	TSG has been in contact with other community bodies which have explained how they can assist in development and provision of walking access, but only where this can be identified and connected through Council action. At present, the Tyers Stream Reserve is not adequately connected to residential Khandallah.	Seeks that public access to, along and within Tyers Stream Reserve be developed by WCC in line with its policies on public access.
Richard W Keller	232.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Opposes the construction of a second vehicle tunnel.
Richard W Keller	232.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that "Lets Get Wellington Moving" is renamed to "Lets get Wellington Serious About Climate Change".
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the maximum height in the residential area of Khandallah should be 11m	Amend the height in the mapping to 11m in Khandallah.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.3	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the maximum height in Khandallah Village should be 14m	Amend the height in the mapping to 14m in Khandallah Village.
Regan Dooley	239.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Council binds land use and transport closer together to they create co-benefits and don't undermine each other.
Regan Dooley	239.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Supports better resourcing for Council Officers related to the submission points.	Seeks better resourcing for Council officers.
Alan Fairless	242.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the submission for LIVE Wellington.	Supports the submission of LIVE Wellington. [See Submission 155 - LIVE Wellington].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Alan Fairless	242.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that innovative models for public and private investment working together are needed to rapidly develop Wellington's large areas of underutilised land into high quality housing, greenspace, and small business facilities. Current proposals only develop 14% of rezoned areas. LIVE Wellington want to see partnerships that will develop at least 50% of underutilised land in the next ten years.	Seeks that the District Plan identify key potential actors and development partnerships to achieve an increased rate of development on underutilised land.
Richard Norman	247.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that greater housing density should not be at the expense of existing wooden housing, which is proven to be earthquake resistant.	Seeks that Council maps areas of the central city which are underdeveloped, with a focus on Te Aro and major roads through Newtown to identify where higher apartments could be built without destroying or shading wooden heritage.
Richard Norman	247.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Requests that the commissioners are mindful that the greenest buildings are those that are already built, and that using wood is less carbon intensive than using steel or concrete. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that wholesale rezoning is replaced with research and evidence-based analysis of city precincts and neighbourhoods, and the upzoning in the Proposed District Plan is given a more considered investigation and consideration of alternatives for creating affordable housing.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.37	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials. Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow
Richard Norman	247.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that WCC review it's capital rating system and its contribution to underdevelopment of the city, and investigate how rated based on unimproved land values could make more development land available.
Richard Norman	247.4	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that WCC review whether it needs a specialist development agency.
Richard Norman	247.5	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the highest level of the terrace has buildings which provide a rare reminder of 19th century Wellington. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that WCC include advice from Heritage New Zealand with regards to large buildings at the highest levels of The Terrace.
Richard Norman	247.6	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that WCC map in detail the impacts of proposed rezoning on the most affected localities and neighbourhoods about how housing can be increased without blighting large blocks of pre 1930s houses.
Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that any statement made by the Council in respect of the Cemetery's history is fully and properly researched by qualified people and that such research is done in consultation with the Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery.
Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery are party to any change of status that might later be proposed to the listing in the Proposed District Plan.
Cherie Jacobson	251.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Supports the Wellington Heritage Professionals group submission.	Seeks that the table of specific submission points on the Proposed District Plan in the Wellington Heritage Professionals group submission are submitted.
Friends of Khandallah	252.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that large scale residential will lead to erosion of commercial by residential. Theoretical planning from other cities is not necessarily good for Khandallah. Commercial areas need to be protected in Khandallah for resilience and emergencies. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the height limits in the Khandallah local centre zone in the operative district plan are amended from 12m to 8m.
Generation Zero Inc	254.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the Proposed District Plan needs to create space for different housing typologies, such as papakāinga, to be developed with ease. The rules and regulations of the PDP must be relevant, applicable, and adaptable, to different types of housing. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Generation Zero Inc	254.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that more analysis that complies with section 77L is required. Considers that applying Character Precincts within the Medium Density Residential Zone WCC has not provided a section 32 analysis that complies with section 77L of the RMA. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that more information is provided with respect to the Character Precincts is undertaken that complies with the requirements of section 77K and 77L of the Resource Management Act 1991. [inferred decision requested]
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.65	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Kāinga Ora supports further assessment is required if Character Precincts/Overlays are to remain in the District Plan.	Allow
Generation Zero Inc	254.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that at the time of preparing this submission, the impact assessment had not yet been made publicly available. The section 32 report notes that at the time of publishing, the requisite detailed assessment has not yet been undertaken and will be published in approximately August 2022. Submitter was unable to comment on the adequacy of the impact assessment. [see original submission]	Seeks the ability to make a further submission point on the assessment on the impacts of limiting development capacity through qualifying matters, when the assessment is available. [inferred decision requested]
Jim & Christine Seymour	262.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that current infrastructure cannot cope with significant increases in load. Considers how well the current power network will cope with intensification. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that infrastructure - potable and sewer networks in particular - are upgraded before denser housing is implemented.
Jim & Christine Seymour	262.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers the lack of play areas for young children and sporting facilities for older children.	Seeks the addition of green spaces.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks that the Council undertake a suburb specific response to assessing the ability of Infrastructure to accommodate impacts on wastewater, water supply and storm water,
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks planting around natural water courses and on steep contours to maintain the steep hillsides under severe weather events.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks protection of Middleton Road.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks protection of the Porirua Stream.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks protection of the Te Awarua-o-Porirua Harbour.
Marilyn Powell	281.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that picnickers enjoy sitting on the grass and looking out at the view there. The area could have park benches added for visitors to rest on when walking the area and for the existing government workers who currently lunch there to use.	Seeks that Wellington City Council purchase the green space area at 107 Hill Street and convert it to a public recreation area.
Steve Dunn	288.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that to do density well there needs to be green infrastructure that requires adequate space in urban planning. Considers that there are studies that demonstrate the value of open space to health.	Amend the plan to include the Council's Green Network Plan as an enforceable key document for greening Wellington.
Steve Dunn	288.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the provision of new public space and well-designed streets is critical as the central city intensifies to ensure the health and wellbeing of the new residents and should have adequate protection for sunlight access and protect from building development or shading.	Seeks that the plan identify open spaces in the City Centre to recognise the need for this green infrastructure along with the Council's Green Network Plan.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Steve Dunn	288.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>Considers that the provision of new public space and well-designed streets is critical as the central city intensifies to ensure the health and wellbeing of the new residents and should have adequate protection for sunlight access and protect from building development or shading.</p> <p>Considers that the current provision under the Lambton Harbour plan allows buildings for a Fale Malae on Frank Kitts Park if allowed under a resource consent application. This area has always been open space and a building should be at the transitional building site between Te Papa and Waitangi Park.</p>	Seeks that Frank Kitts Park and Waitangi Park are vested as reserves under the Reserves Act.
Priscilla Williams	293.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that housing intensification should be targeted to brownfield areas such as Adelaide Road, which has good transport links.	Seeks that housing intensification should be targeted to brownfield areas such as Adelaide Road.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.6	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Tawa Community Board	294.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that structure plans are a key tool to encourage larger footprint development or redevelopment.</p> <p>Wishes to ensure that infrastructure is sufficient for the planned more intensive development.</p> <p>Supports encouragement of the redevelopment of seismic limited structures.</p> <p>Ensure the inclusion of adequate community facilities including green spaces, connectivity and laneways.</p> <p>Ensure there is wider scale area planning for climate change effects - minimum floor heights, flood flow zones, and Porirua stream development setbacks.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that a Structure Plan is developed for the Tawa CBD to sit alongside the plan that provides a more holistic community and business development.
Tawa Community Board	294.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that passing the baton to GWRC in providing the minimum setback measure does not address the problems caused by the intersection between GWRC and WCC responsibilities in this transitional space along the stream edge.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan includes more stringent measures to provide greater protection against increased erosion events along the Porirua Stream.
Matthew Plummer	300.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Roland Sapsford	305.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports Live Wellington's submission. [refer to submission 154]
Roland Sapsford	305.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports Aro Valley Community Council Inc's submission. [refer to submission 87]
Roland Sapsford	305.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[no specific reasons - refer to original submission]	Seeks that a community based planning exercise be undertaken with reference to intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls, and that this be completed before significant infrastructure investment.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.52	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area.</p> <p>Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.</p>	Allow
Roland Sapsford	305.4	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.
Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the impacts of COVID, migration and remote working should be factored into the council's projections of 50,000 to 80,000 population growth over the next 30 years.	Seeks that the Council's population growth projections be re-assessed.
oOh!Media Street Furniture New Zealand Limited	316.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Supports the submission made by Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa. [Refer to submission 284]
Bruce Crothers	319.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the Council needs to respond to the climate emergency, as it is indeed an emergency. Radical change is required.	Seeks that Council responds to the climate emergency.
Bruce Crothers	319.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that responding to biodiversity collapse and the climate emergency will require a deliberate reduction in economic activity, less cars, less planes, energy consumption reductions by using less heating and cooling, less wasteful consumption and a return to values of the past that put humans above money.	Seeks reductions in economic activity, energy consumption and wasteful consumption.
Hilary Watson	321.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Hilary Watson	321.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports Newtown Residential Association's submission on the topic of extending Character Precincts to houses bordering on Carrara Park.	Supports Newtown Residential Association's submission. [refer to submission 440]
Hilary Watson	321.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that submissions from the public on the Spatial Plan and the District Plan, and the resulting professional advice to Councillors made by Council Officers was disregarded by just over half of councillors.	Not specified.
Hilary Watson	321.4	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan, as it shows how 2000 dwellings can be fitted in around the central spine of Newtown by making use of under-utilised land and going up to six stories.	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan.
Richard Murcott	322.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Richard Murcott	322.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that Council should use facts and evidence-based decision-making rather than ideology to drive the PDP.	Not specified.
Richard Murcott	322.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that new developments in the Thorndon area require resource consents, with notification clauses that provide for the community and neighbours to have a say on new developments.
Tawa Residents Association	328.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports the Tawa Community Board's submission. [refer to submission 294]
Tawa Residents Association	328.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports the Tawa Business Group's submission. [refer to submission 107]
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that all Community Emergency Hubs should have water tanks on site.	Not specified.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that all parks have water tanks on site unless they are within the tsunami hazard zone.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.4	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Apartments outside the tsunami zone need to have provision for water tanks in their grounds, in their basements, or in a designated separate storage area within the building. For apartments within the tsunami zone, indoor water storage areas need to be made available on level 5 and above. This is because anyone living below level 5 will have been asked to evacuate. People living above level 5 may be stranded for some time.	Seeks that multi-unit dwellings have provisions for water tanks in their grounds, basements, or in designated separate storage areas within their building.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.5	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that water tanks be required for all social housing complexes, particularly for new-builds.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.6	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that apartment blocks should designate an area for humanure collection, or a long drop. Typically, this could be a wheelie bin and a supply of dry carbon matter, e.g. sawdust, used to cover each layer of contents. The wheelie bin would need to be stored for 6 months before it is safe to be disposed of as compost. The Body Corporate needs to determine how this will be done in each apartment complex, and communicate this to residents.	Seeks that apartments blocks be required to designate an area for humanure collection, or a long drop.
Kerry Finnigan	336.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.33	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts.	Allow
Kerry Finnigan	336.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports submission 275. [Refer to submission 275]
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.34	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts.	Allow
Property Council New Zealand	338.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that a whole-of-system approach should be adopted to make strides towards reducing emissions, rather than solely focusing efforts on the elimination of private vehicles. The Golden Mile design consultation earlier this year proposed up to 300 carparks being removed, with final numbers potentially changing. Removing private vehicle use directly contradicts to the Government's commitment towards EVs. The whole-of-system plan should consider a space for private vehicles (moving towards EV), a freight and transport movement plan, and should encourage sustainable designs within the building sector. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a whole-of-system approach be adopted to make strides towards reducing emissions.
Property Council New Zealand	338.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that congestion charging could support the upkeep of connections and infrastructure and support the development of EV charging stations around the city. This would align with the Government and the Council's policies to reduce total net emissions. The introduction of congestion charging should be ringfenced towards the upkeep of connections, infrastructure and EV charging stations around Wellington. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that congestion charging be implemented to support the development of EV charging stations around the city.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.202	General / Other / Other / Other	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, The RVA considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provisions.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.202	General / Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provisions.
Tina Reid	341.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Support the majority of the Mt Cook area as high density would destroy the pre-1930 character of the area, and believe that intensification of housing can happen in much more harmonious ways.	Supports the Mt Cook Mobilised submission. [Refer to submission 331]
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that resource consents' requirements are not properly enforced and offers should be supported and trained to ensure no mistakes are made that require retrospective consents and administrative tasks to be undertaken in order to get the paperwork in line.	Seeks that resource consents are properly enforced.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that another density measure based on people, or separate dwellings per hectare and not number of storeys per building should be included in the PDP.	Seeks that a new density measurement based on people per hectare be included.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that low-speed and low-traffic improvements would allow greater connections with neighbours in most suburbs.	Not specified.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.4	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the maintenance of redevelopment of character houses should be financially supported. Reworking existing buildings has been shown to be more climate-friendly than construction of entirely new structures.	Seeks that renovation activities for character houses be financially supported.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.5	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that a new scheme needs to be designed that utilises the full scope of grounds available in this case for exemption from NPS height provisions. In order to allow proper consideration of an alternative scheme, the Council needs to complete a design for that new scheme in close consultation with affected stakeholders, and complete a draft evaluation report in support of it. This will preferably be carried out on an explicit co-design basis. It needs to be prepared well in advance of any consultation on proposed revisions to the district plan as it would be fundamental to the shaping of such changes. [Refer to original submission, including Appendix 1]	Seeks that a new NPS height exemption scheme be designed for Mount Victoria, as outlined in Appendix 1. [Refer to original submission and Appendix 1]
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.6	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that new height limits could be introduced incrementally. While the NPS requires sufficient development capacity to be identified for the coming 30 years, it does not require that all of this be made available immediately. Only what is required in the next 3 years needs to be available at any one time. So instead of releasing all the capacity at once, through changing height limits across the suburb overnight, the capacity can be released in blocks. As one block is nearly used up, more can be made available as there is evidence of need. Once there development is channelled to priority areas, the immediate need for new dwellings can be catered to without having to incur costs through sacrificing amenity values before it is clear there is a need for this.	Seeks that new height limits be released and enforced incrementally.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.97	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington, noting that NPSUD capacity requirements are minimums not targets.	Disallow
Carolyn Stephens	344.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the plan needs to identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls.	Seeks that community-based planning for intensification be identified to increase housing supply in areas subject to revised demolition controls.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.50	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Ryman Healthcare Limited	346.1	Other / Other / Other	Support in part	Supports the Retirement Village Association of New Zealand's' submission on the provisions applicable to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Supports the Retirement Village Association of New Zealand's' submission. [refer to submission 350]
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Support	Retain Ngā Hononga i Waenga i Ngā Paparanga Mokowā - Relationships Between Spatial Layers as notified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers it appropriate to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.3) and give effect to the RMA	Seeks that any changes through the process that require S32AA evaluation should include matters in Policy FW.3 as appropriate.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.2	Other / Other / Other	Support in part	Supports s32 reports.	Not Specified.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers it appropriate to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.3, FW.4, 55 and UD.3) and give effect to the RMA.	Seeks that any changes through the process that require S32AA evaluation should include matters in Policy 55 as appropriate, for any new FUS or any change to relevant residential zones, commercial, industrial or mixed-use zones.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers it appropriate to make decisions based on the best available information and mātauranga Māori, upholding Māori data sovereignty and requiring Māori data and mātauranga Māori to be interpreted within Te Ao Māori.	Seeks to ensure that where Māori data is used, sovereignty is upheld and data is interpreted within Te Ao Māori.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that to ensure planners and decision makers understand the key natural character values when assessing the potential effects of an activity, and therefore support the protection of natural character, we request that the 2016 Boffa Miskell natural character assessment report is made public.	Seeks to make the 2016 Boffa Miskell natural character assessment report publicly available alongside the PDP.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that height limits on apartment blocks should not have exceptions. Notes that these height limits are most likely specified for reasons of safety in steep valleyed and severe earthquake-prone zones; to prevent domination of the city and hills around the harbour by manmade structures; and probably for practical infrastructure reasons. Such reasons should be adhered to for the necessary purposes they were put in place, with no exceptions.	Seeks that height limits be strictly enforced.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.158	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Sarah Walker	367.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that a derelict building on the Terrace could be used for apartments as it will have good access to amenities without encroaching on existing homes.	Seeks that a derelict building on the Terrace is used for apartments. [Inferred decision requested]
Elizabeth Nagel	368.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Supports the Live Wellington submission.	Not specified.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.207	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Inferred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Elizabeth Nagel	368.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the plan needs to identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls.	Seeks that community-based planning for intensification be identified to increase housing supply in areas subject to revised demolition controls.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.48	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that provisions of food sources and flight paths for Wellington's birds is an important aspect of Wellington's natural environment.	Seeks that provisions be made in the District Plan to provide for food source and flight paths of local birds. [Inferred decision requested]
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	The Council's previous plantings of kowhai and pōhutukawa in the city to support the indigenous bird life is applauded. The significant increase in indigenous birdlife in the city adds to its uniqueness and character.	Not specified.
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the timing and location of development in the city will be a relevant factor in meeting the Atakura - First to Zero emission reduction targets of 57% by 2030 and to net zero by 2050. Emissions from the construction industry have increased by 66 percent in the decade from 2007 - 2017. As well as the carbon footprint of the raw materials used in construction, we need to reduce locked-in or embodied carbon. The large scale demolition of existing homes will have a negative impact on any carbon reduction goals. It is considered that more than half of upfront embodied carbon emissions captured in a building's sub-structure, frame, upper floors and roof, the business case for refurbishing is growing. On average, the carbon footprint of a refurbished building is half that of a newly built replacement building. The concept of "novelty of new" needs to be rethought.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.36	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials. Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.4	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there currently is sufficient development capacity and that further development capacity can and should be encouraged in existing underutilised brownfields - such Kent Terrace, Cambridge Terrace, south end of Taranaki St and the north end of Adelaide Road. The increased development along this transport spine and in walking distance to the CBD will meet a number of objectives of the Proposed District Plan	Seeks that further development capacity be encouraged in existing underutilised brownfields, such Kent Terrace, Cambridge Terrace, the south end of Taranaki St and the north end of Adelaide Road.
Waka Kotahi	370.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Oppose use of 'access allotment' as it is redundant as it duplicates definition of access lot and access strip.	Seeks any consequential changes in the plan to convert "Access Allotment" to "Access Lot".
Waka Kotahi	370.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Oppose use of 'access allotment' as it is redundant as it duplicates definition of access lot and access strip.	Seeks any consequential changes in the plan to change "access strip" to "access lot".
Waka Kotahi	370.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that The operative district plan does not contain provisions to manage noise and vibration effects to new noise sensitive activities established alongside state highway. where there is intensification of noise sensitive activities proposed which has immediate legal effect (such as in HRZ and MRZ zones) the related provisions in the NOISE chapter to manage the effects should also have immediate legal effect (e.g rules in Noise-R3). Is concerned about the risk of intensification occurring alongside state highways which is not designed to appropriately mitigate noise and vibration effects in the existing environment, and the adverse human health and nuisance effects to occupants as a result	Seek that Noise R3 rules have immediate legal effect [Inferred decision requested].
Jane Szentivanyi	376.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that intensification and density must be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity and heritage of the City. Density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that density be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity and heritage of the City.
Jane Szentivanyi	376.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that Moir Street should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites, given it is designated as a heritage area by Boffa Miskell. Boffa Miskell's recommendation for all character areas is a 5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for any zone adjoining a character area (let alone allowing 28m high buildings). This is based on their extensive studies to maintain acceptable hours of sunlight access to existing buildings, but also compromising to still allow for development to take place. Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. The street is unique, it has a small and diverse community, as well as many historical and cultural qualities that must be preserved from CCZ standards. No other MDRZ has as many character and heritage factors as Moir Street. This means that the specific changes requested in relation avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir St do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans. Development as currently proposed in the draft district plan would have a significant adverse effect on the character, heritage and amenity of houses on both sides of Moir St. You simply cannot mitigate the impacts of buildings which are up to 28.5m tall on a heritage / character area consisting of low lying houses [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the character, heritage value and sunlight access of Moir Street be protected from the adverse effects of nearby City Centre Zoning standards.
Jane Szentivanyi	376.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].
Wellington Civic Trust	388.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 should be completed. The Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 was intended to be Stage One of a three-stage process. Stage two was to prepare detailed plans for each of the sub-areas, and Stage three was an implementation and monitoring stage. The current Framework is thus no more than a framework, as has been pointed out by the Environment Court.	Seeks that the Council completes the unfinished work on the Wellington Waterfront Framework so that it provides greater detail for the future of the distinctive areas of the waterfront.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the extensive opportunities for Taranaki Whānui in Strathmore, that Taranaki Whānui would like opportunities of engagement. [see original submission].	Seeks the opportunity to engage with Council and stakeholders regarding future regeneration opportunities in Strathmore.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.2	Other / Other / Other	Oppose in part	Considers that social and cultural wellbeing has not been adequately provided for within the Proposed District Plan. The planning framework that has focused on delivering a certain type of suburban and rural development – typically one dwelling per site with no communal buildings/outdoor areas, does not fit with more traditional forms of village living such as Papakāinga where tikanga Māori can be practiced. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.46	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Rezone	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and the proposed zoning of the prison land. This is an important part of Wellington's current green space, which Wellington Civic Trust has had a long interest and involvement in, and the overlays and zoning are appropriate.	Disallow
Andy Foster	FS86.4	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers it is important that papakainga are allowed for. Considers that there is a problem with Taranaki Whānui's submission is that it is completely open ended about definition, location, size, design, height – and therefore potential impacts. Considers that it is quite reasonable that papakainga be allowed in areas where that level of development is anticipated. For example in residential areas allowing 11 metre heights, and the appropriate level of site coverage. That does not apply in ridgelines, special amenity areas, or open space. For Watts Peninsula this again means that a papakainga could well be a result of a master planning exercise, but it would come with some certainty about location, scale etc. Supports the request in part as it applies to zones where housing development of equivalent scale, height, site coverage is expected. For clarity that excludes open space and recreation zones and limits scale in rural areas. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.2]	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Andy Foster	FS86.14	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whānui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.20]</p>	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that with any decisions made in respect of landholdings over which Taranaki Whānui have an interest in, that Taranaki Whānui are consulted first so as to ensure our interests are given due consideration as required under the RMA and in line with their MOU with Council.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that any decisions made in respect of landholdings over which Taranaki Whānui have an interest in, that Taranaki Whānui are consulted first.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.1	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.12	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, with its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.12	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</p> <p>Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.</p>	Disallow
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.4	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that the success of the Proposed District Plan for Taranaki Whānui will be realised through high standards of implementation and ability to operationalise the provisions well. It is expected that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tākai Here and Tūpiki Ora will enable resourcing for Taranaki Whānui partnership opportunities with Wellington City Council. - Cultural Capability Programmes will be developed with Taranaki Whānui for successful implementation. 	Not specified.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Seeks that the interest of the submitter in Shelly Bay is given recognition.</p>	Seeks that the planning framework as set out in the consented Shelly Bay Masterplan and Design Guide is adopted as the default planning settings for the landholdings within the scope of the granted consents.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.2	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.2	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.37	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.6	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that the height control area being amended to 27m appropriate, as it is the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent.</p> <p>Submitter seeks that that the planning framework as set out in the consented Shelly Bay Masterplan and Design Guide is adopted as the default planning settings for the landholdings within the scope of the granted consents. Notes that the granted resource consent is currently being implemented on site.</p>	<p>Seeks that any other such amendments that are most appropriate to address increasing permitted heights for Shelly Bay Taikuru. [Inferred decision requested]</p>
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.3	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.</p>
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.2	General/ Other/ Other/ Other	Oppose	<p>The current Operative District Plan allows for heights of 11 metres or less in the suburban centre area, and zero (buildings not expected at all) in Open Space B land.</p> <p>The Wellington Company—Taranaki Whānui development at Shelly Bay was enabled by the High Court through the HASHA – (“Special Housing Areas”) agreement with intensive scale and impact on the District Plan saying that the default height limits in all SHAs anywhere were 27 metres. We believe that the legislation was completely mis-interpreted. We understand that the granting of this modification in accordance with Taranaki Whānui’s request would mean that any agreed development would for the life of the District Plan as of right be enabled up to 27 metres.</p> <p>A height limit of 27 metres is, in this context, completely inappropriate and antithetical to Open Space values. In addition, the height limit of 27 metres should not be viewed in isolation. Buildings up to a height of 27 metres will have a corresponding increase in local traffic, use of infrastructure and amenities, such that significant investment would be required in relation to the infrastructure before such buildings could be supported. The feasibility of undertaking such upgrades should be considered before any changes to the height limits are made.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.3	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.38	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for Mount Victoria	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for Mount Victoria
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.54	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for other old suburbs (such as Thorndon and Mount Cook etc.).	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for other old suburbs (such as Thorndon and Mount Cook etc.).
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the heritage scheduling of additional sites identified by Historic Places Wellington.	Seeks that the Heritage Buildings identified by the Historic Places Wellington submission are listed in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas. (Historic Places Wellington Submission 182).

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that any specific sites or buildings that the Council considers to be worthy of protection to be assessed on a site-by-site basis to determine if it meets the definition of historic heritage as set out in s6 of the RMA and propose that those sites or buildings are considered for scheduling in the PDP, including any buildings that the Council considers having historic heritage values pre-1930s and should be protected.
Hilary Watson	FS74.25	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the proposal to add Town Centres - ie Newtown, Miramar and Tawa - to the Centres hierarchy is an unnecessary change. There is enough realisable capacity for development even if the PDP is modified to further reduce walking catchments and increase character precincts. Overzoning has many negative effects on the urban environment.	Disallow
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone. 6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details]. 7. Any consequential updates to maps.
Newtown Residents' Association	FS63.2	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the proposal to add Town Centres - ie Newtown, Miramar and Tawa - to the Centres hierarchy is an unnecessary change. As outlined in the submission appendix of Kāinga Ora's original submission, the primary purpose seems to be to justify increasing the walking catchments and increasing permitting building heights up to 8 storeys. Newtown Residents' Association original submission (#440) outlines that there is enough realisable capacity for development even if the PDP is modified to further reduce walking catchments and increase character precincts. The rationale for the Kainga Ora submission is that maximising development is desirable and leads to a "well functioning urban environment". We argue that zoning for vastly more development than will be realised in the foreseeable future is counter productive and has many negative effects on the urban environment. [Inferred reference to submission 391.2]	Disallow
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.3	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Submitter opposes new Town Centre Zone to be added to Newtown including corresponding objectives.	Disallow
Hilary Watson	FS74.26	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchments in PDP are already too large - reducing them can still provide predicted development capacity. They should be reduced to avoid negative effects on the community.	Disallow
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.9	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Considers it is not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington. Seeks to retain hierarchy of centres and definition of Local Centres as notified.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.62	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.17	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that SNAs are applied to all zones where relevant criteria are met.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone. 6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details]. 7. Any consequential updates to maps.
Newtown Residents' Association	FS63.3	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Newtown Residents' Association submit that the walkable catchments in the PDP are certainly adequate to allow more than enough realisable development capacity, and could be reduced further. Zoning for more development than needed has unintended negative consequences. [Inferred reference to submission 391.3]	Disallow
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.10	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Considers it is not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington. Seeks to retain hierarchy of centres and definition of Local Centres as notified.	Disallow
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.63	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington.	Disallow
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.18	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Murray Pillar	393.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Boffa Miskell 2019 report.	Seeks to amend the character precincts to reflect the area recommended in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.76	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Boffa Miskell - adoption Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all Add Character Precincts to areas missed 10min walkable catchment Character precincts and rules Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M. Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings	Allow
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].
Stephen Minto	395.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the assumption of undersupply of housing driving housing prices up and fixing this problem by increasing the supply of houses to drive down prices is false and will not deliver affordable housing. The real problem is not a housing supply shortage but excessive demand for the usage of housing for purposes other than long-term residence. This includes: short-term rentals for tourists e.g. Airbnb and holidays; Overseas students; High pre-Covid immigration; Superannuation/Income investments; and "build to rent". The private market, with its economic imperative to maximise profit, simply does not work to set prices by using demand and supply. These reasons mean that intensification does not result in affordable housing. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.4	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that in Inner City areas, expensive new high rise buildings will not provide resident living space but be used for short term rental. Considers that this will not provide affordable housing which should be the focus of Council. Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Stephen Minto	395.2	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that under the Local Government Act 2002, section 10.1, the purpose of Council is to 'enable democratic local decision making'. Granting permission to developers to bully build up to six-stories without a right of complaint is not in alignment with promoting democracy and an abdication to an elite, and often wealthy few. Changes to intensification in the District Plan will not deliver affordable housing and therefore Council will be in breach of its purpose to promote social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.5	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that in Inner City areas, expensive new high rise buildings will not provide resident living space but be used for short term rental. Considers that this will not provide affordable housing which should be the focus of Council. Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
David Cadman	398.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
David Cadman	398.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
David Cadman	398.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Expresses concern that 60% of the proposed district plan is notified using ISPP, rendering it unappealable.</p> <p>Considers that it is unclear how progressing the Natural Hazards chapter through the ISPP will give effect to one of the mandatory outcomes, and therefore questions why the entire chapter is being progressed through ISPP.</p> <p>Considers that it is unclear how the hearing process will work for chapters that are partly processed through Schedule 1 and partly through the ISPP.</p> <p>Considers that decisions from the ISPP cannot be appealed which significantly limits the opportunity for the provisions to be considered, which could have significant ramifications particularly for district-wide provisions and overlays such as those mentioned above.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	The submitter seeks that the matters relating to notification under the ISPP is appropriately rectified to ensure that only chapters/provisions which qualify to be notified under the ISPP are notified under the ISPP, and everything else is notified under Schedule 1.
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow
Cheryl Robilliard	409.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks the relief requested by the Newtown Residents' Association with respect to sunlight protection to parks and reserves.
Cheryl Robilliard	409.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks the relief requested by submitter Paul Forrest with respect to ecosystems in the context of densification and green corridors and biodiversity within the inner city and inner city suburbs Mt Victoria and Newtown.
Cheryl Robilliard	409.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Amend the plan to include the Wellington City Council Green Network Plan as an enforceable key document for greening Wellington.
Cheryl Robilliard	409.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Amend the Wellington City Council Green Network Plan to include Newtown and Mount Victoria.
Emma Osborne	410.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.
Emma Osborne	410.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Emma Osborne	410.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	<p>Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>Considers that local and overseas research has shown that heritage contributes to positive economic, environmental, social, and cultural wellbeing outcomes.</p> <p>Considers that Seville, Graz and Copenhagen are good examples of cities that have strong heritage values.</p>	Not specified
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that heritage and character can make a significant contribution to the city's climate change goals by reducing emissions and waste through sustainable resource use and mitigating the effects of climate change through building community cohesion and resilience.	Not specified
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that an approach where consent fees are fixed and payable upfront is an approach used in other places which NZ is frequently compared to such as Victoria and the United Kingdom. In these places the cost of planning permission is substantially lower than it is in New Zealand.	Seeks that the Council investigate making resource consent fees fixed and payable up front, depending on the cost of the activities being applied for.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Council continue its program of waiving resource consent fees for heritage items as an incentive to keep places in sustainable use.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.6	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the lack of public consultation throughout the planning process combined with flawed analysis, particularly around character areas, has resulted in a schedule that does not adequately protect historic heritage nor reflect what Wellingtonians value.	Not specified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.7	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the methodology that has been used for selecting potential new places to add to the schedule is unclear. Considers that the section 32 analysis has limited information about the methodology used. States there is no heritage study listed in the technical assessments, reports and background content informing the Proposed District Plan. Considers that the work undertaken to review the schedule outlined in the relevant section 32 analysis report is ad hoc in nature, is not indicative of the expected methodology for a professional heritage study.	Not specified
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.8	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the Council has not adequately sought the views of the community on historic heritage in the development of the PDP. The submitter notes that the section 32 report notes engagement with owners, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Thorndon and Mt Victoria heritage groups on proposed new heritage listings but not with the general public. Considers that there was no awareness campaign activity commonly undertaken by TAs occurring, such as social media posts, newsletter content, or press releases, for example. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.9	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that as the submissions on the draft district plan also included nominations for heritage listings that this is indicative of a lack of public engagement.	Not specified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.10	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that much of the character areas are likely to meet the threshold for scheduling as historic heritage for their historical and physical significance.	Seeks that the Council apply the Greater Wellington Regional Council 'Guide to historic heritage identification' to assess the value of the character areas.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.10	Other / Other / Other	Support	The further submitter supports the point that there are significant weaknesses in the Council's process and their proposal lacks evidence - including the proposed listings in SCHED1. The further submitter supports this view and have also been disappointed with the Council's lack of diligence and rigor applied to justifying the original submitters proposal. The RMA sets clear requirements in s32 Clause 1(c) that the evaluation must contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal. This requirement has not been met by the Council's evaluation. [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow / Seeks that the Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.11	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the Pre-1930s character area Boffa Miskell review 2019 was based on a flawed analysis character areas. Considers that the review elevated original built form over pre-1930s character as described in the operative district plan.	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.12	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that there is a lack of evidence indicating that the existing heritage and character provisions in the District Plan are affecting the housing market in Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that the Council's 2019 HBA does not include any analysis of the impacts of heritage and character provisions on the housing market in Wellington.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.13	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Council to lobby the government to improve resource consent processes to make them more cost effective and less risky.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.14	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that historically this is how housing shortages have been solved in New Zealand and that affordable and good quality housing has only been delivered in Aotearoa/NZ when the government has been a significant player in the housing market - either through cheap mortgage finance or by building dwellings itself.	Seeks that the Council continue to invest in social housing and lobby central Government to provide it.
VicLabour	414.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that small groups of people have had a disproportionate influence on Council planning processes, particularly homeowners with a vested interest in slowing change to our urban form.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Seeks that the Council centres the needs of those worst affected by the realities and locked-in future challenges for the status quo.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>
VicLabour	414.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supportive of Council taking a partnership approach within a Te Tiriti framework, especially in relation to sites and areas of significance to Māori.	Not specified.
VicLabour	414.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there is a saturation of colonial/settler monuments in the city, and mana whenua should be partnered with and empowered to shape the future of the city. Considers that as part of this Council should change current design rather than only taking a Te Tiriti approach for future developments.	Seeks that mana whenua are partnered with and empowered to shape the future of the city and as part of this council should change current design rather than only taking a Te Tiriti approach for future developments.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.117	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	The submitter seeks that mana whenua are partnered with and empowered to shape the future of the city and as part of this council should change current design rather than only taking a Te Tiriti approach for future developments. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because mana whenua should be empowered to achieve their aspirations for Te Whanganui a Tara.	Allow
VicLabour	414.4	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Supported the introduction of rent controls for council tenants on low incomes until at least Income related rent subsidy is realised, wages go up substantially or inflation is under control	Seeks that a rent to buy scheme, perhaps in partnership with central government is introduced. [Inferred decision requested]
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.29	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
VicLabour	414.5	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that land be made available for infrastructure corridors, particularly the proposed MRT Southern spine corridor making sure that housing, transport, and other uses are well catered for.
VicLabour	414.6	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the district plan does not go far enough to address climate change and that meeting the challenge presented by climate change must be a key focus through the district plan. [see original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the district plan be amended to create a legal obligation for carbon emissions to be controlled and budgeted in a time-bound way within wellington city.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.31	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>The further submitter agrees that making changes to a heritage listed building is a very fraught, uncertain, and costly process. There is also risk that regimes change and become more restrictive in the future at further cost to property owners.</p> <p>The further submitter does not believe the community values associated with the heritage of the Gordon Wilson Flats (which the further submitter thinks are low) outweigh the costs of protection. The Council should evaluate the listing under s32 of the RMA and quantify the costs and benefits to inform their decisions.</p> <p>While the University is a large enough organisation to employ lawyers and team to fight its own battles, private home owners are simply not equipped with the resources to challenge heritage process. The further submitter discusses this issue in terms of the power imbalance and incentives of the Council in sections of their submission "The Council is naturally incentivised to over-provide Heritage protection" and "There is a significant power imbalance between the Council and isolated homeowners".</p> <p>[See original further submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that Item 299 (Gordon Wilson Flats) is removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings (unless the Council can demonstrate a net benefit to retaining it in the schedule)</p> <p>The Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.</p> <p>The Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance the effect imposed by heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers Wellington, like many cities is under pressure from rapid growth and demographic changes, 'crumbling' and deficient infrastructure, supply and affordability housing issues for renters and first-time home buyers, societal demand for greater sustainability considerations, and resilience to climate change just to name a few.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	Not specified.
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.14	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that the Council should refer to guidance provided by the Ministry for the Environment, the NZ Treasury, the RMA and the Office of Best Practice Regulation in Australia. Guidance should be reviewed when undertaking evaluations of the impacts of proposed policies and changes on community value, cost-benefit analysis and non-use and community values. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	<p>Seeks that Council use guidance from the Ministry for the Environment, the NZ Treasury, the RMA and the Office of Best Practice Regulation in Australia to better evaluate the impacts of Heritage listings.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.15	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers the listing of 28 Robieson Street on the heritage schedule should proceed through a Schedule 1 process, rather than the ISPP [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]</p>	<p>Seeks that the listing of 28 Robieson Street on the heritage schedule should proceed through a Schedule 1 process, rather than the ISPP [Inferred decision requested]</p>
Ian Attwood	FS16.6	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>Absence of accountability and fair presentation of evidence through denying a right of appeal through applying the ISPP instead of the RMA process.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.</p>
Sophie Kahn	FS76.5	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>The submitter (415) highlight the following legal point: that the inclusion of new heritage listings in the ISPP, NPS-UD or MDRS is inappropriate, and there is insufficient justification for them. The Submitters (415) point to the legal misrepresentation WCC is using to justify the lack of right to appeal which does not follow the WCC's own requirements for natural justice. The further submitter concurs with their assertion.</p>	<p>Amend / Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. Allow all private homeowners the right to appeal in order for justice to occur.</p> <p>Seeks that Council: -seek and make publicly available an independent legal evaluation of the the councils inclusion of heritage scheduling of new listings in the ISPP process, and if the proposed WCC's inclusion of inaccessible private homes are aligned with the independent evaluation</p>
Thomas John Broadmore	417.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Supports the submission of Il Casino Body Corporate.</p>	Not specified.
Thomas John Broadmore	417.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Supports the submission of Juliet Broadmore on the point on the use of Viewshaft area as greenspace.</p>	Not specified.
Penny Griffith	418.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Supports the submission of Historic Places Wellington.</p>	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Penny Griffith	418.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the 40km/hr speed zone in Oriental Bay doesn't interface well with nearby 50km/hr zones because drivers don't react to 10km/hr changes in speed limit - compounded by the fact that there's many pedestrians. [See original submission for full reasons]	Not specified.
Penny Griffith	418.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the New World supermarket adjacent to Waitangi Park creates a busy roundabout , with many lane changes and pedestrian activity making it dangerous. [See original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan add a new objective that recognises the positive value of participation in decisions on an ongoing basis, and acknowledge that this is central to communities being able to meet their needs on an ongoing basis.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.39	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is more rigorously tested against the objectives to ensure that the Council's chosen methods are the best options to deliver on the objectives of the Plan.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that many sites in the city are under utilised and that filling these gaps will provide for future housing needs without impacting quality, amenity and character.	Seeks that the proposed district plan add a clear sequence for intensification, done through zoning, that follows the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan and that it focus on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of under utilised sites close to public transport.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.40	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that Wellingtonians will relish the challenge of working together. Some suburbs such as Newtown are proactively taking a lead in rethinking their localities. Such initiatives create a sense of community, enhance democracy and deliver change in ways that build on community strengths. Seeks that participatory design projects, coupled with clear housing targets, so communities are involved in welcoming new people. Imposing arbitrary change when better options exist simply fosters local resentment.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.41	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellingtonians will relish the challenge of working together. Some suburbs such as Newtown are proactively taking a lead in rethinking their localities. Such initiatives create a sense of community, enhance democracy and deliver change in ways that build on community strengths.</p> <p>Seeks that participatory design projects, coupled with clear housing targets, so communities are involved in welcoming new people. Imposing arbitrary change when better options exist simply fosters local resentment.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.33	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.6	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that local government, central government agencies, private developers, and communities need to work in partnership not as adversaries.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington needs innovative models for public and private investment working together to rapidly develop Wellington's large areas of underutilised land into high quality housing, greenspace and small business facilities.</p> <p>Current proposals assume a meagre 14% of rezoned areas will be developed.</p> <p>LIVE WELLington wants to see partnerships that can realise the potential of at least half our underutilised land in the next ten years.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan includes an assessment of housing capacity in Wellington that is based on a target of realising at least 50% of the development capacity (as measured under the Operative Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the draft Plan, and that the draft Plan needs to include methods to achieve this.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that re-zoning rural land for urban purposes is needed to provide more space for affordable housing.</p> <p>Takapu Valley and Ohariu Valley has been land-banked by developers. These areas can potentially account for 25% of future population growth.</p>	Seeks that Wellington City Council review the prohibition on rezoning rural land for urban purposes.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that since Johnsonville residential area was zoned as Medium Density that many non-compliant and substandard multi-unit developments have been built.</p> <p>Considers that if a review was done of this area that it would be found that District Plan Change 72 did not achieve its promised levels of high quality, high density housing.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that WCC complete an independent review of the MDRAs to determine if the objectives in DPC72 have been met and confirm the WCC has successfully permitted "Density Done Well" developments. This review should provide a clear list of Do's and Don'ts for future housing development within the city.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that the New Zealand Motu Study identified the property value effect of each hour of sunlight lost, valuing it at around 2.4% per hour lost.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that WCC undertake independent monitoring of what happens to Wellington Property Market prices when properties are surrounded by High Density Developments over 3 storeys versus those that aren't.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.4	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that Amenity Values are protected under the Resource Management Act, and are valuable - inferring that any loss of amenity value should be compensated for.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that neighbouring properties losing amenities and value because of nearby 6 or more storey high density accommodation housing located in the outer suburbs is essentially an economic wealth transfer from those residents to the developer without compensation.	<p>Seeks that the PDP include a compensation framework for neighbouring residents who suffer a loss of value and amenity due to nearby high density accommodation housing developments.</p> <p>[See original submission for further details on this framework]</p>
Director-General of Conservation	FS107.1	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Stride is opposed to a compensation framework for neighbouring residents of high-density housing developments as this could impose inappropriate costs on development.	Disallow
Investore Property Limited	FS108.1	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Investore is opposed to a compensation framework for neighbouring residents of high-density housing developments as this could impose inappropriate costs on development.	Disallow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Johnsonville Community Association	429.6	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that because the Wellington RLTP says that decisions around intensification around Rapid Transit stops will be considered during the District Planning process, and the PDP does not have a definition of Rapid Transit, the classification of Johnsonville line or any other transit as Rapid Transit is not supported by the Wellington RLTP.	Seeks that WCC release the criteria used to determine which public transport stops are rapid transit stops and/or “commercial centres and with good public transport accessibility” deemed suitable for a MDRZ.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.7	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that Johnsonville is expected to have the highest population growth of any Wellington suburb and needs infrastructure investment to account for this. Considers that Johnsonville has a high level of traffic and there are many uncompleted road projects. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that WCC complete planned roading improvements for the Johnsonville Triangle.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.8	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that Johnsonville is expected to have the highest population growth of any Wellington suburb and needs infrastructure investment to account for this. Considers that Johnsonville has a high level of traffic and there are many uncompleted road projects. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that WCC support planned growth in Johnsonville.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.9	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that Johnsonville lacks public parking and green space and that the site of the old Johnsonville library is a good opportunity. It is the only WCC owned site in the triangle, it is sunny, sheltered and a decent distance from other green space, and there are other sites that can be repurposed for social housing.	Supports the completion of the Green Space Review for Johnsonville.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.10	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that Johnsonville lacks public parking and green space and that the site of the old Johnsonville library is a good opportunity. It is the only WCC owned site in the triangle, it is sunny, sheltered and a decent distance from other green space, and there are other sites that can be repurposed for social housing.	Seeks that development of the Old Library Site in Johnsonville is postponed until Green Space Review is complete.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.48	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Support the submission regarding more provision for green space in Johnsonville and generally throughout the city.	Allow
Johnsonville Community Association	429.11	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that while Johnsonville does have some public facilities including the new public library and the Alex Moore sports ground, there is a shortage of other facilities. Perhaps the most obvious is the lack of any indoor sports stadium. Other major suburbs have such a facility including Tawa, Ngaio, Newtown and Kilbirnie	Seeks that the WCC outline the specific planned investments that require further investment in facilities and infrastructure, with regard to Indoor sports stadium, parks, greenspace, public transport and roading. [Inferred Decision Requested]
Johnsonville Community Association	429.12	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Submitter is concerned at the lack of supporting information in justifying these major changes in PDP urban planning rules for Johnsonville.	Seeks that further information be released on the justification of both the rapid transit stop walking catchment MDRZs and the metropolitan walking catchment MDRZ.
Kat Hall	430.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Kat Hall	430.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan, as their 'proof of concept' plan shows that intensification along the main streets, and mostly within existing Suburban Centres zoning, could provide up to 2,000 or more new dwellings. This far exceeds the current projections of the Draft Spatial Plan for the whole Newtown area.	Not specified.
Anna Kemble Welch	434.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan, as it shows the potential for development of increased housing while retaining the historic frontages of the old shops. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan. [Inferred decision requested]
Anna Kemble Welch	434.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.
Anna Kemble Welch	434.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports Newtown Resident's Association's submission on the extension of Newtown's character Precinct, sunlight access and their point related to MDRZ sites with parks and open space in the neighbourhood.	Supports Newtown Residents' Association submission. [Refer to submission 440]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Paul M Blaschke	435.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>The decision from Council's Planning & Environment Committee to remove SNAs from all residentially zoned properties on 23 June 2022 is opposed. This decision renders the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity section much less effective than it could and should be.</p> <p>It greatly hinders the achievement of Council's Te Atakura blueprint and other moves towards sustainability and resilience.</p> <p>It disadvantages the great majority of the city's residents except for a tiny number of suburban residential landowners who become privileged over all others including other suburban residential landowners with portions of SNAs within their properties and who have welcomed or not objected to the provisions.</p> <p>It overturns the very good process adopted by the council team and consultants who have planned and undertaken the SNA survey and policy development. Finally, it renders ECO-O1, ECO-P1, ECO-P2, and ECO-P3, and the rules supporting these objectives and policies, incapable of being properly implemented, and perpetuates the uncertainty caused by lack of a comprehensive statutory process around significant areas and indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes the decision from Council's Planning & Environment Committee to remove Significant Natural Areas from all residentially zoned properties.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan, as it demonstrated how new buildings on only 45% of Mansfield Street escarpment area could provide at least 2000 sunny, accessible, comfortable new apartments, while retaining the historic character of the Riddiford St shops. Planned intensification along Newtown's main streets is supported.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Planning for Residential Amenity, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Planning for Residential Amenity, Boffa Miskell Report.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that there are environmental effects associated with demolition and rebuilding. New buildings, particularly high rises, are very carbon intensive. On the other hand, existing timber houses represent a great deal of embodied energy and sequestered carbon. Many have been adapted and upgraded over time, which is more environmentally sustainable than replacing them. Furthermore, these buildings are resilient and have survived 100+ years of earthquakes, while many new buildings in Wellington have been badly damaged in earthquakes.</p>	Not specified.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.35	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials.</p> <p>Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.</p>	Allow
Save Our Venues	445.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Considers that there are significant issues with current Noise Control enforcement processes.</p> <p>Considers that the current methodology of measuring sound is subjective and places the onus on the complainant. The response from noise control officers is then exclusively a punitive process. This can create a huge scope for loss of income and confidence in the venue.</p> <p>A model where measuring the sound at the boundary of the property from where the sound is emanating, as well as inside the complainant's property, would enable Council to ensure that both the venue and the residential property are compliant with noise standards and acoustic mitigation standards respectively. This will allow for mediation between both parties and ensure reasonable steps can be taken to mitigate noise before the venue is restricted in its ability to operate at all.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the WCC reforms its Noise Control enforcement processes, equipping officers with decibel meters and requiring that an objective measurement demonstrating non-compliance be recorded before an infringement notice can be issued or enforcement action taken.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Save Our Venues	445.2	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that there should also be the consideration that the sound of live music is inherently a different frequency to the sound of amplified recorded music or the normal environmental sounds of living in the city and should be measured to a standard that takes that into account. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that there should be separate consideration that the sound of live music, due to its frequency. [Inferred decision requested]
Kay Larsen	447.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that it seems impossible to imagine allowing developers to demolish existing houses without public notification so that the local community can work together to improve the neighbourhood. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Dale Mary McTavish	448.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Opposes recent examples of infill housing. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Dale Mary McTavish	448.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the Newtown shopping strip needs to be viable, which means parking for cars outside the shops, and the character needs to be kept.	Seeks that parking for cars outside shops on the Newtown shopping strip are kept.
Peter Jack	450.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that more catchment or reservoir storage be looked at for the future. With all this excessive water we are getting in the winter now rather than let it go, store it.	Not specified.
Graham Thomas Stewart	451.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	The submitter wants to follow the Councils (Kainga Ora's) proposal for 300 houses to be built [at Arlington Development in Mt Cook, Wellington].	Not specified.
David Lee	454.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers there is the Climate change issue to consider. Demolishing wooden heritage housing (which the Plan will allow of right) will release carbon into the atmosphere. Considers that more carbon will be used in building replacements made of concrete, steel and glass. 'Old is greener than new'.	Not specified.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.34	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials. Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow
(Vivien) Jane Kirkcaldie and Denis Maxwell Kirkcaldie	455.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Opposes the creation of canyons within the submitters' area (the Botanic Gardens and Bolton St Cemetery, the motorway and the cable car track), from multi-floor buildings. Considers that the area is steep and hilly, subject to seismic activity as the city in general, and the service infrastructure is old.	Not specified.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.20	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
(Vivien) Jane Kirkcaldie and Denis Maxwell Kirkcaldie	455.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that functioning, well-maintained houses in our area built before the 1930s should retain protection from demolition. Considers that people have worked hard in their jobs to be able to choose single dwellings to live their lives in this area and they take pride and love in maintaining the houses and gardens. These in turn reflect the history and stories of our city.	Not specified.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.21	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Chris Horne, Sunita Singh, Julia Stace, Paul Bell-Butler	456.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the protection of indigenous plant communities for their own sake and for their carbon-sequestration function. This is of increasing importance in the battle to limit global climate change and rising sea levels.	Not specified.
Marilyn Head	457.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Support the Newtown Residents Association submission. [Refer to submission number 440 for full details].	Support the Newtown Residents Association submission. [Refer to submission number 440 for full details].
Marilyn Head	457.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that Council should instead support redevelopment and repurposing of existing buildings, or, where necessary, rebuilding on similar scales. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Marilyn Head	457.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that Council should regulate to prevent land banking and unused sites/buildings, requiring cleared sites to be available as temporary parks if building has not commenced within a specified period. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.
Marilyn Head	457.4	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers the recreational outdoor space to built space needs to be increased and levies charged for parks and recreation must be made into law to ensure that these facilities are available in the area. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks to introduce fees for entrance into parks to ensure that these facilities are available in the areas not aggregated into public spaces like the waterfront. [inferred decision requested].
Marilyn Head	457.5	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers the plan does not factor in infrastructure requirements	not specified.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers there to be insufficient evidence of Brooklyn suburbs character or heritage value.	Seeks for WCC to investigate Character/ Heritage in the Brooklyn suburb.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Consideration given to topography, not just roads on a map for development.	Not specified.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.14	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that upzoning heights on swathes of housing is very 'destructive'. Considers high rise sites need to be carefully and individually selected according to topology with pockets of intensity if sites allow.	Allow
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the LIVE WELLington submission in its entirety.	Supports the LIVE WELLington submission (submission 154) in its entirety.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that WCC needs to redress some of the housing market failure and become a market maker and standards setter through actively fostering development on key sites.	Seeks that Wellington City Council actively fosters development through targeting properties for acquisition, engaging designers, consenting a plan, and then onselling the package to developers.
Philip Cooke	465.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings should be amended to remove protection of the roof design. The unusual arrangement or intriguing roof design is highlighted in the Physical Values and Rarity as of importance. The submitter considers that this feature was originally intended to be hidden from view. The roof's internal gutters are a problematic design which have resulted in damaging leaks twice in the last 23 years and would benefit from re-configuration.	Seeks that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) is amended to remove protection of the roof design.
Philip Cooke	465.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings should be amended with regard to its description of 'Age' under Physical Values. Considers that the description has "the place is particularly old in the context of human occupation in the Wellington region" but it should be amended to reflect that the house is old in the "context of European occupation of Mount Victoria".	Seeks that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) is amended in its description of Age under Physical Values to reflect that the house is old in the "context of European occupation of Mount Victoria" rather than the "context of human occupation".
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Supports more rates being used for resourcing these teams vs for maintaining large sections of road seal to a high standard for driving and parking private vehicles.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.4	Other / Other / Other	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].
Christina Mackay	478.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Submitter supports Historic Places Wellington's submissions. Supports the submission by Historic Places Wellington including support for PDP proposals for heritage provisions, proposals for additional heritage listings, new Historical and Cultural Heritage provisions and for inner city heritage/character suburbs.	Supports Historic Places Wellington's submission. [Refer to submission 182]
Ben Barrett	479.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Supports the Isthmus group planning ideas https://isthmus.co.nz/thinking/density-donewell-10-tips-for-aotearoa/ If any of these ideas can be included in the DP that would be useful. Submitter wants to see more evidence of wider expert planning consideration from professional groups such as Isthmus.	Supports the Isthmus group planning ideas
Ben Barrett	479.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council has a dedicated customer team to support those that are leading the way in development and make it easier for them to get consent.
Ben Barrett	479.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the Council should increase the percentage of green spaces in line with planned population density . [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council will increase the percentage of green spaces in line with planned population density.
Ben Barrett	479.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the Council improve the quality of the green spaces; (quiet, allow seats to capture sunshine hours, away from roads, connect us to nature/plants/water, include playgrounds for all ages).	Seeks that the Council improve the quality of green spaces.
Ben Barrett	479.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that Newtown streets have far too many cars on already. Private (internal combustion) vehicle priorities need to be secondary to active travel, and public transport.	Seeks that the Council will limit private car use and parking.
Catharine Underwood	481.12	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the 'We Are Newtown housing/dwelling plan/proposal by the residents for the residents' should be recognised by Councillors and be considered as the blue print for Newtown. Council officers have rejected the residents' plan as it was different to the residents wants. Though it achieved exactly the same outcome regarding the number of dwellings.	Seek that the 'We Are Newtown housing/dwelling plan/proposal by the residents for the residents' be recognised and considered as the proposed district plan provisions for Newtown.
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.242	General/ Other/ Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that this matter goes beyond the scope of the District Plan controls.	Disallow
Catharine Underwood	481.13	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Seeks that this would protect the valley location of Zealandia from aero plane noise and make listening to kiwi calling at night a much better experience.	Seeks a no commercial plane/helicopter fly zone between Mt Kaukau and Te Ahumairangi and over the Zealandia valley.
Wellington Helicopters	FS5.1	General/ Other/ Other/Other	Oppose	Restriction of flying through this area would restrict Wellington Helicopters' ability to operate and possibly introduce compromises to safety by restricting the available operating area. The comment regarding hearing kiwis would only be relevant at night.	Disallow
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there are too many shortcuts where the edges often have no obvious exits (because of high and solid property boundaries) and there is no surveillance.	Seeks that shortcuts have obvious exits and do not have high and solid property boundaries. [Inferred decision requested].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there are often excessive numbers or width of vehicle accessways across footpaths, and footpaths are often modified to suit driveway use rather than footpath users	Not specified.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that during construction, it tends to be the footpath that is lost.	Seeks that the WCC ensures that effective pedestrian provision is maintained through the construction stage, including for those with wheelchairs, suitcases etc. [Inferred decision requested].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.5	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the pedestrian network is disconnected at every intersection. Roundabouts are a particular problem. Crossings often put where that minimises effects on traffic rather than to ensure a direct pedestrian route. Crossing systems are not designed to make the pedestrian journey seamless eg. they may require the pedestrian to wait twice, as at the Basin Reserve crossing in Kent/Cambridge.	Not specified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.6	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that parts of the pedestrian grid are missing. Sometimes this is because of topography, sometimes because of poor past decisions during subdivisions, sometimes because it has been subsequently lost. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the complete pedestrian grid is restored and enhanced at every opportunity. [inferred decision requested]
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.7	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the District Plan needs to be clear that public access is a far higher priority than privacy. Public accessways are not always visible or signposted and there is sometimes pressure from adjacent landowners to not have them visible to the public.	Seeks that the public accessways are visible or signposted. [Inferred decision requested].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.8	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that there have been a number of cases where private property owners have requested driveways along what are currently pedestrian only shortcuts. This significantly reduces pedestrian service levels and amenity of the space.	Seeks that the District Plan ensures that private vehicle use on pedestrian accessways is avoided.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.9	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that the city suffers from poor quality public spaces in terms of lighting, surface, seats, shelter and shade, wayfinding. It is important that the overall public space delivers amenity, rather than there just being reliance on a few spaces that get focused design work.	Seeks that every available public space is treated as valuable and made usable.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.10	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that many public spaces are cluttered by poles, signs, café tables, bike parking infrastructure and so on. It is vital that the DP ensures an adequate uncluttered width of footpath, rather than treating an unusable part of the footpath as contributing to provision.	Seeks that the District Plan ensures that an adequate uncluttered width of footpath is provided and that new infrastructure should not be located in footpath space.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.11	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there are significant accessibility issues in Wellington, including to buildings and public spaces.	Not specified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.12	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that walking routes also need to be public spaces. Considers that this is essential to ensure that access is assured in future and walkability can be enhanced by the council and supported by community groups.	Not specified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.13	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that an important health measure to combat the spread of COVID-19 and other future diseases will be to increase the utility of well-ventilated outdoor space. In cities and towns overseas where this has been handled well, this involved widened footpaths, temporary cycle lanes, and an increase in outdoor dining options, to allow for adequate social distancing.	Not specified.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.14	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Much of our public space between buildings is wasted – cultivating only parked cars, weeds, and litter. Many of our streets are wider than needed for vehicle movement purposes, and space could easily be re-allocated to public amenity and walking.	Seeks that street space is re-allocated to public amenity and walking. [Inferred decision requested].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.15	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the widening of footpaths is vital to handle the likely increased pedestrian numbers, use of micro-mobility devices, social distancing, and as meeting and socialising spaces.	Seeks that planning prioritises the widening of footpaths. In the short-term, tactical urbanism can be used to create more walking space until the budget allows for a proper footpath is created.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.16	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the widening of footpaths is vital to handle the likely increased pedestrian numbers, use of micro-mobility devices, social distancing, and as meeting and socialising spaces. Much of our public space between buildings is wasted – cultivating only parked cars, weeds, and litter. Many of our streets are wider than needed for vehicle movement purposes, and space could easily be re-allocated to public amenity and walking.	Seeks that the formed footpath space available is increased through the removal of footpath clutter, a well-signalled tougher line on footpath parking, and utilisation of roadside parking for outdoors seating.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.17	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that non-disability parking should be re-purposed for outdoor seating to achieve the triple benefit of increasing capacity for businesses, highlighting to businesses in practice that short-term car parking is not essential for business success, and maintaining the footpath space required for pedestrians and other footpath users.	Seeks that non-disability parking is re-purposed for outdoor seating.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.18	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that work needs to be to increase parking availability while reducing parking footprint. The Thorndon Quay argument epitomises the tendency for businesses to conflate parking places with parking availability.	Seeks that work is done to allow booked parking for some key purposes, changing long-term spaces to more short-term and drop off/pickup spaces, and moving non-customer parking to other places. [Inferred decision requested].
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.19	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Opposes allowing individual developers to impose their vision on the community.	Not specified.
Hilary Carr	483.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that to encourage more people to use public transport, more park and ride facilities are required in the suburbs, and a fairly large one on the waterfront by the railway station.	Seeks that more park and ride facilities are required in the suburbs, and a fairly large one on the waterfront by the railway station (charged during the week, free in weekends). [Refer to original submission for full detail].
Hilary Carr	483.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that to encourage more people to use public transport, maybe have buses running 24/7 continually or until 3-5am from Courtney Place to the Railway station at least Thursday to Saturday hop on hop off for a minimal or no charge.	Seeks that there are buses running 24/7 continually or until 3-5am from Courtney Place to the Railway station at least Thursday to Saturday hop on hop off for a minimal or no charge.
Hilary Carr	483.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that providing each property with a food waste bin, services for collection, and a worm farm landfill would reduce methane and provide user friendly manure.	Seeks that each property is provided with a food waste bin, and services provided for collection and a worm farm landfill.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that there are limited provisions for papakainga in the plan and this is not adequate for iwi.	Amend the plan to include a papakainga chapter to be developed in partnership with mana whenua.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.42	Other / Other / Other	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the introduction of a standalone papakāinga chapter.	Allow
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that throughout the plan the language used to refer to the role of mana whenua in resource management switches between 'active involvement,' 'active participation,' and 'active partnership.'	Seeks that the role of mana whenua is consistently referred to as active partnership. [Inferred decision requested]
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that cultural wellbeing could be better supported in the plan as CEKP-O5 is the only place this is mentioned.	Amend the plan to give effect to cultural wellbeing across the Proposed District Plan.
Craig Palmer	492.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that more inner city parks and green space are needed in the CCZ.	Seeks that more inner city paks and green spaces are created in the City Centre.
Rita Angus Cottage Trust (formerly Thorndon Trust)	494.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the Historic Heritage Area Evaluation report December 2021 on the Ascot Street Heritage Area should be amended to correct two mistakes regarding Cooper's Cottage.	Seeks that Cooper's Cottage should be HNZPT Category 2 listed in both the <i>Acknowledgements</i> , page 2, and the <i>List of Places</i> , pages 21-36 (not Category 1). In the <i>Inventory of buildings and features</i> table, pages 275-8, Cooper's Cottage should be status 4 (not status 3).
John Mulholland	497.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports Smith Guersen's submission regarding the alteration of SNA boundaries in Carey Gully.	Supports Smith Guersen's submission. [Refer to submission 475]

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
----------------	-------------------	--------------------------------	----------	-----------------------	---------------------

blank page

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
----------------	-------------------	--------------------------------	----------	-----------------------	---------------------

blank page

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested
----------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------	-----------------------	---------------------

blank page